109th Congress
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H. DOCUMENT
109–56

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

MESSAGE

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

CERTIFICATION OF HIS APPROVAL OF ALL THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE COMMISSION'S REPORT, PURSUANT TO PUB. L. 101–510, SEC. 2903(e) (104 STAT. 1812)

Volumes 1 and 2

SEPTEMBER 19, 2005.—Message and accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

109th Congress
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H. DOCUMENT
109–56

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

MESSAGE

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

CERTIFICATION OF HIS APPROVAL OF ALL THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE COMMISSION'S REPORT, PURSUANT TO PUB. L. 101–510, SEC. 2903(e) (104 STAT. 1812)

Volumes 1 and 2

SEPTEMBER 19, 2005.—Message and accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

23–478

WASHINGTON : 2005

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the report containing the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission pursuant to sections 2903 and 2914 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Public Law 101–510, 104 Stat. 1810, as amended. That report includes changes referenced in errata sheets submitted to me by the Commission, including the enclosed errata sheets dated September 8, September 9, September 12, and September 13, 2005.

I note that I am in receipt of a letter from Chairman Principi, dated September 8, 2005, regarding a district court injunction then in effect relating to the Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station in Windsor Locks, Connecticut. Chairman Principi's letter states that, as a result of that injunction, "you should consider the portion of Recommendation 85 . . . that recommends realignment of the Connecticut 103rd Fighter Wing withdrawn from the Commission's report." The Chairman's letter further states that "[i]f the court's injunction is later vacated, reversed, stayed, or otherwise withdrawn, it is the intent of the Commission that the entirety of the recommendation be a part of the Commission's report." On September 9, 2005, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit granted a stay of the district court's injunction. Because the injunction is no longer in effect, Recommendation 85 in its entirety is part of the Commission's report.

I certify that I approve all the recommendations contained in the Commission's report.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 15, 2005.*

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 8, 2005

The following administrative changes were made to the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Report following the printing of the hard bound and CD-ROM versions of the report. The electronic versions of the report on the www.brac.gov web site and three ring binder versions of the Report reflect the changes detailed below.

Page 335, chart, 2nd row, 2nd column. Changed from "Army, 12 major closures, $170,180,00;" to, "Army, 12 major closures, $170,180,000;"

Page Q-92, line 32. Added the motion number "186." to precede the wording, "CREATE AN INTEGRATED WEAPONS & ARMAMENTS SPECIALTY SITE FOR GUNS AND AMMUNITION (TECH 19)"

Page R-13, paragraph (3). Changed from, "After June 30, 2011, the Commission shall promptly provide, upon request, to any Member of Congress information used by the Commission in making its recommendations." to "After June 30, 2015, the Commission shall promptly provide, upon request, to any Member of Congress information used by the Commission in making its recommendations."

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret),The Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 9, 2005

The following are corrections to the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Report. The electronic versions of the report posted here at www.brac.gov will be corrected to reflect these changes.

Page 12, line 15, replace "substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1, 2 and 5" with "substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7"

Page 129, line 24; page Q-38, Recommendation 90, paragraph a, and; page Q-39, footnote 113, replace "Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 183rd Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN" with "Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 122nd Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN."

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret),The Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 12, 2005

George W. Bush
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Further review of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report transmitted to you on September 8, 2005 has revealed several corrections needed for clarity and accuracy. The changes, which are to be incorporated into the Report, are administrative and conforming in nature and serve to ensure correct and complete understanding of the Commission's reasoning and intent.

In addition to the corrections contained in the enclosed errata provided earlier, the following changes have also been made to the Report:

- Page 127, 8th paragraph. Delete "(ANG)" after "57th Fighter Wing".
- Page 253, line 7. Change PAYBACK PERIOD from "4 YEARS" to "8 YEARS".
- Page O-7, Appendix O, 2nd entry: "Denver-Aurora, CO Metropolitan Statistical Area". Change "Air Reserve Personnel Center" to "Air Reserve Personnel Center and Defense Finance and Accounting Service (Buckley Annex)".
- Page O-21, Appendix O, 8th entry. "Fayetteville, NC Metropolitan Area". Replace "Pope Air Force Base/Net Changes for This Economic Area" figures with:

-5,806	-382	-132	-6,320	-4,234	-10,554	-3.8%
-1,728	-135	-132	-1,995	-1,321	-3,316	-1.6%

- Page O-22, Appendix O, 1st entry: "New Bern, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area". Replace "Total for North Carolina" figures with:

-1,310	-721	-161	-2,192	-1,424	-3,620	-1.7%

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, the Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret), the Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), the Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

The electronic version of the Report posted on the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission website will be corrected to reflect these changes.

Mr. President, I once again note, on behalf of the Commissioners and staff, that it has been an honor and privilege to serve on the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Respectfully yours,

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Enclosure
(1) Changes to BRAC Commission Report dtd September 8, 2005
(2) Changes to BRAC Commission Report dtd September 9, 2005

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 13, 2005

George W. Bush
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

The need for an additional change to the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Report has been brought to my attention. A motion to amend a recommendation of the Secretary of Defense was voted down but is reflected in the Report as having passed. As a result of the motion failing and in the absence of the Commission determining that the Secretary deviated substantially from the force-structure plan and final selection criteria as required by Section 2903(d)(2)(B) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended, the Secretary's recommendation is approved.

Three changes in the Report, described below, are required to correct this error.

- Page 170. Delete "Commission Recommendations" and the text that follows.
- Page Q-58, Appendix Q. Replace subparagraph a. with the Secretary's recommendation: "Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA. The 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will associate with the 92nd Air Refueling Wing at Fairchild Air Force Base, and the 141st Air Refueling Wing's eight KC-135R aircraft are distributed to the 185th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard Station, IA. The 256th Combat Communications Squadron and 242nd Combat Communications Squadron, which are ANG geographically separated units at Four Lakes and Spokane, are relocated into available facilities at Fairchild Air Force Base."
- Pages Q-58 and 59, Appendix Q. Delete footnote 160.

The effect of these changes is limited with results that conform to and reflect the Commission's overall purpose and plan. The Secretary's recommendation largely provides for the distribution of aircraft as the Commission envisioned. I am confident that the realignment of Fairchild Air Force Base directed by the Secretary will be accomplished consistent with the overall KC-135 aircraft laydown plan developed by the Commission.

Respectfully yours,

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, the Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret), the Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), the Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

2005
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT

VOLUME 1



DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 8, 2005

George W. Bush
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

The 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission is proud to present its Final Report for your consideration. As required by law, the Commission thoroughly and objectively reviewed the domestic installation closure and realignment recommendations proposed by the Secretary of Defense on May 13, 2005.

In 2005, the Secretary made more recommendations, with more complexity, than all four previous base closure rounds combined. We held ourselves to a high standard of openness and transparency in all our activities and deliberations as we assessed these recommendations. Over the past four months, the Commission conducted 182 site visits, held 20 legislative and deliberative hearings, hosted 20 regional hearings, and received well over 200,000 written and electronic communications from the public. We publicly sought, and received, expert analysis and commentary from a variety of governmental and non-governmental sources to assist our independent analysis.

We recognize that our final recommendations will have profound effects on many communities and the people who bring them to life as well as on the uniformed men and women embodying our Armed Forces. We are confident that the recommendations contained in our Final Report will positively shape our military for decades to come. The warfighters securing our way of life will depend on the successful implementation of our recommendations to shape the infrastructure supporting their current and future missions.

In addition to the Commission's assessment of the Secretary's recommendations, we have addressed issues relevant to future rounds of base realignment and closure.

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Billbray, the Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret), the Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), the Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

Mr. President, it has been an honor and privilege for us to serve on the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Respectfully Yours,

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

James H. Bilbray
Commissioner

Philip E. Coyle III
Commissioner

ADM Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret)
Commissioner

James V. Hansen
Commissioner

GEN James T. Hill, USA (Ret)
Commissioner

Gen. Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton, USAF (Ret)
Commissioner

Samuel K. Skinner
Commissioner

Brig. Gen. Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Commissioner

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report

Table of Contents

Volume One

Section Name	Page
Executive Summary	iii
Chapter One: Commission Findings & Recommendations	1
Commission Strategic Overview	1
Army	5
Navy/Marine Corps	81
Air Force	111
Education & Training	179
Headquarters & Support Activities	191
Industrial	229
Intelligence	253
Medical	257
Supply & Storage	271
Technical	281
Chapter Two: Issues for Further Consideration	305
Chapter Three: Previous Experience with Base Closures	311
Chapter Four: The 2005 BRAC Process	315

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME TWO

SECTION NAME

Appendix A: Abbreviations

Appendix B: Definitions

Appendix C: BRAC Statute

Appendix D: Force Structure Plan

Appendix E: Final Selection Criteria

Appendix F: Closures and Realignments by State, 1988-1995

Appendix G: Commissioners' Biographies

Appendix H: Staff List

Appendix I: Hearings Held by Commission

Appendix J: Commissioner and Staff Base Visits

Appendix K: DoD Closure and Realignment Recommendations List

Appendix L: Bases Added by the Commission, 2005

Appendix M: COBRA Analysis of Commission Final Recommendations

Appendix N: COBRA Comparison of BRAC 1988-2005

Appendix O: Economic Impact of Commission Final Recommendations

Appendix P: Selected Environmental Remediation Costs

Appendix Q: Commission's Final Recommendations

Appendix R: Legislative Proposal

Appendix S: "Life After BRAC" Resource Finder

Appendix T: Maps

Index by State

Index by Recommendation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Commission assessed the Department of Defense's (DoD's) closure and realignment recommendations for consistency with the eight statutory selection criteria and the DoD Force Structure Plan. The recommendations announced by Secretary Rumsfeld on May 13, 2005 comprised, by the Commission's count, 190 separate DoD recommendations that would produce as many as 837 distinct and identifiable recommended BRAC "close" or "realign" actions. These 837 distinct actions also involved an additional 160 installations that would gain missions or resources due to the proposed closures and realignments. All told, the 2005 BRAC recommendations exceeded the number considered by all prior BRAC Commissions combined. In addition to the unprecedented number, many DoD recommendations were extremely complex, proposing intertwining movements between and among numerous installations. Other DoD proposals consolidated apparently unrelated actions within the same recommendation.

Secretary Rumsfeld was very clear that his primary goal for the BRAC process was military transformation. And, unlike prior BRAC rounds, the Commission evaluated DoD's recommendations in the context of a stable or increasing force structure, an ongoing conflict in Southwest Asia, and the projected redeployment of 70,000 servicemembers and family members from Europe and Asia to the United States. The 20-year BRAC outlook required the Commission to make allowances for major uncertainties in the military and strategic environment. While acknowledging the importance of savings as a BRAC goal, the Commission went beyond a business model analysis of DoD's recommendations and weighed the strategic environment within which recommendations would be implemented and their effect on DoD's transformational goals.

NUMBER OF CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS

Of the 190 DoD recommendations, the Commission approved 119 with no change and accepted another 45 with amendments; over 86% of those proposed by DoD. The Commission rejected 13 DoD recommendations in their entirety and significantly modified another 13.

The Commission has forwarded a total of 182 closures or realignment recommendations, including 177 of the 190 recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense and five closures or realignment recommendations from the eight installations it considered on its own initiative.

Of DoD's recommended 33 "major" closures, the Commission approved 21, recommended realignment for seven, and rejected five. In addition, the Commission recommended closure, rather than realignment, for Naval Air Station Brunswick, for a total of 22 major closures. Of DoD's 29 recommended "major" realignments, the Commission approved 25, closed rather than realigned one (Naval Air Station Brunswick) and rejected three. In addition, it added one major realignment on its own initiative for a total of 33 major realignments, including realignment of the seven installations proposed for closure by DoD.

COSTS AND SAVINGS

Over the next 20 years, the total savings of the Commission's recommendations are estimated at $35.6 billion rather than $47.8 billion for DoD's proposals. However, if DoD's claimed cost avoidances attributable to military personnel actions are excluded, as both the Commission and GAO believe necessary, actual savings to the taxpayer are estimated at $15 billion over 20 years. The Commission estimates that implementation of its recommendations will result in annual savings of $4.2 billion, compared to $5.4 billion for DoD's proposals. Implementation will require one-time up-front costs of $21 billion compared to the $24.6 billion that would have been required by the DoD proposal.

BRAC AS A VEHICLE FOR JOINTNESS

While the Secretary of Defense described the 2005 BRAC as an opportunity to promote jointness, very few of the hundreds of proposals increased jointness, and some actually decreased or removed joint and cross-service connections. Most of the DoD proposed consolidations and reorganizations were within the Military Departments, not across the Services. "Collocation" is not synonymous with "integration", and "transformation" is not synonymous with "jointness". While the Secretary's recommendations will not move the ball across the jointness goal line, Commission decisions will help move the ball down the field.

Savings due to Military Personnel

DoD frequently credited recommendations with creating "savings" derived from the costs of servicemembers who would be reassigned from a closing or realigning installation to a gaining base or activity. Much of DoD's claimed "savings" are attributable to the reassignment of 26,830 military personnel positions that would not be eliminated, although military effectiveness would increase as servicemembers are reassigned to higher priority missions.

DoD's claimed savings (as opposed to cost avoidance) will be significantly reduced by the extent that military personnel costs are not reduced but are instead shifted to another installation or mission. DoD claimed its proposals would produce $47.8 billion in savings after investing $24.6 billion in one-time implementation costs. However, if personnel savings are not realized, DoD's 2005 BRAC proposal would still incur $24.6 billion in one-time costs while saving only $18.6 billion.

For some Air Force base recommendations, the cost savings due to personnel reductions were over 90% of the total savings. For example, the DoD projected savings due to personnel reductions at Pope AFB, Grand Forks AFB, and Cannon AFB were 97.8%, 94.5%, and 92%, respectively of the total savings claimed. In the case of the Air National Guard, roughly 106,000 military personnel assigned before the 2005 BRAC are retained after the 2005 BRAC. Obviously, no savings will be achieved by moving these positions around the country if the total does not change.

Air National Guard

DoD proposals to close or realign Air National Guard bases nationwide represented one of the most difficult issues faced by the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Thirty-seven of the 42 DoD Air Force proposals involved the Air National Guard.

As proposed by DoD, 23 Air National Guard units would have lost all their currently assigned aircraft. The proposed realignments or closures threatened the confidence of many Governors that they would have Air National Guard resources if needed for emergencies, natural disasters, or homeland defense missions. Several states have filed law suits to block such moves.

From the outset, the Commission and its staff worked long hours with the U.S. Air Force, with the National Guard Bureau, and with the Adjutants General to fashion recommendations that would achieve DoD's objectives, conform to the military value BRAC selection criteria and respond to the concerns of the states and the Adjutants General. The result of those efforts was approved unanimously by the Commission during its hearing on August 26, 2005.

Commission Process

In accordance with the BRAC statute, three Commissioners were directly nominated by the President and six nominated by the President after consultation with majority or minority leaders of the House and Senate. By law, and by Commission policy, the Commission's process was open, transparent, apolitical, and fair. In addition to considering certified data provided by DoD, Commissioners sought input from communities and individuals affected by the DoD recommendations. Commissioners made 182 site visits to 173 separate installations. They conducted 20 regional hearings to obtain public input and 20 deliberative hearings for input on, or discussion of, policy issues. Commissioners were accessible to communities, citizens, and to their advocates without regard to party or agenda. Commissioners participated in hundreds of meetings with public officials and received well over 200,000 pieces of mail. All documents provided to the Commission were scanned into an "e-library" and made available through the internet. The Commission's web site registered over 25 million "hits."

The 2005 BRAC Commission assessed closure and realignment recommendations of unprecedented scope and complexity while setting a new standard for accessibility to the American people and transparency of deliberations.

STATUTORY BRAC FINAL SELECTION CRITERIA

MILITARY VALUE (GIVEN PRIORITY CONSIDERATION)

1. The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department of Defense, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.
2. The availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.
3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training.
4. The cost of operations and the manpower implications.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5. The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.
6. The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.
7. The ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel.
8. The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance.

MAJOR CLOSURES:

ARMY (12)

Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA

Fort Gillem, GA

Fort McPherson, GA

Newport Chemical Deport, IN

Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS

Selfridge Army Activity, MI

Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS

Fort Monmouth, NJ

Umatilla Chemical Deport, OR

Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX

Deseret Chemical Deport, UT

Fort Monroe, VA

NAVY (5)

Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA

Naval Station Pascagoula, MS

Naval Air Station Willow Grove, PA

Naval Station Ingleside, TX

Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME

AIR FORCE (5)

Kulis Air Guard Station, AK

Onizuka Air Force Station, CA

Brooks City Base, TX

General Mitchell ARS, WI

Cannon Air Force Base, NM*

* Closure recommendation goes into effect if the Secretary of the Air Force does not designate a new mission for the installation by December 31, 2009.

MAJOR REALIGNMENTS:

ARMY (6)

Walter Reed National Military Medical Center (at Bethesda), DC

Rock Island Arsenal, IL

Fort Knox, KY

Army Reserve Personnel Center, St. Louis, MO

Ft. Eustis, VA

Red River Army Depot, TX

NAVY (13)

Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA

Naval Base Ventura City, CA

Naval Base Coranado, CA

Naval Medical Center San Diego, CA

Naval District Washington, DC

NAS Pensacola, FL

Naval Station Great Lakes, IL

Naval Support Activity Crane, IN

NAS Corpus Christi, TX

Naval Medical Center Portsmouth, VA

NAS Oceana, VA

Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, LA

Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Concord Detachment, CA

AIR FORCE (12)

Eielson AFB, AK

Elmendorf AFB, AK

Mountain Home AFB, ID

Pope AFB, NC

Grand Forks AFB, ND

Lackland AFB, TX

Sheppard AFB, TX

McChord AFB, WA

Otis Air National Guard Base, MA

W.K. Kellogg Airport Guard Station, MI

Niagara Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, NY

Pittsburg International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA

Defense Agencies/Multiple Services (2)

NCR Leased locations, DC

Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) Arlington, VA

Proposed Closures Rejected by the Commission:

Hawthorne Army Depot, NV

Naval Support Activity, Corona, CA

Submarine Base New London, CT

Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, ME

Ellsworth AFB, SD

Proposed Realignments Rejected by the Commission:

NAS Brunswick, ME**

Maxwell AFB, AL

Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR

DFAS Cleveland, OH

** Commission recommended closure instead

CHAPTER 1

COMMISSION STRATEGIC OVERVIEW

America's servicemembers are supported by, but also constrained by, the physical infrastructure of our nation's defense establishment: the bases where they live and train; the facilities where they maintain their weapons and equipment; the schools where they learn and practice their craft; the laboratories where future weapons and equipment are researched, developed, and tested; the logistics installations that servicemembers count on for the supplies they need to operate; and the depots that refurbish and overhaul their equipment. Today's defense infrastructure is the collective and tangible legacy of decades—even generations—of decisions on defense installations. Today, the armed forces and the Department of Defense are the stewards of installations ranging from some built originally to defend our harbors during the age of sail to others defending against intercontinental ballistic missiles.

No institution will remain successful without adapting to its constantly changing environment. Our armed forces must adapt to changing threats, evolving technology, reconfigured organizational structures, and new strategies and structures. Our infrastructure must support that progress, not hinder it. Neither DoD, nor the American taxpayer, can afford to support unneeded infrastructure at the expense of funding for supplies and equipment for our servicemembers. The base closure and realignment (BRAC) process is a systematic, rational process to bring our nation's military infrastructure into line with the needs of our armed forces, not only by reducing costs and closing unneeded installations, but also by facilitating the transformation of our armed forces to meet the challenges of the new century.

The closure or realignment of a base can have profound effects on the communities hosting our military installations and, more important, on the people who bring those communities and our military to life. The BRAC process created by Congress establishes clear criteria for DoD evaluation of, and recommendations for, the closure of military installations, to be followed by an assessment of those DoD recommendations by an independent commission. The President and then the Congress have the option of accepting or rejecting the Commission's report, in its entirety. Under law, neither the President nor the Congress can pick and choose from the Commission's report.

Prior BRAC rounds occurred at the dusk of the Cold War, when military budgets and force structure were shrinking. The 2005 BRAC round occurred in a post-9/11 environment with our armed forces deployed in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan with stable or increasing force structure and defense budgets. During the 2005 BRAC implementation period, the armed forces expect to relocate 70,000 servicemembers from overseas to installations within the United States. Prior BRAC rounds took place in the context of military doctrine and force structure shaped by the Cold War. The 2005 BRAC round occurred during the transformation of military doctrine and force structure to meet the needs of an entirely new threat and security environment.

The Commission's assessment of the Secretary's recommendations took numerous factors into account, as discussed below.

THE ROLE OF DEPOTS IN WARTIME AND UNCERTAINTY

In assessing DoD recommendations against the statutory BRAC criteria and the Force Structure Plan, the Commission had to consider the tradeoff between savings attributable to closure of excess depot capacity and the efficiencies attributable to consolidated operations against the value of retaining sufficient surge capacity to sustain our military in a time of war and uncertainty. Scaling back depots and industrial functions reduces the capacity to rapidly increase outputs and could lead to an unacceptable risk of single-point failures in our nation's capacity to repair and/or modify certain critical weapons systems and platforms. Under the 20-year Force Structure Plan, many major weapons systems and platforms are projected to remain in service for decades. Utilization of these systems in the Global War on Terrorism, including in Afghanistan and Iraq, subjects many vehicles and aircraft to harsh battlefield conditions and extensive and unanticipated operational tempo. The Commission had to assess whether living with slightly higher levels of excess capacity might be preferable than being left with too little capacity.

Reconciling the Principle of Dispersion to BRAC

The Commission had to assess the effect on the statutory BRAC criteria and Force Structure Plan of trade-offs between efficiency and affordability and the strategic values of dispersion and defense in depth. Yet the 2005 BRAC Commission was asked by DoD, in the form of many BRAC recommendations, to agree to the concentration of some types of facilities and systems onto fewer large DoD-owned installations.

Strategic Presence in the United States

The Commission's assessment of the Secretary's recommendations' consistency with the Force Structure Plan and the BRAC selection criteria took place in the context of changing threats to our national security. During the Cold War, the domestic U.S. installation infrastructure focused primarily on projecting power across the Arctic Circle and across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. In the post–September 11th era when the main threats of the future do not involve Soviet bombers, submarines, or ballistic missiles, a re-evaluation of facility infrastructure has turned some Cold War virtues into vices. But in DoD recommendations for shifting assets and investments, Commissioners were required to assess whether the result might be insufficient strategic presence in some parts of the United States. In addition, the Commission addressed a concern about the long-term effects of having little military presence in large regions of the country.

Coordinating Homeland Defense and Homeland Security

In preparing its recommendations, DoD was required by statute to consider the homeland defense implications of its proposals. Additionally, DoD was to consider the costs that might be incurred by non-DoD agencies as a result of closure and realignment actions. Many DoD installations host non-DoD federal tenants, including the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (e.g., the Coast Guard), the FBI, and the Department of Veterans Affairs. These non-DoD tenants reap significant benefits from their collocation at military bases. In turn, DoD spreads its base operating support costs (BOS) across all of its tenants, and thus these non-DoD entities are frequently bill-payers that help reduce DoD's installation operating budgets. If DoD proposes to close or downsize these installations, these non-DoD tenants often incur substantial new costs that were not budgeted or anticipated. In many cases, the Commission learned through its investigations and analysis that DoD routinely failed to properly account for the added costs to non-DoD tenants and failed to properly coordinate its decisions with federal tenant organizations. Many tenants learned of DoD's BRAC recommendations for the first time on May 13, 2005. As a result, Commissioners were required to assess whether certain DoD closure or realignment proposals that posed an unanticipated negative impact on federal tenant organizations might rise to a level where the proposal's military value and feasibility were cast into doubt.

Compounding this problem has been the combined failure of DoD and DHS to define where DoD's responsibilities for providing homeland defense ends and where DHS' homeland security functions begin. A gray area of overlap between these two distinct but related spheres of authority and responsibility persists despite four years' having elapsed since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. BRAC could have been a prime opportunity to shrink this gray and inherently nebulous boundary—had DoD and DHS actively chose to coordinate with each other. Sadly, this opportunity was not seized by either Department. The Commission, on several occasions, solicited input and feedback from DHS on DoD BRAC recommendations having a direct and immediate impact on DHS' ability to execute homeland security functions. But in many cases, these inquiries were met with a level of passivity and reluctance to criticize that was out of proportion to the seriousness of the issues at stake. This was particularly true of many Air Force Air National Guard recommendations that stripped units of their flying mission. Commissioners heard numerous protests from governors and state delegations that DoD's proposed removal of these air assets, and their conversion into Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) units, could have a direct and immediate negative impact on their ability to perform homeland security missions. Clearly, the presence or absence of such assets as C-130 aircraft, which are routinely tasked by governors to rapidly deploy Civil Support Teams (CSTs) and emergency relief supplies in the event of manmade or natural disasters, was an issue of major significance. DoD proposed significant reallocation of air assets (notwithstanding their retention of expeditionary combat support units) with a direct bearing on the national homeland security network, yet DHS provided little or no guidance, input, or assistance to the Commission on how to objectively evaluate these community homeland security concerns, even when directly asked to do so. As a result, the Commission was forced to assess, by itself, the homeland security and homeland defense implications of many BRAC recommendations.

During the 2005 BRAC process, many Commissioners both heard and expressed concerns about DoD recommendations that would significantly downsize numerous Air National Guard units and radically change their future missions. In many cases, ANG units would lose their flying mission but retain their ECS operations. An extensive volume of evidence and

speculation was presented to Commissioners during their review that the proposed plane-less ECS units and enclaves were not viable over the long term. Commissioners were told by Adjutants General and community representatives that for a variety of reasons the kind of people historically attracted to ANG units will not join in the future if there are no flying assets available. Recruitment and retention in ANG units without aircraft would plummet, according to many communities. Whole regions of the country, it was argued, would be devoid of any significant military or National Guard presence.

Transformation versus cost savings

In previous rounds of BRAC, the explicit goal was to save money and downsize the military in order to reap a "peace dividend." It was clear from the Commission's examination of the DoD 2005 BRAC list that the historical goal of achieving savings through eliminating excess capacity was not always the primary consideration for many recommendations. In fact, several DoD witnesses at Commission hearings made it clear that the purpose of many 2005 BRAC recommendations was to advance the goals of transformation, improve capabilities, and enhance military value. In some cases, accomplishing these new goals meant proposing BRAC scenarios that either never paid off (i.e., resulted in a net increased cost) or had very long payback periods. The Commission's assessment of the selection criteria and Force Structure Plan took place in the context of a balance between the goals of realizing savings and rationalizing our military infrastructure to meet the needs of future missions.

However, as discussed elsewhere in this Report, the Commission noted in many cases that DoD claimed savings from proposals on the basis of eliminated military personnel. Yet, because total end strength was not being reduced proportionately, these so-called "savings" will not actually reduce total DoD spending levels. Hence, they are not truly savings in the commonly understood sense of the term. No new equipment or increases in operations could be purchased with these "reductions" in military personnel. Because these military personnel would not be eliminated, but merely reassigned to higher-priority tasks, the Commission concluded that DoD's initial estimates of $49 billion in net savings over a 20-year period were vastly overestimated, although "military value"—the primary selection criterion—might be increased.

Complex and interconnected recommendations

Among the issues that made the work of the Commissioners more difficult, was the decision by DoD to routinely mingle unrelated proposals under the title of a single "recommendation." Unlike prior rounds of BRAC where each base was handled by a single integrated recommendation, the 2005 DoD recommendations were scattered throughout its report, often affecting the same facility several times in different proposals. Some installations had ten or more recommendations that had a direct impact on their missions and infrastructure. In many instances, Commissioners had to reconcile whether a substantial deviation in one or more selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan rose to a level that warranted rejecting an entire package of interconnected moving parts. Commissioners struggled to fully understand the net impact on bases that were both gaining and losing missions at the same time, and they knew that rejecting one element of a recommendation could potentially set off a cascade of known and unknown effects rippling across several other proposals. Thus, Commissioners in 2005 not only had to consider each recommendation's individual merits, but also how the recommendation's pieces fit together as a whole, and how they related to other recommendations that depended on one another for successful implementation.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

BRAC Commission Findings and Recommendations

Department of the Army

Note: The recommendations appear in this report in the exact same order, and using the exact same titles, as they appeared in the Department of Defense report submitted May 13, 2005. Paragraphs titled "Secretary of Defense Recommendations," and "Secretary of Defense Justification" are from the May 13, 2005, report submitted by the Secretary to the BRAC Commission. Where bases not originally listed by DoD have been "added" by the Commission, they will appear at the end of the relevant Report section.

Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Recommendation # 1 (Army 5)

One-Time Cost:	$0.05M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.05M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($0.7M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Wainwright, AK, by relocating the Cold Regions Test Center (CRTC) headquarters from Fort Wainwright, AK, to Fort Greely, AK.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation relocates CRTC headquarters to Fort Greely to improve efficiency of operations and personnel safety. Sufficient capacity exists at Fort Greely. This would not affect Force Structure. This recommendation relocates headquarters closer to the CRTC's test mission execution on the Bolio Lake Range Complex. This complex, although realigned under Fort Wainwright in BRAC 95, is only 10 miles south of Fort Greely but 100 miles from Fort Wainwright's cantonment area. This action would improve interoperability and reduce costs by permitting personnel to live closer to their primary work site, thus avoiding a 200-mile round trip between quarters and work sites. It also decreases the risks associated with the required year-round travel in extreme weather conditions and results in more efficient and cost effective monitoring and control of arctic testing of transformational systems. This recommendation did not consider other locations since the CRTC headquarters manages testing at only one site.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that this recommendation would reverse a 1995 BRAC decision realigning Fort Greely by placing the CRTC headquarters at Fort Wainwright. The original proposal essentially mothballed Fort Greely and moved two major activities, the Northern Warfare Training Center and the Cold Regions Test Activity (now the Cold Region Test Center), off the installation.

In 2001, Congress, as part of Public Law 107-20, permitted the use of Fort Greely for missile defense, effectively reactivating the installation. The Commission agrees with DoD's rationale for moving the CRTC headquarters back to Fort Greely to reduce harsh weather travel demands on headquarters personnel.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Fort Gillem, Georgia

Recommendation # 2 (Army 6)

One-time Cost:	$56.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($35.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($421.5M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Fort Gillem, GA. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Rock Island Arsenal, IL. Relocate the 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52nd Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Group to Fort Campbell, KY. Relocate the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Fort Benning, GA. Relocate the 3rd US Army Headquarters support office to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Headquarters US Forces Command (FORSCOM) VIP Explosive Ordnance Support to Pope Air Force Base, NC. Close the Army- Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) Atlanta Distribution Center and establish an enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the remainder of the 81st RRC units and the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Forensics Laboratory.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation closes Fort Gillem, an Army administrative installation and an AAFES distribution center. The recommendation moves the major tenant organizations to Rock Island Arsenal, Redstone Arsenal, Fort Benning, and Fort Campbell. It also moves small components of the Headquarters 3rd US Army and US Army Forces Command to Pope AFB and Shaw AFB. It enhances the Army's military value, is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities to address unforeseen future requirements. This closure allows the Army to employ excess capacities at installations that can accomplish more than administrative missions.

The closure of Fort Gillem also enables the stationing of its tenant units at locations that will increase their ability to associate with like units and promote coordination of efforts. Both the 52nd EOD Group and the 2nd Recruiting Brigade have regional missions in the Southeastern United States. The 52nd EOD Group was co-located with operational forces at Fort Campbell to provide training opportunities. The 2nd Recruiting Brigade is recommended to relocate to Redstone Arsenal because of its central location in the Southeast and its access to a transportation center in Huntsville, AL. The Army is converting the 1st US Army Headquarters into the single Headquarters for oversight of Reserve and National Guard mobilization and demobilization. To support this conversion the Army decided to relocate 1st Army to Rock Island Arsenal, a central location in the United States. The 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site is relocated to Fort Benning, where there are improved training opportunities with operational forces.

Community Concerns

The community emphasized that Fort Gillem and Fort McPherson are linked. They asserted that DoD understated costs, producing projected savings which appear to be the primary basis for the closure decision. They indicated relocation of three major headquarters (1st Army, 2nd Recruiting Brigade and 52nd EOD Group) would adversely affect Reserve Component training readiness, homeland defense, and efficient command and control. They also held that relocation of 1st Army Headquarters would separate it from the many related capabilities offered by homeland security organizations and Reserve Components located at Fort Gillem. They argued that cost, command and control obstacles, loss of Reserve Component

synergies, homeland defense coordination issues, and security challenges for enclaved organizations should persuade the Commission to vote against closure. The community indicated the economic impact will be great on Clayton County and the surrounding community which suffers from high unemployment rates and low per-capita income. The community states that the proposed enclave at Fort Gillem would create security challenges and fragment potential reuse, in addition to challenges of long-term contamination cleanup.

Commission Findings

The Commission's findings supported DoD's overall recommendation, although the Commission found that DoD failed to adequately define its planned enclave at Fort Gillem, contrary to its agreement with the findings of a 2003 study by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) of prior BRAC enclaves. GAO recommended that the Secretary of Defense provide the 2005 BRAC Commission with data clearly specifying the infrastructure needed for any proposed enclaves and the estimated costs to operate and maintain such enclaves. The Commission found merit in community concerns about the adverse effect of multiple enclaves on reuse of the remainder of Fort Gillem, and therefore modified the DoD recommendation to require a contiguous enclave.

The Commission also found that units other than those explicitly stated in the approved recommendation, such as the Military Entrance Processing Station, may need to remain in the enclave, although the Commission strongly believes that the size of the enclave needs to be minimized to give the community maximum opportunities for reuse. The Commission found that the recommendation failed to address the Ammunition Supply Point, the only Army ASP in north Georgia supporting the Federal Transportation Security Administration, Army Reserves, and National Guard. The Commission was advised by the Department that the ASP was not part of the enclave recommendation and that disposition of the ASP will be determined during implementation. The Commission found that DoD designated Fort Gillem as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mobilization site for the Southeast United States and that further determinations by FEMA and DoD are required during implementation. The Commission found DoD's economic impact analysis failed to consider significant loss of jobs associated with closing the Army and Air Force Exchange Service Atlanta Distribution Center. The Commission notes that Fort Gillem borders Forest Park, GA, an Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) Zone and that the Garrison provides employment opportunities to a number of individuals with severe disabilities. The Commission strongly urges the Department to proactively work with the community to minimize these economic impacts.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 7 and the force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close Fort Gillem, GA. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Rock Island Arsenal, IL. Relocate the 2d Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52d Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Group to Fort Campbell, KY. Relocate the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Fort Benning, GA. Relocate the 3d US Army Headquarters support office to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Headquarters US Forces Command (FORSCOM) VIP Explosive Ordnance Support to Pope Air Force Base, NC.

Close the Army-Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) Atlanta Distribution Center and establish a contiguous enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the remainder of the 81st RRC units and the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Forensics Laboratory.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all other recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Fort McPherson, Georgia

Recommendation # 3 (Army 8)

One-time Cost:	$214.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($82.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($878.6M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Fort McPherson, GA. Relocate the Headquarters US Army Forces Command (FORSCOM), and the Headquarters US Army Reserve Command (USARC) to Pope Air Force Base, NC. Relocate the Headquarters 3rd US Army to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Installation Management Agency Southeastern Region Headquarters and the US Army Network Enterprise Technology Command (NETCOM) Southeastern Region Headquarters to Fort Eustis, VA. Relocate the Army Contracting Agency Southern Region Headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation closes Fort McPherson, an administrative installation, and moves the tenant headquarters organizations to Fort Sam Houston, Fort Eustis, Pope AFB and Shaw AFB. It enhances the Army's military value, is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities to address unforeseen future requirements. This closure allows the Army to employ excess capacities at installations that can accomplish more than administrative missions. The organization relocations in this recommendation also create multifunctional, multicomponent and multi-Service installations that provide a better level of service at a reduced cost.

The recommended relocations also retain or enhance vital linkages between the relocating organizations and other headquarters activities. FORSCOM HQs is relocated to Pope AFB where it will be co-located with a large concentration of operational forces. The USARC HQs has a mission relationship with FORSCOM that is enhanced by leaving the two co-located. 3rd Army is relocated to Shaw AFB where it will be collocated with the Air Force component command of CENTCOM. The IMA and NETCOM HQs are moved to Fort Eustis because of recommendations to consolidate the Northeastern and Southeastern regions of these two commands into one Eastern Region at Fort Eustis. The ACA Southern Region HQs is moved to Fort Sam Houston where it is recommended to consolidate with the ACA Southern Hemisphere Region HQs, and where it will co-locate with other Army service providing organizations.

Community Concerns

The community argued that cost was the overriding factor in DoD's decision to close this historic installation, and significant relocation costs were understated. The community maintained that the current co-location of three major Army headquarters (Forces Command, Reserve Command and Third Army) next to an international airport with unparallel access and point-to-point travel is an important synergy for training readiness and operational planning. Loss of a major military presence in the Atlanta metropolitan area would adversely affect the City of Atlanta, a terrorist target; hinder military recruitment of African Americans; reduce military support to the Department of homeland security; disadvantage a significant number of handicapped employees at Fort McPherson; and adversely affect surrounding communities already suffering high unemployment rates and low per-capita income. It was the community's judgment that Fort McPherson, Atlanta's seventh largest employer, is ideally located to take advantage of Atlanta's major transportation and information technology hubs which they believed will be necessary to meet future military and homeland security command and control challenges. The community maintained DoD substantially deviated from criteria 3 and 4 by dispersal of headquarters which limits command and control at additional cost; criterion 1 by dispersing critical synergy; and criterion 5 by understating costs.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the cost to relocate the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) regional communications hub at Fort McPherson was not accounted for in DoD's analysis. Subsequent DoD certified data revealed relocation of the hub would cost $17.09M. Moreover, relocating Third Army Headquarters to Shaw Air Force Base could require more

construction funding than anticipated. The Commission confirmed that Fort McPherson has a large number of historic facilities requiring maintenance and consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office. Fort McPherson Garrison supports an 85-acre recreational area at Lake Allatoona, GA, consisting of cabins, boating and outdoor activities, and the Commission found no plan for the disposition of this Morale, Welfare and Recreational Area. The Commission notes that Fort McPherson borders East Point, GA, a Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) Zone. The closure of Fort McPherson will have a negative economic impact on this already economically depressed, predominantly minority community, and because the Garrison provides employment opportunities to a large number of individuals with severe disabilities, the Commission strongly urges the Department to proactively work with the community to minimize these impacts. However, the Commission did not find these issues individually or collectively rose to the level of a substantial deviation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary

Fort Bragg, North Carolina

Recommendation # 4 (Army 10)

One-time Cost:	$334.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$23.8M
20-Year Net Present Value:	$639.2M
Payback Period:	Never

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Bragg, NC, by relocating the 7th Special Forces Group (SFG) to Eglin AFB, FL, and by activating the 4th Brigade Combat Team (BCT), 82d Airborne Division and relocating European-based forces to Fort Bragg, NC.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation co-locates Army Special Operation Forces with Air Force Special Operations Forces at Eglin AFB, activates the 4th BCT of the 82nd Airborne Division, and relocates Combat Service Support units to Fort Bragg from Europe to support the Army modular force transformation. This realignment and activation of forces enhances military value and training capabilities by locating Special Operations Forces (SOF) in locations that best support Joint specialized training needs, and by creating needed space for the additional brigade at Fort Bragg. This recommendation is consistent with and supports the Army's Force Structure Plan submitted with the FY 06 budget, and provides the necessary capacity and capability, including surge, to support the units affected by this action.

This recommendation never pays back. However, the benefits of enhancing Joint training opportunities coupled with the positive impact of freeing up needed training space and reducing cost of the new BCT by approximately $54-$148M (with family housing) at Fort Bragg for the Army's Modular Force transformation, justify the additional costs to the Department.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that this recommendation was consistent with DoD's justification. Specifically, the Commission views that the relocation of the 7th Special Forces Group to Eglin AFB, FL, provides this unit an opportunity to achieve outstanding joint training through its collocation with the Air Force Special Operations Command. Also, the Commission found that this relocation enables the activation of the 4th Brigade Combat Team, 82D Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, NC, and it is consistent with the Army's transformation efforts and the Force Structure Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

Recommendation # 5 (Army 11)

One-time Cost:	$780.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($146.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($1,093.4M)
Payback Period:	5 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Fort Monmouth, NJ. Relocate the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY. Relocate the Joint Network Management System Program Office to Fort Meade, MD. Relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for depot level repairables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as Inventory Control Point functions, detachment of Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate Information Systems, Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research and Development & Acquisition (RDA) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate the elements of the Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems and consolidate into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating and consolidating Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare Research, Development and Acquisition activities to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Research and Development and Acquisition (except for the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Army Research Institute, Fort Knox, KY, by relocating Human Systems Research to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL, by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Development and Acquisition to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign the PM Acquisition, Logistics and Technology Enterprise Systems and Services (ALTESS) facility at 2511 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA, a leased installation, by relocating and consolidating into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The closure of Fort Monmouth allows the Army to pursue several transformational and BRAC objectives. These include: consolidating training to enhance coordination, doctrine development, training effectiveness, and improve operational and functional efficiencies, and consolidating RDA and T&E functions on fewer installations. Retain DoD installations with the most flexible capability to accept new missions. Consolidate or collocate common business functions with other agencies to provide better level of services at a reduced cost.

The recommendation relocates the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY, and increases training to enhance coordination, doctrine development, training effectiveness and improve operational and functional efficiencies.

The recommendation establishes a Land C4ISR Lifecycle Management Command (LCMC) to focus technical activity and accelerate transition. This recommendation addresses the transformational objective of Network Centric Warfare. The

solution of the significant challenges of realizing the potential of Network Centric Warfare for land combat forces requires integrated research in C4ISR technologies (engineered networks of sensors, communications, information processing), and individual and networked human behavior. The recommendation increases efficiency through consolidation. Research, Development and Acquisition (RDA), Test and Evaluation (T&E) of Army Land C4ISR technologies and systems is currently split among three major sites—Fort Monmouth, NJ, Fort Dix, NJ, Adelphi, MD, and Fort Belvoir, VA, and several smaller sites, including Redstone Arsenal and Fort Knox. Consolidation of RDA at fewer sites achieves efficiency and synergy at a lower cost than would be required for multiple sites.

This action preserves the Army's "commodity" business model by near collocation of Research, Development, Acquisition, and Logistics functions. Further, combining RDA and T&E requires test ranges, which cannot be created at Fort Monmouth.

The closure of Fort Monmouth and relocation of functions that enhance the Army's military value, is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities. Fort Monmouth is an acquisition and research installation with little capacity to be utilized for other purposes. Military value is enhanced by relocating the research functions to under-utilized and better equipped facilities; by relocating the administrative functions to multipurpose installations with higher military and administrative value; and by co-locating education activities with the schools they support. Utilizing existing space and facilities at the gaining installations maintains both support to the Army Force Structure Plan and capabilities for meeting surge requirements.

Community Concerns

The communities surrounding Fort Monmouth, NJ as well as many elected officials, maintained that a significant number of current civilian employees would not move to Aberdeen Proving Grounds, MD, creating a serious "brain drain" for the Land C4ISR mission. They further claim that Aberdeen Proving Grounds has virtually no existing C4ISR mission or capability. Advocates for Fort Monmouth questioned the availability of qualified personnel for technical jobs at other locations. They believed a move would have detrimental effects on all of the programs underway at Fort Monmouth, and could potentially harm soldiers involved in wartime operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The community disputed DoD's justifications that test and evaluation activities were limited by Fort Monmouth's small size, and claimed that established and growing relationships with the nearby Fort Dix-McGuire AFB-Navy Lakehurst complex overcame any constraints on future mission activities. Some advocates went further and urged the Commission to consider realigning Fort Monmouth, converting it into an enclave, and merging it with Dix-McGuire-Lakehurst. There was also concern that closure would have a significant negative impact upon the local retiree and veterans' community, as well as the economy of that portion of NJ.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that moving the Night Vision and Electronic Sensors Directorate (known as the Night Vision Laboratory) and the Program Manager Night Vision/Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Target Acquisition (PM NV/RSTA) at Fort Belvoir would add costs and risks to important ongoing programs.

Next, the Commission found that loss of some intellectual capital is a concern and is to be expected in this closure, and agreed with the Department's view of this as an implementation challenge that must be managed with careful planning and sequencing. The Department pointed out that there is a nationally recognized science and technology workforce in Maryland containing the highest percentage of professional and technical workers (about 24 percent).

The Commission concluded that adverse effects of moving existing programs could be managed over the six-year implementation period by properly sequencing the movement of programs to ensure no loss in service, or by providing temporary redundant or duplicative capabilities as necessary to ensure continuous and uninterrupted program integrity. The Commission was also told by the Secretary of the Army that under no circumstances would the Army permit the move to sacrifice or shortchange ongoing C4ISR support and services to warfighters in the field. While the Commission accepted this pledge, and agreed with the Department's position, the critically important nature of the missions resulted in the Commission adding modifying language to ensure that the intent of both the Department and the Commission would be clearly understood by future Secretaries and other leadership during the implementation period. A reporting requirement was also added so Congress could exercise the necessary independent oversight to make sure the Commission's intent was faithfully implemented by the Department. The Commission also believes Congress' oversight on this issue may benefit from review by the Government Accountability Office.

Last, to ensure that all parties correctly understand which organizations remain at Fort Belvoir and which move to Aberdeen Proving Grounds, the following Unit Identification Code (UIC) level of detail is provided.

1. The following organizations remain at Fort Belvoir under this recommendation as amended:

UIC	UIC Description
W4G828	NVESD (Night Vision Lab)
W6DP02	PM NV/RSTA

2. The following organizations move from Fort Belvoir to Aberdeen Proving Ground under this recommendation as amended:

UIC	UIC Description
W4FH10	USA SOFTWARE ENG CTR
W4GV75	OFC HQ CECOM
W27P5A	MGR USA AAESA, PEO SOLDIER
W27P8A	MGR USA AAESA, PEO SOLDIER
W4G875	CTR RD&E CTR
W27P26	PEO CT3

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1, 2, and 5 and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close Fort Monmouth, NJ. Relocate the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY. Relocate the Joint Network Management System Program Office to Fort Meade, MD. Relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as Inventory Control Point functions, detachment of Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate Information Systems, Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research and Development & Acquisition (RDA) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate the elements of the Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems and consolidate into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating and consolidating Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare Research, Development and Acquisition activities to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, except the Night Vision and Electronic Sensors Directorate (the Night Vision Lab) and the Project Manager Night Vision/Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Target Acquisition (PM NV/RSTA), and by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Research and Development and Acquisition (except for the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Army Research Institute, Fort Knox, KY, by relocating Human Systems Research to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL, by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Development and Acquisition to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign the PM Acquisition, Logistics and Technology Enterprise Systems and Services (ALTESS) facility at 2511 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA, a leased installation, by relocating and consolidating into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the Congressional Committees of Jurisdiction that movement of organizations, functions, or activities from Fort Monmouth to Aberdeen Proving Ground will be accomplished without disruption of their support to the Global War on Terrorism or other critical contingency operations and that safeguards exist to ensure that necessary redundant capabilities are put in place to mitigate potential degradation of such support, and to ensure maximum retention of critical workforce.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Fort Hood, Texas

Recommendation # 6 (Army 15)

One-time Cost:	$435.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$45.3M
20-Year Net Present Value:	$980.4M
Payback Period:	Never

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Hood, TX, by relocating a Brigade Combat Team (BCT) and Unit of Employment (UEx) Headquarters to Fort Carson, CO.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation ensures Army BCTs and support units are located at installations capable of training modular formations, both mounted and dismounted, at home station with sufficient land and facilities to test, simulate, or fire all organic weapon systems.

This recommendation enhances the military value of the installations and the home station training and readiness of the units at the installations by relocating units to installations that can best support the training and maneuver requirements associated with the Army's transformation. This recommendation relocates to Fort Carson, CO, a Heavy BCT that will be temporarily stationed at Fort Hood in FY06, and a Unit of Employment Headquarters. The Army is temporarily stationing this BCT to Fort Hood in FY06 due to operational necessity and to support current operational deployments in support of the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). However, based on the BRAC analysis, Fort Hood does not have sufficient facilities and available maneuver training acreage and ranges to support six permanent heavy BCTs and numerous other operational units stationed there. Fort Carson has sufficient capacity to support these units. The Army previously obtained approval from the Secretary of Defense to temporarily station a third BCT at Fort Carson in FY05. Due to Fort Carson's capacity, the BRAC analysis indicates that the Army should permanently station this third BCT at Fort Carson.

This relocation never pays back because it involves the relocation of a newly activated unit. No permanent facilities exist to support the unit.

Community Concerns

The community argued that realignment of Fort Hood would result in a loss of personnel due to the relocation of approximately 4,100 soldiers to Fort Carson and almost 5,000 personnel to Fort Bliss, based on 2005 data, rather than the 2003 certified data provided to the Commission. The local community has embraced the newly activated BCT and did not consider this unit as temporarily stationed at Fort Hood. They asserted soldiers have already purchased homes and integrated into the community. The community fears housing prices will drop and soldiers forced to sell homes will experience significant financial losses. Also, the community stated that it responded to the so-called temporary increase in soldiers with increased housing, police, fire and municipal services. They argued that realigning Fort Hood, leaving only five Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) permanently stationed there, would forego important existing training facilities and create 15 percent excess capacity. The community proposed retention of 6 BCTs at Fort Hood, believing the base has the capacity to train and support up to 50,000 soldiers and their families.

Commission Findings

The Commission's review and analysis found that moving a Brigade Combat Team (BCT) and Unit of Employment (UEx) Headquarters to Fort Carson would enhance military value and improve future mission capabilities. Fort Hood is a model installation for the Army in terms of its infrastructure, ranges, and power projection capabilities, and its very high overall quantitative military value score reflects those favorable installation characteristics. However, Fort Hood's constraining variable is maneuver acres and, more specifically, its contiguous maneuver acres. The Commission's independent and objective analysis showed that, with or without including Piñon Canyon Maneuver Site in the accounting of acreage, Fort

Carson still has more contiguous maneuver acres per brigade combat team than Fort Hood. The Commission views the UEx headquarters relocation to Fort Carson, CO, as important to provide the four planned BCTs with an appropriate-level command and control headquarters. The Commission found in favor of the overall recommendation as providing the necessary balance to the force structure. The Commission took community concerns into account but found them to be offset by the increased military value of DoD's recommendation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Red River Army Depot, Texas

Recommendation # 7 (Army 16)

One-time Cost:	$150.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($22.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($187.7M)
Payback Period:	5 years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Red River Army Depot, TX. Relocate the storage and demilitarization functions of the Munitions Center to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK. Relocate the munitions maintenance functions of the Munitions Center to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK, and Blue Grass Army Depot, KY. Relocate the depot maintenance of Armament and Structural Components, Combat Vehicles, Depot Fleet/Field Support, Engines and Transmissions, Fabrication and Manufacturing, Fire Control Systems and Components, and Other to Anniston Army Depot, AL. Relocate the depot maintenance of Powertrain Components and Starters/Generators to Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Relocate the depot maintenance of Construction Equipment to Anniston Army Depot, AL, and Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Vehicles to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA, and Letterkenny Depot, PA. Relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA. Disestablish the supply, storage, and distribution functions for tires, packaged Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants, and compressed gases. Relocate the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot to the Defense Distribution Depot, Oklahoma City, OK.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation supports the strategy of minimizing the number of industrial base sites performing depot maintenance for ground and missile systems. The receiving depots have greater maintenance capability, higher facility utilization and greater opportunities for inter-service workloading. This recommendation reinforces Anniston's and Letterkenny's roles as Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence for Combat Vehicles (Anniston) and Missile Systems (Letterkenny).

This recommendation decreases the cost of depot maintenance operations by consolidation and elimination of 30 percent of duplicate overhead structures required to operate multiple depot maintenance activities. This recommendation also increases opportunities for inter-service workloading by transferring maintenance workload to the Marine Corps.

This recommendation relocates storage, demilitarization, and munitions maintenance functions to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, and thereby reduces redundancy and removes excess from Red River Munitions Center.

This recommendation allows DoD to create centers of excellence, generate efficiencies, and create deployment networks servicing all Services.

This recommendation relocates the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Defense Distribution Depot Oklahoma City at Tinker Air Force Base. It also contributes to the elimination of unnecessary redundancies and duplication, and streamlines supply and storage processes.

The disestablishment of the wholesale supply, storage, and distribution functions for all packaged POL, tires, and compressed gas products supports transformation by privatizing these functions. Privatization of packaged POL, tires, and compressed gas products will eliminate inventories, infrastructure and personnel associated with these functions and products.

Community Concerns

The community stated that the Army must retain all depots to support the warfighter and combatant commanders, disputed DoD's assertion of excess capacity, and claimed the recommendation deviated substantially from the military value criteria. The community focused on the Industrial Joint Cross Service Group's creation of 2.6 million direct labor hours of capacity at Anniston and Letterkenny Army Depots to justify closure of the Red River Army Depot (RRAD) over Army objections, and the artificial use of a 60-hour work week instead of the DoD 40-hour standard for determining capacity. Also highlighted was the disestablishment of the top-ranked Defense Distribution Red River, TX, center due to the potential closure of the RRAD. The community emphasized that there was no excess capacity to eliminate because Red River was running at twice its 2003 level of effort and pointed to a major backlog of Bradley Fighting Vehicles and High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWV) awaiting repair at the depot. They also highlighted that RRAD is the only facility that strips and replaces track pads and manufactures M1 road wheels. The community proposed leaving the Red River Army Depot, Munitions Center, and Defense Distribution Center intact. The community argued that the economic impact from closure would be devastating, creating a projected unemployment rate exceeding 14 percent of the total employment in the seven surrounding rural towns.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that many vehicle and weapons systems repaired at Red River are critical to ongoing real-time efforts in Operations Iraqi Freedom/Enduring Freedom, and was unwilling to take the risk of closing a ground vehicle depot-level maintenance facility during a time of war and uncertainty. The Army is already surging its industrial base capacity with the execution of 12 million direct labor hours (DLH) in fiscal year 2004, and goals of 19 million DLH in fiscal year 2005 and 25 million DLH in fiscal year 2006 at the Army's five maintenance depots. The Commission found that Red River is operating at twice its fiscal year 2003 level (when BRAC data-calls were issued) and that there is no current excess capacity within the Army's maintenance depots. The Army's depot level maintenance workload has and continues to increase to respond to several critical Army efforts. Ongoing business process reengineering efforts have also successfully resulted in significant process improvements at each of the maintenance depots. In response to community concerns, the Commission recalculated the economic impact to incorporate increased staffing, and if closure had been approved, it would have resulted in a negative economic impact of 8.3 percent of area jobs. The Commission's analysis determined that the amended realignment recommendation would best meet the military's future needs and requirements.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary of Defense substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1, 2, 3 and 6 and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Red River Army Depot, TX. Relocate the storage and demilitarization functions of the Munitions Center to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK. Relocate the munitions maintenance functions of the Munitions Center to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK, and Blue Grass Army Depot, KY. Relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA. Disestablish the supply, storage, and distribution functions for tires, packaged Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants, and compressed gases.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all other recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Fort Monroe, Virginia

Recommendation # 8 (Army 19)

One-time Cost:	$72.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($56.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($686.6M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Fort Monroe, VA. Relocate the US Army Training & Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Headquarters, the Installation Management Agency (IMA) Northeast Region Headquarters, the US Army Network Enterprise Technology Command (NETCOM) Northeast Region Headquarters and the Army Contracting Agency Northern Region Office to Fort Eustis, VA. Relocate the US Army Accessions Command and US Army Cadet Command to Fort Knox, KY.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation closes Fort Monroe, an administrative installation, and moves the tenant Headquarters organizations to Fort Eustis and Fort Knox. It enhances the Army's military value, is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities to address unforeseen future requirements. The closure allows the Army to move administrative headquarters to multi-purpose installations that provide the Army more flexibility to accept new missions. Both Fort Eustis and Fort Knox have operational and training capabilities that Fort Monroe lacks, and both have excess capacity that can be used to accept the organizations relocating from Fort Monroe.

The recommended relocations also retain or enhance vital linkages between the relocating organizations and other headquarters activities. TRADOC HQs is moved to Fort Eustis in order to remain within commuting distance of the Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) HQs in Norfolk, VA. JFCOM oversees all joint training across the military. IMA and NETCOM HQs are moved to Fort Eustis because of recommendations to consolidate the Northeastern and Southeastern regions of these two commands into one Eastern Region at Fort Eustis. The ACA Northern Region is relocated to Fort Eustis because its two largest customers are TRADOC and IMA. The Accessions and Cadet Commands are relocated to Fort Knox because of recommendations to locate the Army's Human Resources Command at Fort Knox. The HRC recommendation includes the collocation of the Accessions and Cadet Commands with the Recruiting Command already at Fort Knox and creates a Center of Excellence for military personnel and recruiting functions by improving personnel life-cycle management.

Community Concerns

The community offered a partnership with the Army through the Hampton Industrial Development Agency to construct an office complex and lease-back arrangement with the Army. It was concerned that the BRAC process precluded the Army from talking to the Community about viable alternatives to closure of Fort Monroe. The Community believed that the history and unique nature of the installation necessitates its continued use. This argument was further supported by what the Community believes will be ordnance cleanup costs greatly exceeding any of the Army's estimates. The Community reminded the Army that the main portion of Fort Monroe's property contains a reversion provision and must be returned to the State of Virginia in an environmentally clean condition. It contended that property boundaries are now encumbered with historic facilities that will complicate the reversion and will likely lead to litigation. The Community concluded that because of the large number of historic facilities, historic events, cost of cleanup and title issues, Fort Monroe is most suited for continued military use. If these issues could be resolved, the community concedes that Fort Monroe has a very high reuse potential.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with DoD's overall recommendation but noted that the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) move to Fort Eustis in Newport News, VA, is based on a construction cost estimate that anticipates utilizing facilities to be vacated by the Transportation School. Accordingly, construction of Headquarters, TRADOC at any other location such as Fort Story is not in keeping with the intent of the recommendation. The

Commission found that Fort Monroe is a National Historical Landmark and that some or all of the real property of the landmark contains a reversion to the State of Virginia. The State advised the Commission that property boundaries are now encumbered with facilities in the historic district, complicating the reversion. The Commission urges the Army to begin early consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office and other State officials to ensure preservation of these historic assets. The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense reported to the Commission that a Military Munitions Response Program would likely be required at Fort Monroe but reported no estimate of cost. However, the Commission notes that DoD's Defense Environmental Programs annual report to Congress for fiscal year 2004 showed an estimated cost of $201 million for cleanup at Fort Monroe. The Commission found that the Joint Task Force-Civil Support, a new major tenant on Fort Monroe, was not identified in the Secretary of Defense's recommendations and will require relocation during the implementation period.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Maneuver Training

Recommendation # 9 (Army 20)

One-time Cost:	$773.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($123.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($948.1M)
Payback Period:	5 years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Knox, KY, by relocating the Armor Center and School to Fort Benning, GA, to accommodate the activation of an Infantry Brigade Combat Team (BCT) at Fort Knox, KY, and the relocation of engineer, military police, and combat service support units from Europe and Korea. Realign Fort McCoy, WI, by relocating the 84th Army Reserve Regional Training Center to Fort Knox, KY.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation enhances military value, improves training and deployment capabilities, better utilizes training resources, and creates significant efficiencies and cost savings while maintaining sufficient surge capability to address unforeseen requirements. It properly locates Operational Army units in support of the Army's Force Structure Plans and modular force transformation.

This recommendation supports the consolidation of the Armor and Infantry Centers and Schools at Fort Benning and creates a Maneuver Center of Excellence for ground forces training and doctrine development. It consolidates both Infantry and Armor One Station Unit Training (OSUT), which allows the Army to reduce the total number of Basic Combat Training locations from five to four.

This recommendation also relocates the 84th ARRTC to Fort Knox and supports another recommendation that relocates Army Reserve Command and Control units to Fort McCoy. These relocations enhance command and control within the Army Reserve and promote interaction between the Active and Reserve Components.

This recommendation directly supports the Army's operational unit stationing and training requirements by using available facilities, ranges, training land at Fort Knox, KY, (vacated by the Armor Center and School) to effectively and efficiently relocate various Combat Support and Combat Service Support units returning from overseas, and as the installation platform for the activation of a new Infantry BCT. These units are a combination of the relocation of Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS)-related units returning from overseas and the activation of units as part of the Army's modular force transformation.

Community Concerns

The Fort Knox, KY, community reluctantly supported the loss of Ft. Knox's Armor Center and School and the related armor tradition because of offsetting gains at Fork Knox from other DoD BRAC recommendations. However, it questioned whether the same quality of Armor training could be reconstituted at Fort Benning due to its concern that insufficient training land and facilities are available at Fort Benning. Both Fort Knox and Fort Benning communities requested clarification of which Armor Center and School-related activities will relocate to Fort Benning. Fort Knox wanted to retain a museum to preserve its Armor legacy.

The Columbus, GA, and Fort Benning community welcomed the relocation of the Armor Center and School, and indicated full support for this portion of DoD's recommendation. However, the Fort Benning community was concerned that an additional brigade combat team (BCT), previously planned for Fort Benning, is instead now identified in this recommendation for stationing at Fort Knox. The Fort Benning community felt the Army ought to station additional units at Fort Benning to more fully use its available capacity.

Commission Findings

Although the Fort Benning community was concerned that the Army BRAC proposal revised a pre-BRAC plan to activate a brigade at Fort Benning but did not identify substitute units to be based at Fort Benning, the Commission found that the Army does not currently plan to add major units to Fort Benning as part of BRAC but may do so outside of BRAC. Both the Fort Benning and Fort Knox communities requested clarification from the Army about which specific units would relocate under BRAC from Fort Knox to Fort Benning, and the Commission obtained the needed Army clarification. Last, the Fort Knox community expressed concern that the Armor Center and School functions might not be readily accommodated at Fort Benning, but the Commission found the Army would implement the transfer only as the moves are fully supportable and that Armor student training will not be degraded by BRAC moves. The Commission found that Army BRAC plans relocate the museum portion on the Armor school manning document, and remaining museum issue resolutions can be addressed during implementation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Operational Army (IGPBS)

Recommendation # 10 (Army 22)

One-time Cost:	$3,946.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$294.7M
20-Year Net Present Value:	$7,826.7M
Payback Period:	Never

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Bliss, TX, by relocating air defense artillery units to Fort Sill and relocating 1st Armored Division and various echelons above division units from Germany and Korea to Fort Bliss, TX. Realign Fort Sill by relocating an artillery (Fires) brigade to Fort Bliss. Realign Fort Hood, TX, by relocating maneuver battalions, a support battalion, and aviation units to Fort Bliss, TX. Realign Fort Riley, KS, by inactivating various units, activating a Brigade Combat Team (BCT) and relocating 1st Infantry Division units and various echelons above division units from Germany and Korea to Fort Riley, KS. Realign Fort Campbell, KY, by relocating an attack aviation battalion to Fort Riley, KS.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This proposal ensures the Army has sufficient infrastructure, training land and ranges to meet the requirements to transform the Operational Army as identified in the Twenty Year Force Structure Plan. It also ensures the Army maintains adequate

surge capacity. As part of the modular force transformation, the Army is activating 10 new combat arms brigades for a total of 43 active component brigade combat teams (BCTs). Including the results of the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS), the number of BCTs stationed in the United States will rise from twenty-six to forty. Relocating the units listed in this recommendation to Fort Bliss, Fort Riley, and Fort Sill takes advantage of available infrastructure and training land. Fort Bliss and Fort Riley are installations capable of training modular formations, both mounted and dismounted, at home station with sufficient land and facilities to test, simulate, or fire all organic weapon systems. This recommendation enhances home station training and readiness of the units at all installations.

Relocating 1st Armored Division units and echelons above division (EAD) units to Fort Bliss will transform it from an institutional training installation into a major mounted maneuver training installation. This avoids overcrowding and overuse at other installations by stationing them at one of the installations with the greatest capacity. It also creates a potential opportunity for enhanced Operational Testing due to the close proximity of Fort Bliss to White Sands Missile Range.

Relocating an Air Defense Artillery (ADA) unit to Fort Sill supports the establishment of the Net Fires Center, combining the Artillery and ADA schools at Fort Sill and provides a force stabilization opportunity for soldiers in this unit. Relocating the Artillery (Fires) Brigade to Fort Bliss collocates the artillery with the maneuver units at Fort Bliss and vacates space at Fort Sill for the ADA unit.

Realigning Fort Riley by inactivating an Engineer Brigade Headquarters, two other engineer units, two maneuver battalions and other smaller units beginning in FY 06 directly supports the Army's modular force transformation. It also facilitates activating a BCT in FY 06, and relocating 1st Infantry Division Headquarters, the Division Support Command Headquarters, Aviation Brigade units and other units returning from overseas to Fort Riley. The relocation of an attack aviation battalion from Fort Campbell to Fort Riley supports the formation of a multifunctional aviation brigade at Fort Riley.

The Army obtained approval to temporarily station a BCT at Fort Hood in 2005 and another BCT at Fort Bliss in 2006. This recommendation validates the stationing of that BCT at Fort Bliss and relocates two maneuver battalions, an armored reconnaissance squadron and a support battalion from Fort Hood to support the activation at Fort Bliss. Relocating these battalions will provide the assets necessary to accomplish the activation. Relocating aviation units from Fort Hood supports the activation of a multifunctional aviation brigade.

While this recommendation does not in BRAC terms save money, the costs are mitigated by the non-BRAC savings that will accrue to the Department from the closure or realignment of the overseas locations from which these units come. Those non-BRAC savings amount to $4,400M during the 6-year period and approximately $20,000M of 20-year net present value savings.

Community Concerns

Fort Bliss, TX was the only installation to express community issues to the Commission concerning the relocation of an operational air defense artillery (ADA) brigade to Fort Sill, OK. The Fort Bliss community argued relocating an operational ADA brigade to Fort Sill does not sufficiently consider the brigade's strategic deployment and training requirements. The community also believed that the certified data undervalued the airspace capacity at Fort Bliss. They urged the Commission to retain the ADA missile brigade at Fort Bliss and reject this DoD recommendation.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that realignments associated with this recommendation were consistent with the DoD justification.

The Commission conducted an independent and in-depth review of the requirements for training and live-fire of these systems. Fort Sill has 42,000 maneuver acres compared with 992,000 maneuver acres at Fort Bliss. While Fort Sill ranges cannot support live fire, and they are not compatible with tank or mechanized infantry unit maneuver requirements, they are compatible with the movement and positioning of artillery units. Field artillery units have trained at Fort Sill successfully for years, and the air defense artillery brigade will be able to accomplish its maneuver training at Fort Sill as well. The Commission's analysis confirmed that ADA units at Fort Sill will have to deploy to Fort Bliss to live-fire. The Avenger system requirement is to live-fire one missile per platoon every six months. Therefore, this will require additional simulation and deployments to Fort Bliss to meet the requirement. However, the Patriot system live-fire requirement is infrequent, with one missile launch per battery every other year, and only if missiles are available. This can be satisfied through simulation and deployments to Fort Bliss in conjunction with other joint exercises, to include Roving Sands.

The Commission found that relocating this brigade was not optimal, but it was suitable and did not rise to the level of a substantial deviation. It enabled the Net Fires center and concepts at Fort Sill through the collocation of an operational ADA brigade with an institutional ADA brigade, thus creating synergies and force stabilization opportunities between the units.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

RC Transformation in Alabama

Recommendation # 11 (Army 25)

One-time Cost:	$109.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($17.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($140.3M)
Payback Period:	6 years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Birmingham Armed Forces Reserve Center, Birmingham, AL, by relocating Detachment 1, 450th Military Police Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on or near Birmingham Air National Guard Base, Birmingham, AL, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Alabama National Guard units from the following Alabama ARNG Readiness Centers: Fort Graham, Fort Hanna and Fort Terhune, Birmingham, AL, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Wright United States Army Reserve Center, Mobile, AL, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Mobile, AL, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Alabama National Guard units from the following Alabama ARNG Readiness Centers: Fort Ganey, and Fort Hardeman, Mobile, AL, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Faith Wing United States Army Reserve Center on Fort McClellan, AL, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Pelham Range in Anniston, AL.

Close the Finnell United States Army Reserve Center and the Area Maintenance Support Activity, Tuscaloosa, AL, and the Vicksburg United States Army Reserve Center, Vicksburg, MS, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Area Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA) in Tuscaloosa, AL, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and AMSA shall have the capability to accommodate the 31st Chemical Brigade from the Northport Alabama Army National Guard Readiness Center and units from the Fort Powell-Shamblin Alabama Army National Guard Readiness Center, Tuscaloosa, AL, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Screws Army Reserve Center in Montgomery, AL; close the Cleveland Abbot Army Reserve Center, Tuskegee, AL; close the Harry Gary, Jr. Army Reserve Center, in Enterprise, AL; close the Quarles-Flowers Army Reserve Center in Decatur, AL; close the Grady Anderson Army Reserve Center, Troy, AL; and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) at the Alabama Army National Guard Joint Forces Headquarters Complex in Montgomery, AL, if the Army is able to acquire suitable property for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate ARNG units currently located on the Alabama Army National Guard Joint Forces Headquarters Complex in Montgomery, AL, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Alabama. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes nine Army Reserve Centers and one Area Maintenance Support Activity throughout the state of Alabama and constructs five multicomponent/service, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers, and one Area Maintenance Support Facility capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing fifteen geographically separated facilities into five modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. The Department understands that the State of Alabama will close ALARNG Readiness Centers: Fort Graham, Fort Hanna, Fort Terhune, Fort Ganey, Fort Hardeman and Fort Powell-Shamblin and realign the Northport Alabama Army National Guard Readiness Center by relocating the 31st Chemical Brigade to the new AFRC. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $72.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Arizona

Recommendation # 12 (Army 28)

One-time Cost:	$31.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($5.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($51.7M)
Payback Period:	5 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Allen Hall near Tucson, AZ, and the Area Maintenance Support Activity 18 on Fort Huachuca, AZ by relocating all units from the closed facilities to an Armed Forces Reserve Center and maintenance facility on the Arizona Army National Guard Silverbell Army Heliport/Pinal Air Park in Marana, AZ, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the

Arizona National Guard 860th MP Company and the 98th Troop Command from Papago Park Readiness Center if the state of Arizona decides to relocate those units.

Close the Deer Valley United States Army Reserve Center (#2) in Phoenix and re-locate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the Arizona Army National Guard Buckeye Training Site. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Army National Guard Phoenix Readiness Center if the state of Arizona decides to relocate those units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Arizona. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two Army Reserve centers, closes an Army Maintenance Support Activity and constructs two multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), in the State of Arizona, capable of accommodating National Guard and Army Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing units from six geographically separated facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. Relocating units to Buckeye will allow them to utilize a large local training area while maintaining a reasonably close commuting distance from Phoenix. The Department understands that the State of Arizona will close the Army National Guard Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop Phoenix, AZ, and realign the Papago Park Army National Guard Readiness Center by relocating the 860th Military Police Company and the 98th Troop Command. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs. This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $1.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20- year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Arkansas

Recommendation # 13 (Army 30)

One-time Cost:	$118.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($5.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$38.2M
Payback Period:	31 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Arkadelphia, AR, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Arkadelphia if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Arkadelphia if the state of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Camden, AR, and relocate units into an Armed Forces Reserve Center by converting the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Camden, if the state decides to alter their facility.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, El Dorado, AR, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in El Dorado if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, El Dorado if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Realign the Army Reserve Center, Darby, AR, by relocating the 341st Engineer Company and elements of the 75th Division (Exercise) from buildings #2552-2560, 2516, and 2519, Fort Chaffee, AR, into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center, on Fort Chaffee, AR. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the following Arkansas National Guard Readiness Centers: the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Charleston, AR, the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Van Buren, AR, and the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Fort Smith, AR, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site (ECS), Barling, AR, and relocate units to a new Joint Maintenance Facility on Fort Chaffee, AR. The new Joint Maintenance Facility shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Combined Support Maintenance Shop (CSMS) on Fort Chaffee if the state of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Hot Springs, AR, and the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Activity (OMS), Malvern, AR, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on property located in Hot Springs, AR, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas Army National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center in Hot Springs, AR, if the state of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Jonesboro, AR, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Field Maintenance Site in Jonesboro, AR, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Jonesboro, AR, the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Paragould, AR, and the Field Maintenance Site (FMS), Jonesboro if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units. Close the Pond United States Army Reserve Center, Fayetteville, AR, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Northwest Arkansas if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Centers in Fayetteville, Springdale, Rogers and Bentonville, AR, if the state of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

Close the Stone United States Army Reserve Center, Pine Bluff, AR, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Pine Bluff Arsenal, AR. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Pine Bluff if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Arkansas. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes seven Army Reserve centers, one Equipment Concentration Site and one Organizational Maintenance Site. It also constructs eight multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs) and one multicomponent, maintenance facility throughout the State of Arkansas, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing twenty-six geographically separated facilities into nine modern, multicomponent facilities. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Arkansas will close fifteen Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Charleston, Van Buren, Fort Smith, Jonesboro, Paragould, El Dorado, Pine Bluff, Arkadelphia, Fayetteville, Springdale, Rogers, Bentonville, and Hot Springs, the Fort Chaffee Combined Support Maintenance Shop and the Jonesboro Field Maintenance Shop. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs. This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $63.3M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in California

Recommendation # 14 (Army 33)

One-time Cost:	$78.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($8.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($46.0M)
Payback Period:	10 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Moffett Field, CA, the George Richey United States Army Reserve Center, San Jose, CA, and the Jones Hall United States Army Reserve Center, Mountain View, CA, and relocate units to a new armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Shop on existing Army Reserve property on Moffett Field, CA. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate California National Guard Units from the following California ARNG Readiness Centers: Sunnyvale, San Lorenzo, Redwood City, and the Organizational Maintenance Shop, San Jose, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Desiderio United States Army Reserve Center, Pasadena, CA, the Schroeder Hall United States Army Reserve Center, Long Beach, CA, the Hazard Park United States Army Reserve Center, Los Angeles, CA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on property being transferred to the Army Reserve from the General Services Administration at Bell, CA. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate California National Guard Units from the following California ARNG Readiness Centers: Bell, and Montebello, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of California. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes six Army Reserve centers, two Naval Reserve Centers, and one Marine Corps Reserve Center throughout the State of California and constructs two multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs) capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing fifteen geographically separated facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of California will close five California Army Guard Armories: Sunnyvale, San Lorenzo, Redwood City, Bell, and Montebello, and the Organizational Maintenance Shop, San Jose. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new AFRCs will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $6.3M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs

and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Connecticut

Recommendation # 15 (Army 35)

One-time Cost:	$128.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($5.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$47.5M
Payback Period:	36 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Turner US Army Reserve Center, Fairfield, CT; close Sutcovey US Army Reserve Center, Waterbury, CT; close Danbury US Army Reserve Center Danbury, CT, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Maintenance Facility in Newtown, CT if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities adjacent to the existing Connecticut Army National Guard Armory in Newtown, CT. The new AFRC and OMS shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Connecticut Army National Guard Armories in Naugatuck, Norwalk and New Haven, CT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the US Army Reserve Center, Middletown, CT, the Organizational Maintenance Shop, Middletown, CT; the SGT Libby US Army Reserve Center, New Haven, CT; the Organizational Maintenance Shop, New Haven, CT; the Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity #69, Milford, CT, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center, Organizational Maintenance Shop and Army Maintenance Support Activity in Middletown, CT, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC, OMS and AMSA shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Connecticut Army National Guard Armories in Putnam, Manchester, New Britain and the CTARNG facility in Newington, CT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Connecticut. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes five US Army Reserve Centers, one Army Maintenance Support Activity and two Organizational Maintenance Shops throughout the state of Connecticut and constructs two Armed Forces Reserve Centers and collocated Organizational Maintenance Shops and one Army Maintenance Support Activity capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. The Department understands that the State of Connecticut will close six Connecticut Army National Guard Centers: Naugatuck, Norwalk, Putnam, Manchester, New Berlin and Newington, CT. The Connecticut Army National Guard will realign New Haven Armory, moving the 192nd Chemical Battalion to the facility. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $52.1M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Delaware

Recommendation # 16 (Army 37)

One-time Cost:	$13.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$0.9M
Payback Period:	19 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Major Robert Kirkwood United States Army Reserve Center and its organizational maintenance shop in Newark, DE, and re-locate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and organizational maintenance support facility in Newark, DE, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Delaware Army National Guard units from the William Nelson Armory in Middletown, DE, if the state decided to relocate those units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Delaware. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes an Army Reserve Center in Newark, DE and relocates units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and organizational maintenance support facility capable of accommodating Delaware Army National Guard units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing two facilities into one. The Department understands that the State of Delaware will close the William Nelson Armory in Middletown, DE. The Armed Forces Reserve Center will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from the closed facilities into the new AFRC.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimized the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers, and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $10.9M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Georgia

Recommendation # 17 (Army 39)

One-time Cost:	$21.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($5.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($44.8M)
Payback Period:	5 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Columbus, GA, and relocate and consolidate those units together with Army Reserve Units currently on Fort Benning into a new United States Army Reserve Center on Fort Benning, GA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Georgia. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one United States Army Reserve Center in Columbus, GA, and relocates units together with United States Army Reserve units currently on Fort Benning into a new United States Army Reserve Center on Fort Benning, GA. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by reducing the number of separate DoD installations and by relocating a US Army Reserve Center to an existing base. This recommendation supports the recommendation to close Fort Gillem by providing a relocation site for the vehicles and equipment stored at the Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site (ECS).

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $52.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Hawaii

Recommendation # 18 (Army 40)

One-time Cost:	$56.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($9.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($62.4M)
Payback Period:	7 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Hilo (SFC Minoru Kunieda), HI, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Keaukaha Military Reservation if the Army can acquire suitable land for the construction of the new facilities. The New AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Hawaii National Guard units from the following Hawaii ARNG Armories: Keaau and Honokaa if the state decides to relocate those units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Hawaii. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Army Reserve Center in Hilo, HI, and constructs a multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on Keaukaha Military Reservation, HI. The Department understands that the State of Hawaii will close two Hawaii Army National Guard Armories: Keaau and Honokaa, HI. The Armed Forces Reserve Center will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from the closed facilities into the new AFRC.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $17.4M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Illinois

Recommendation # 19 (Army 42)

One-time Cost:	$42.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($3.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($6.5M)
Payback Period:	14 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Marion, IL, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Carbondale, IL, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Illinois National Guard Units from the following Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Cairo, IL, and Carbondale, IL, if the state of Illinois decides to relocate those units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Centralia, IL, and the United States Army Reserve Center in Fairfield, IL, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Mt. Vernon, IL. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Illinois National Guard Units from the following Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Mt. Vernon (17B75), IL, Mt. Vernon (17B73), IL, and Salem (17C65), IL, if the state of Illinois decides to relocate those units.

Close the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Waukegan, IL, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Lake County, IL, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Illinois National Guard Units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center in Waukegan, IL, if the state of Illinois decides to relocate those units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Illinois. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four United States Army Reserve Centers and constructs three multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs) throughout the State of Illinois capable of accommodating National Guard, Army Reserve, Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing ten geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Illinois will close six Illinois Army Guard Armories: Cairo, IL, Carbondale, IL, Mount Vernon, IL, Mount Vernon, IL, Salem, IL, and Waukegan, IL. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $29.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Indiana

Recommendation # 20 (Army 44)

One-time Cost:	$47.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$6.1M
Payback Period:	22 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Lafayette United States Army Reserve Center in Lafayette, IN, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on the site of the existing Indiana Army Guard Armory (18B75) Lafayette, IN, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Indiana National Guard units from the following Indiana ARNG Readiness Centers: Boswell, IN, Attica, IN, Delphi, IN, Remington, IN, Monticello, IN, and Darlington, IN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Realign Charles H. Seston United States Army Reserve Center by relocating the 402nd Engineer Company and Detachment 1 of the 417th Petroleum Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Greenwood and Franklin, IN, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Indiana National Guard units from the Camp Atterbury Army National Guard Readiness Center (building #500), and the 219th Area Support Group Readiness Center (Building #4), Camp Atterbury, IN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Indiana. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and

deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Army Reserve Center in the state of Indiana and constructs two multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. The Department understands that the State of Indiana will close the following INARNG Readiness Centers: Boswell, IN, Attica, IN, Delphi, IN, Remington, IN, Monticello, IN, Darlington, IN, and Camp Atterbury, IN. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $34.7M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Iowa

Recommendation # 21 (Army 46)

One-time Cost:	$68.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($19.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($201.7M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Recruiting Battalion Headquarters and Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) leased facilities in Des Moines and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and MEPS at Camp Dodge, IA. The new AFRC shall

have the capability to accommodate units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center located at Camp Dodge, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center and the Area Maintenance Support Activity in Middletown, IA, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) with an Organizational Maintenance and Vehicle Storage Facility on Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, IA. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Burlington Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Burlington, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Muscatine, IA, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) in Muscatine, IA, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Muscatine Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Muscatine, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Cedar Rapids, IA, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) with an Organizational Maintenance Facility (OMF) in Cedar Rapids, IA, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Cedar Rapids Army National Guard Readiness Center and its Organizational Maintenance Facility located in Cedar Rapids, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Iowa. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes three Army Reserve Centers, one Area Maintenance Support Activity, one Recruiting Battalion, and one Military Entrance Processing Station throughout the State of Iowa and constructs three multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers, two Organizational Maintenance Facilities, and one MEPS capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing eight geographically separated facilities into four modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. The Department understands that the State of Iowa will close IAARNG Readiness Centers: Camp Dodge, IA, Burlington, IA, Muscatine, IA, and Cedar Rapids, IA. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $20.5M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Kentucky

Recommendation # 22 (Army 48)

One-time Cost:	$25.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($4.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($34.1M)
Payback Period:	6 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Richmond US Army Reserve Center, Maysville US Army Reserve Center and relocate and consolidate those units with Army Reserve units currently on Bluegrass Army Depot into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Field Maintenance Facility (FMS) on Blue Grass Army Depot, KY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Kentucky National Guard units located on Bluegrass Army Depot, KY, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Paducah Memorial United States Army Reserve Center and the Paducah #2 United States Army Reserve Center and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Field Maintenance Shop (FMS) adjacent to the Paducah Airport, Paducah, KY, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and FMS shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Paducah Army National Guard Readiness Center and the Kentucky Army National Guard Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS) #2, Paducah, KY, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Kentucky. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four Army Reserve Centers throughout the state of Kentucky and constructs two multi-component, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers, and two Field Maintenance Shops capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing seven geographically separated facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. The Department understands that the State of Kentucky will close the Blue Grass Station and the Paducah Army National Guard Readiness Centers and the Kentucky Army National Guard Organizational Maintenance Shop, Paducah, KY. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $5.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

Only one community comment was received for all of the 39 RC Transformation recommendations. A political leader argued that the Maysville USAR Center in Maysville, KY, should not be closed on the grounds that closure would increase commuting time and distance for soldiers assigned to that unit.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Community concerns were carefully weighed and considered, but the Commission found they did not rise to the level of a substantial deviation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Louisiana

Recommendation # 23 (Army 50)

One-time Cost:	$30.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($13.6M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($147.6M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Roberts United States Army Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA, and the Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Baton Rouge, LA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Field Maintenance Shop on suitable state property adjacent to the Baton Rouge Airport (State Property). The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Louisiana National Guard Units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Baton Rouge, LA, and the Army National Guard Organizational Maintenance Shop #8 located in Baton Rouge, LA, if the state of Louisiana decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close United States Army Reserve Center, Shreveport, LA, and the United States Army Reserve Center, Bossier City, LA, and relocate all Reserve Component units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center that will be constructed on or adjacent to the Naval-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Shreveport in Bossier City, LA, if the Army is able to acquire suitable property for construction of the facilities.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Louisiana. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes three Army Reserve centers, one Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center and constructs two multicomponent or joint, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of Louisiana, capable of accommodating National Guard, Army Reserve, Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve units.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing six separate facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers.

These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Louisiana will close the Louisiana Army National Guard Readiness Center in Baton Rouge and Organizational Maintenance Shop #8 in Baton Rouge. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $20.0M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Maryland

Recommendation # 24 (Army 52)

One-time Cost:	$6.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($17.8M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Flair Memorial Armed Forces Reserve Center and its organizational maintenance shop in Frederick, MD, and relocate US Army Reserve and US Marine Corps Reserve units to a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center and organizational maintenance support facility on Fort Detrick, MD.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Maryland. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Army Reserve Center and one Organizational Maintenance Shop in Frederick, MD, and constructs a multi-service, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop on Fort Detrick, MD. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by reducing the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $10.0M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Massachusetts

Recommendation # 25 (Army 54)

One-time Cost:	$85.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$60.4M
Payback Period:	100+ Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site 65 Annex, Ayer, MA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Ayer, MA; realign the Devens Reserve Forces Training Area, MA, by relocating the 323d Maintenance Facility, and the Regional Training Site Maintenance to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex in Ayer, MA; realign Ayer Area 3713 by relocating storage functions to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex in Ayer, MA. Realign the Marine Corps Reserve Center Ayer, MA, by relocating the 1/25th Marines Maintenance Facility, Marine Corps Reserve

Electronic Maintenance Section, and Maintenance Company/4th Marine Battalion to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex in Ayer, MA. The new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex shall have the capability to accommodate all Reserve units affected by this recommendation, including Army National Guard units from the Ayer Armory and Consolidated Support Maintenance Shop, Ayer, MA, if the state decides to relocate the National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Massachusetts. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Equipment Concentration Site Annex, realigns a Reserve Forces Training Area and a US Marine Corps Reserve Center, and constructs a multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Center in Ayer, MA. The Department understands that the State of Massachusetts will close: one Massachusetts Army National Guard Armory and one Consolidated Support Maintenance Site, Ayer, MA. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from the closed facilities to the new AFRC complex.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $28.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Michigan

Recommendation # 26 (Army 55)

One-time Cost:	$7.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($21.6M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the US Army Reserve Center Stanford C. Parisian in Lansing, MI, and the Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity #135 in Battle Creek, MI, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Custer Reserve Training Center, MI.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Michigan. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Army Reserve Center in Lansing, MI, and one Area Maintenance Support Activity in Battle Creek, MI, and constructs a multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) capable of accommodating Reserve units. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to a new AFRC.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $9.0M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20- year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Minnesota

Recommendation # 27 (Army 57)

One-time Cost:	$17.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$0.01M
20-Year Net Present Value:	$17.1M
Payback Period:	Never

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close US Army Reserve Center Faribault, MN, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center at Faribault Industrial Park if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Faribault Minnesota Army National Guard Armory if the state decides to relocate those units.

Close US Army Reserve Center Cambridge, MN, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Cambridge, MN, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Minnesota ARNG units from the Cambridge Army National Guard Armory if the state decides to relocate those units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Minnesota. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two US Army Reserve Centers in the State of Minnesota and constructs two Armed Forces Reserve Centers capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. The Department understands that the State of Minnesota will close two Minnesota Army National Guard Armories: Faribault and Cambridge, MN. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing four geographically separated facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business practices.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $3.0M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Missouri

Recommendation # 28 (Army 58)

One-time Cost:	$28.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($6.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($61.0M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Greentop, MO, and relocate units to a new United States Army Reserve Center in Kirksville, MO, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. Close the Jefferson Barracks United States Army Reserve Center, and re-locate units into a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center on Jefferson Barracks, MO, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Missouri Army National Guard Units from the Readiness Center in Jefferson Barracks if the state of Missouri decides to relocate those units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Missouri. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two Army Reserve centers and constructs one Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and one United States Army Reserve Center in the State of Missouri capable of accommodating National Guard and Army Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing four separate facilities into two modern Reserve Centers. These facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Missouri will close one Missouri Army Guard Readiness Centers on Jefferson Barracks. The Armed Forces Reserve Center will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRC.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $5.5M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing

facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Montana

Recommendation # 29 (Army 60)

One-time Cost:	$26.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$4.3M
Payback Period:	23 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Galt Hall Army Reserve Center in Great Falls, MT, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, MT.

Close Army Reserve Center Veuve Hall (building #26) and Area Maintenance Support Activity #75 on Fort Missoula, MT, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Missoula, MT, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Montana National Guard units from the Montana Army National Guard Armory in Missoula, MT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Montana. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two US Army Reserve Centers and one Army Maintenance Support Activity in the State of Montana and constructs two Armed Forces Reserve Centers capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. The Department understands that the State of Montana will close one Montana Army National Guard Armory in Missoula, MT. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $19.5M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Nebraska

Recommendation # 30 (Army 62)

One-time Cost:	$33.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($6.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($53.7M)
Payback Period:	5 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Wymore, NE, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in the vicinity of Beatrice, NE, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard Units from the following Nebraska ARNG Readiness Centers: Fairbury, NE, Falls City, NE, and Troop C, 1-167th Cavalry in Beatrice, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Columbus, NE, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Columbus, NE, The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard Units from the Nebraska ARNG Readiness Center, Columbus, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Hastings, NE, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Greenlief Training Site in Nebraska. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard Units from the following Nebraska ARNG Readiness Centers: Grand Island, NE, Crete, NE, and Hastings, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Kearney, NE, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Kearney, NE, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the

capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard Units from the Nebraska ARNG Readiness Center, Kearney, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in McCook, NE, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in McCook, NE, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard Units from the Nebraska ARNG Readiness Center, McCook, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Nebraska. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes five Army Reserve centers, and constructs five multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of Nebraska, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing thirteen geographically separated facilities into five modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Nebraska will close eight Nebraska Army Guard Armories: Grand Island, Crete, Hastings, Fairbury, Falls City, Columbus, Kearney, and McCook, NE. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $31.4M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in New Hampshire

Recommendation # 31 (Army 65)

One-time Cost:	$54.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($3.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$12.9M
Payback Period:	26 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Paul Doble Army Reserve Center in Portsmouth, NH, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and associated training and maintenance facilities adjacent to Pease Air National Guard Base, NH, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and complex will have the capability to accommodate New Hampshire National Guard units from the following New Hampshire ARNG Armories: Rochester, Portsmouth, Somersworth and Dover, NH, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of New Hampshire. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Armed Forces Reserve Center in Portsmouth, NH and constructs a multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Center on land adjacent to Pease Air National Guard Base. The Department understands that the State of New Hampshire will close four New Hampshire Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Rochester, Portsmouth, Somersworth and Dover. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from the closed facilities into the new AFRC.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $14.6M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in New Jersey

Recommendation # 32 (Army 66)

One-time Cost:	$15.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($3.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($26.6M)
Payback Period:	5 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Nelson Brittin Army Reserve Center in Camden, NJ, and relocate units to a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center in Camden, NJ, if the Army can acquire suitable land for the construction of the new facilities. The New AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the New Jersey ARNG Armory, Burlington, if the state decides to relocate those units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of New Jersey. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes Brittin Army Reserve Center in Camden, NJ, and constructs a multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) in Camden, NJ. This recommendation reduces costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing two separate facilities into one modern AFRC. The Department understands that the State of New Jersey will close one National Guard Armory in Burlington, NJ. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate units to the new multifunctional AFRC in Camden, NJ.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation. This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $14.5M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in New Mexico

Recommendation # 33 (Army 68)

One-time Cost:	$17.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($3.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($24.6M)
Payback Period:	6 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Jenkins Armed Forces Reserve Center located in Albuquerque, NM, and re-locate the units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Kirtland Air Force Base.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of New Mexico. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes an Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) located in Albuquerque, NM, and relocates units to a new multifunctional AFRC on Kirtland Air Force Base, NM. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating a geographically separate facility onto an existing base. Reducing the number of DoD installations also reduces the manpower costs required to sustain multiple facilities.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $0.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in New York

Recommendation # 34 (Army 69)

One-time Cost:	$103.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($4.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$46.5M
Payback Period:	47 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Stewart-Newburg, NY, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Stewart Army Sub Post adjacent to Stewart Air National Guard Base, NY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate New York National Guard units from the Readiness Center at Newburg, NY, if the state of New York decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center and Army Maintenance Support Activity, Niagara Falls, NY, and construct a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the existing site in Niagara Falls, NY. The New AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the NY National Guard units from the Niagara Falls Readiness Center if the state of New York decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the BG Theodore Roosevelt United States Army Reserve Center, Uniondale, NY, the Amityville Armed Forces Reserve Center (Army Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve), Amityville, NY, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Shop on federal property licensed to the New York Army National Guard in Farmingdale, NY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate New York National Guard units from the following New York Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Bayshore, Freeport, Huntington Station, Patchogue and Riverhead, and Organizational Maintenance Shop 21, Bayshore, NY, if the state of New York decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of New York. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four Army Reserve centers and constructs three multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of New York, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing three geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of New York will close six New York Army Guard Armories: Niagara Falls, Bayshore, Freeport, Huntington Station,

Patchogue and Riverhead, and Organizational Maintenance Shop 21 Bayshore, NY. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $81.6M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in North Carolina

Recommendation # 35 (Army 72)

One-time Cost:	$9.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.6M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($30.2M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Army Reserve Adrian B. Rhodes Armed Forces Reserve Center in Wilmington, NC, close the Rock Hill Armed Forces Reserve Center in Rock Hill, SC, close the Niven Armed Forces Reserve Center in Albermarle, NC, and relocate all Army and Navy units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS) in Wilmington, NC, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of North Carolina. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two Army Reserve Centers in the state of North Carolina and one Army Reserve Center in the state of South Carolina and constructs a multicomponent, multifunctional, Armed Forces Reserve Center capable of accommodating Navy and Army Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing three geographically separated facilities into a modern Armed Forces Reserve Center.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $10.2M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in North Dakota

Recommendation # 36 (Army 73)

One-time Cost:	$7.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$0.02M
20-Year Net Present Value:	$8.0M
Payback Period:	Never

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close 96th Regional Readiness Command David Johnson US Army Reserve Command in Fargo, ND, and relocate into a new Reserve Center on Hector Field Air National Guard Base.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of North Dakota. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and

deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes a United States Army Reserve Center (USARC) located in Fargo, ND, and relocates units to a new USARC on Hector Field Air National Guard Base, ND. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facility and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $4.0M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Ohio

Recommendation # 37 (Army 75)

One-time Cost:	$134.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($9.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$1.3M
Payback Period:	18 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Scouten Army Reserve Center, Mansfield, OH, and the Parrott Army Reserve Center, Kenton, OH, and relocate all units to a new AFRC at Mansfield Air National Guard Base located at Mansfield-Lahm Airport. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Ohio ARNG Armories in Mansfield and Ashland, OH, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close US Army Reserve Center, Springfield OH, and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the Springfield Air National Guard Base, Springfield, OH. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from

the following facility: Ohio ARNG Readiness Center, Springfield, OH, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close Fort Hayes US Army Reserve Center, Columbus, OH, and Whitehall US Army Reserve Center, Whitehall, OH, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Ohio ARNG Armories Howey (Columbus), Sullivant (Columbus), Newark, Westerville and Oxford, OH, Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base, Building #943 if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Ohio. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes five US Army Reserve Centers throughout the state of Ohio and constructs three Armed Forces Reserve Centers capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing thirteen geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers.

This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business practices. The Department understands that the State of Ohio will close eight Ohio Army National Guard Centers: Mansfield, Ashland, Springfield, Howey (Columbus), Sullivant (Columbus), Newark, Westerville, and Oxford, OH, and realign Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base Building #943 by relocating the Regional Training Institute to the new AFRC. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $74.4M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Oklahoma

Recommendation # 38 (Army 77)

One-time Cost:	$168.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($16.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($63.8M)
Payback Period:	11 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) Broken Arrow located in Broken Arrow, OK, and relocate the Army Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve and Naval Reserve units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and consolidated maintenance facility in Broken Arrow, OK, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Broken Arrow, Eufaula, Okmulgee, Tahlequah, Haskell, Cushing, Wagoner and the Field Maintenance Shop (FMS 14) located in Okmulgee if the state of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Keathley and Burris United States Army Reserve Centers located in Lawton and Chickasha, OK; close the Wichita Falls United States Army Reserve Center in Wichita Falls, TX; close the 1st, 3rd, 5th, and 6th United States Army Reserve Centers and Equipment Concentration Site (ECS) located on Fort Sill, OK, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Sill and a new United States Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site to be collocated with the Oklahoma Army National Guard Maneuver Area Training Equipment Site on Fort Sill. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Lawton, Frederick, Anadarko, Chickasha, Marlow, Walters, and Healdton; realign B/1-158 Field Artillery (MLRS) from the Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Duncan if the state of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Floyd Parker United States Army Reserve Center in McAlester, OK, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Consolidated Field Maintenance Shop on the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, McAlester, OK. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: the Field Maintenance Shop in Durant, OK; the Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers in Atoka, Allen, Hartshorne, Madill, McAlester and Tishomingo, OK; the Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Center and Field Maintenance Shop in Edmond, OK, if the state of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Ashworth United States Army Reserve Center located in Muskogee, OK, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Muskogee, OK, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Henryetta, Muskogee, Okemah, Pryor, and Stilwell, OK, if the state of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Farr United States Army Reserve Center, Antlers, OK, the Roush United States Army Reserve Center, Clinton, OK, the Smalley United States Army Reserve Center, Norman, OK, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Consolidated Maintenance Facility on the Norman Military Complex, Norman, OK. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard facilities: Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers in Tonkawa, OK, Konawa, OK, Wewoka, OK, Oklahoma City (23rd Street), OK, the 23d Street Field Maintenance Shop in Oklahoma City, the Consolidated Maintenance Facility on the Norman Military Complex, Norman, OK, and C CO, 700th Support Battalion from the Readiness Center, Edmond, OK, if the state of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Manuel Perez and Billy Krowse United States Army Reserve Centers located in Oklahoma City, OK. Relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in West Oklahoma City, OK, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard facilities: Readiness Centers located in Southwest Oklahoma City (44th Street), El Reno, Minco, and Pawnee, the Oklahoma Army National Guard 1345 Transportation Company and the

345th Quartermaster Water Support Battalion from Midwest City if the state of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Robbins United States Army Reserve Center located in Enid, OK, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Consolidated Field Maintenance Shop on Vance Air Force Base, OK. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard facilities: Enid, Alva, Woodward, Blackwell, Cherokee, Watonga, and the National Guard Field Maintenance Shop in Enid, OK, if the state of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Oklahoma. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes eleven Army Reserve centers, realigns five Army Reserve facilities and constructs seven joint or multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs) throughout the State of Oklahoma, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing units from sixty-four geographically separated facilities into seven modern, multicomponent facilities. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Oklahoma will close forty Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers, close five Maintenance Facilities, realign two Readiness Centers and one Maintenance Facility. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $61.9M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Oregon

Recommendation # 39 (Army 80)

One-time Cost:	$24.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$19.8M
Payback Period:	100+ Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Sears Hall United States Army Reserve Center in Portland, OR, close Sharff Hall United States Army Reserve Center in Portland, OR, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Camp Withycombe, OR. The new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) shall have the capability to accommodate Oregon National Guard units currently on Camp Withycombe and from the following Oregon ARNG Armories: Lake Oswego Armory, Maison Armory, and Jackson Band Armory, OR, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Oregon. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two Army Reserve Centers in the State of Oregon and constructs a multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Center capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing three geographically separated facilities into a modern Armed Forces Reserve Center. The Department understands that the State of Oregon will close: Lake Oswego Armory in Lake Oswego, OR and realign the Jackson Band Armory, and the Maison Armory. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from the closed and realigning facilities to the new AFRC complex.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $36M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering the existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Pennsylvania

Recommendation # 40 (Army 82)

One-time Cost:	$142.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($14.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($58.4M)
Payback Period:	10 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Lewisburg, PA, the United States Army Reserve Center in Bloomsburg, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Bloomsburg, PA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in the Lewisburg / Bloomsburg, PA, area if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Pennsylvania National Guard Units from the following Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Lewisburg, PA, Sunbury, PA, Scranton, PA, and Berwick, PA, if the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania decides to relocate those units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Williamsport, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Williamsport, PA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in Williamsport, PA, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Pennsylvania National Guard Units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center in Williamsport, PA, if the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania decides to relocate those units.

Close the Reese United States Army Reserve Center in Chester, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Chester, PA, the Germantown Veterans Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Philadelphia, PA, the Horsham Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Horsham, PA, the 1LT Ray S. Musselman Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Norristown, PA, and the North Penn memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Norristown, PA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility at Willow Grove Joint Reserve Base, PA. The Army shall establish an enclave at Willow Grove Joint Reserve Base, PA, to retain essential facilities to support activities of the Reserve Components.

Close the Wilson Kramer United States Army Reserve Center in Bethlehem, PA, and the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Bethlehem, PA, and relocate units to a new United States Army Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in the Allentown/ Bethlehem, PA, area if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

Close the Philadelphia Memorial United States Armed Forces Reserve Center in Philadelphia, PA, the Philadelphia Memorial United States Armed Forces Reserve Center Organizational Maintenance Shop in Philadelphia, PA, and relocate Army Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in Bristol, PA, on the existing Bristol Veterans Memorial Reserve Center site.

Close the Serrenti Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Scranton, PA, the Serrenti Memorial United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Scranton, PA, the United States Army Reserve Center in Wilkes-Barre, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Wilkes-Barre, PA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in Scranton, PA, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve

training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes eleven Army Reserve Centers, one Armed Forces Reserve Center, and seven Organizational Maintenance Shops throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and constructs six multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers, with six co-located Organizational Maintenance Facilities capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing sixteen geographically separated facilities into six modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. The Department understands that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will close PAARNG Readiness Centers: Lewisburg, PA, Sunbury, PA, Berwick, PA, Scranton, PA, and Williamsport, PA. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $110.4M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Puerto Rico

Recommendation # 41 (Army 85)

One-time Cost:	$87.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($7.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($8.6M)
Payback Period:	15 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the US Army Reserve Center 1st Lieutenant Paul Lavergne, Bayamon, PR, and relocate the 973rd Combat Support (CS) Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on United States Army Reserve property in Ceiba, PR, and relocate all other units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on Fort Buchanan, PR. Realign the US Army Reserve Center Captain E. Rubio Junior, Puerto Nuevo, PR, by relocating the 807th Signal Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Buchanan, PR. The new AFRC on Fort Buchanan, PR, shall have the capability to

accommodate units from the Puerto Rico Army Guard San Juan Readiness Center, San Juan, PR, if Puerto Rico decides to relocate those National Guard units. The new AFRC facility in Ceiba, PR, shall have the capability to accommodate Puerto Rico National Guard units from the following PRARNG Readiness Centers: Humacao, Juncos, and Ceiba, PR, if Puerto Rico decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Realign United States Army Reserve Center Captain E. Rubio Junior, Puerto Nuevo, PR, by relocating the 8th Brigade, 108th DIV (IT) to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Allen, PR.

Realign United States Army Reserve Center Ramey, Aguadilla, PR, by relocating the 249th Quartermaster Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Mayaguez, PR, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land. The new facility shall have the capability to accommodate Puerto Rico National Guard units from the Puerto Rico Army National Guard Readiness Center Mayaguez if Puerto Rico decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout Puerto Rico. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one and realigns four US Army Reserve Centers throughout Puerto Rico and constructs four multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing five geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that Puerto Rico will close PRARNG Readiness Centers: Humacao, Juncos, Ceiba, and Mayaguez, PR. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $36.4M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Rhode Island

Recommendation # 42 (Army 87)

One-time Cost:	$32.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($4.6M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($35.3M)
Payback Period:	6 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Bristol Army Reserve Center, Bristol, RI, the Harwood Army Reserve Center, Providence, RI, the Warwick Army Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop, Warwick, RI. Relocate all units to a new Army Reserve Center on Newport Naval Base, RI.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Rhode Island. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes three Army Reserve Centers in Bristol, Harwood and Warwick, RI; and closes one Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Warwick, RI, and constructs a multifunctional Army Reserve Center (AFRC) on Newport Naval Base, RI. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $20.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Tennessee

Recommendation # 43 (Army 89)

One-time Cost:	$36.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$1.1M
Payback Period:	18 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Guerry United States Army Reserve Center, Chattanooga, TN, and Bonney Oaks United States Army Reserve Center, Chattanooga, TN, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on Volunteer Army Ammunition Plant, Chattanooga, TN.

Close the Kingsport Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC), the Kingsport Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS), and the Army Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA), Kingsport, TN, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Field Maintenance Shop on Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Kingsport, TN. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Tennessee National Guard units from the Kingsport Armed Forces Reserve Center, Kingsport, TN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units. Close the United States Army Reserve Center outside of Fort Campbell (located in Clarksville, TN), KY, and relocate units, along with units currently in buildings #6912 and #2907 on Fort Campbell into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS) on Fort Campbell, KY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Clarksville Army National Guard Readiness Center, Clarksville, TN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Tennessee. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four Army Reserve Centers, one Area Maintenance Support Activity and one Organizational Maintenance Shop throughout the State of Tennessee and constructs three multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers, one Field Maintenance Shop, and one Organizational Maintenance Shop capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing nine geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base.

The Department understands that the State of Tennessee will close the Clarksville Army National Guard Readiness Center, Clarksville, TN. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $23.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs

and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Texas

Recommendation # 44 (Army 91)

One-time Cost:	$375.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($36.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($133.2M)
Payback Period:	12 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Tharp United States Army Reserve Center, Amarillo, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Amarillo, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Amarillo, Pampa, and Hale Co, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Brownsville, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Brownsville, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Center in Brownsville, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Boswell, TX, and the United States Army Reserve Center, Callaghan, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on existing Federal property on Camp Bullis, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Center in Hondo, TX, A Company and Headquarters Company, 1st of the 141st Infantry, the Fifth Army ITAAS, the Regional Training Site-Intelligence, and the Texas Army National Guard Area Support Medical Battalion, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Grimes United States Army Reserve Center, Abilene, TX, and relocate B Company of the 413th Civil Affairs Battalion and the Area Maintenance Support Activity 11 Sub-Shop to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Field Maintenance Shop on Dyess Air Force Base, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Abilene, Coleman, and Snyder, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop, Abilene, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Roque O Segura United States Army Reserve Center, El Paso, Texas, the Benavidez United States Army Reserve Center, El Paso, Texas, the United States Army Reserve Center #3, Fort Bliss, Texas and the McGregor Range United States Army Reserve Center and Equipment Concentration Site, Fort Bliss New Mexico and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Consolidated Equipment Concentration Site and Maintenance Facility on Fort Bliss Texas. The new

AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas Army National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness centers: Fort Bliss and Hondo Pass in El Paso, Texas, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Herzog United States Army Reserve Center, Dallas, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the existing Grand Prairie Reserve Complex, Grand Prairie, TX. Realign the 490th Civil Affairs Battalion from the Grimes United States Army Reserve Center and relocate the unit into the new AFRC. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Arlington, TX, and California Crossing, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Pasadena, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Field Maintenance Shop in (East) Houston, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Baytown, Pasadena, and Ellington Field, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop located on Ellington Field, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close United States Army Reserve Center #2, Perimeter Park, TX, and United States Army Reserve Center #3, Houston, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a consolidated Field Maintenance Shop in (Northwest) Houston, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Beaumont, Port Arthur, Port Neches, and Orange, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop located in Port Neches, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Miller United States Army Reserve Center, Huntsville, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Huntsville, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Center in Huntsville, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Muchert United States Army Reserve Center, Dallas, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center Lewisville, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Denton, Irving, and Denison, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Lufkin, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Lufkin, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Lufkin and Nacogdoches, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Alice, TX, and the United States Army Reserve Center, NAS Kingsville, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on NAS Kingsville, TX, if the Army determines the property is suitable for construction. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Alice and Kingsville, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Watts-Guillot United States Army Reserve Center, Texarkana, TX, and realign the Hooks Army Reserve Center on Red River Army Depot by relocating units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on or in the vicinity of Red River Army Depot, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Atlanta, and Texarkana, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close Round Rock United States Army Reserve Center (leased) and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a consolidated Field Maintenance Shop in Round Rock, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Centers in Austin and Taylor, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop in Austin, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, San Marcos, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in San Marcos, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: San Marcos, Sequin, and New Braunfels, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units. Close the Hanby-Hayden United States Army Reserve Center, Mesquite, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Shop on United States Army Reserve property in Seagoville, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Dallas #2,

Kaufman and Terrell (including the Organizational Maintenance Shop), TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Tyler, TX, and the United States Army Reserve Center, Marshall, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Field Maintenance Shop in Tyler, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Athens, Tyler, Henderson, Kilgore, Marshall, and Corsicana, TX, and the Field Maintenance Shop in Marshall, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Texas. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

The recommendation closes twenty-four Army Reserve centers and one equipment concentration site, realigns one Army Reserve Center, and constructs seventeen multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of Texas capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing seventy-seven geographically separated facilities into seventeen modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Texas will close forty-three Texas Army Guard Armories: Abilene, Alice, Amarillo, Arlington, Atlanta, Athens, Austin, Baytown, Beaumont, Brownsville, California Crossing, Coleman, Corsicana, Dallas #2, Denison, Denton, Ellington Field, Fort Bliss, Henderson, Hondo, Hondo Pass, Huntsville, Irving, Kaufman, Kilgore, Kingsville, Lufkin, Marshall, Nacogdoches, New Braunfels, Orange, Pampa, Pasadena, Hale Co, Port Arthur, Port Neches, San Marcos, Sequin, Snyder, Taylor, Terrell, Texarkana and Tyler, TX; close six Army National Guard Field Maintenance Facilities in Abilene, Austin, Marshall, Ellington Field, Port Neches and Terrell; and realign Camp Bullis. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $231.3M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Vermont

Recommendation # 45 (Army 95)

One-time Cost:	$61.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$41.7M
Payback Period:	100+ Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Chester Memorial Army Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop, Chester, VT, and Berlin Army Reserve Center, Berlin, VT, and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Facility in the vicinity of White River Junction, VT, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and OMS shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Vermont Army National Guard Armories in Ludlow, North Springfield and Windsor, VT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close Army Reserve Center, Courcelle Brothers and associated Organizational Maintenance Shop, Rutland, VT; close Army Reserve Army Maintenance Support Activity, Rutland, VT, and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Facility in the vicinity of Rutland, VT, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and Maintenance Activity shall have the ability to accommodate units from the following facility: Vermont Army National Guard Armory Rutland, VT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Vermont. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

The recommendation closes four US Army Reserve Centers, one Area Maintenance Support Activity and two Organizational Maintenance Shops throughout the State of Vermont and constructs two Armed Forces Reserve Centers and collocated Organizational Maintenance facilities capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing eleven geographically separated facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers with maintenance facilities. These new facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business practices. The Department understands that the State of Vermont will close four Vermont Army National Guard Centers: Ludlow, North Springfield, Windsor and Rutland, VT. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $30.1M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Washington

Recommendation # 46 (Army 97)

One-time Cost:	$61.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($8.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($46.1M)
Payback Period:	9 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Mann Hall Army Reserve Center, Area Maintenance Support Shop #80 and Walker Army Reserve Center in Spokane, WA, and relocate units to a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop on Fairchild Air Force Base. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following Washington ARNG facilities: Washington ARNG Armory and Organizational Maintenance Shop, Geiger Field, WA, if the state decides to relocate those units.

Close Wagenaar Army Reserve Center Pasco, WA, and relocate units to a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center on Yakima Training Center. Realign Pendleton Army Reserve Center on Yakima Training Center by moving all assigned units to the new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Yakima Training Center. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following Washington ARNG facility: Washington ARNG Ellensburg Readiness Center if the state decides to relocate those units.

Close the Oswald United States Army Reserve Center, Everett, WA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the Everett, WA, area if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for construction of the new facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following Washington ARNG facilities: Washington ARNG Everett Readiness Center and Snohomish Readiness Center, if the state decides to relocate those units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Washington. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four US Army Reserve Centers and one Area Maintenance Support Activity, realigns one Army Reserve Center and constructs three multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRCs)

throughout the State of Washington, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation also reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing nine geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint-use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business practices. The Department understands that the State of Washington will close four Washington Army National Guard Centers: Geiger Field, Everett, Snohomish and Ellensburg; and one Organizational Maintenance Shop, Geiger Field, WA. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $24.5M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in West Virginia

Recommendation # 47 (Army 99)

One-time Cost:	$29.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($7.6M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($77.0M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Elkins US Army Reserve Center and its supporting Maintenance Shop in Beverly, WV, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Elkins, WV, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate West Virginia Army National Guard Units from the Readiness Center in Elkins, WV, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the 1LT Harry Colburn US Army Reserve Center and its supporting Maintenance Shop in Fairmont, WV, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Fairmont, WV, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate West Virginia National Guard Units from the Readiness Center in Fairmont, WV, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close SSG Roy Kuhl US Army Reserve Center and Maintenance Facility in Ripley and the MAJ Elbert Bias USAR Center, Huntington, WV, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Ripley, WV, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate West Virginia National Guard Units from the West Virginia Army National Guard Readiness Center in Spencer, WV, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of West Virginia. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four Army Reserve centers, three supporting Maintenance Shops and constructs three multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of West Virginia, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing ten separate facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These multicomponent facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of West Virginia will close three West Virginia Army Guard Armories: Spencer, Fairmont, and Elkins, WV. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $43.6M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Wisconsin

Recommendation # 48 (Army 102)

One-time Cost:	$10.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($10.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($139.7M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Truman Olson and G.F. O'Connell US Army Reserve Centers in Madison, WI, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) in Madison, WI, if the Army can acquire suitable land for the construction of the new facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Army National Guard units from the following Wisconsin Army National Guard Armories; the Madison Armory (Bowman Street), Madison Armory / OMS 9, and the Madison Armory (2400 Wright Street) if the state decides to relocate those units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Wisconsin. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two Army Reserve Centers and realigns three Wisconsin Army National Guard Armories and constructs a multi-service, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) in Madison, WI. The Department understands that the State of Wisconsin will realign the Madison Armory (Bowman Street) by relocating the 64th Troop Command; the Madison Armory / OMS 9, by re-locating the 54th Civil Support Team, the Madison Armory (2400 Wright Street) by re-locating the 641st Troop Command. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these facilities to the new AFRC.

This is a joint proposal with the Navy that supports actions to close the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Madison, WI, the Navy Reserve Center, La Crosse, WI, and the Navy Reserve Center in Dubuque, IA. This recommendation reduces costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing two separate facilities and units from three overcrowded facilities into one modern AFRC.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $12.7M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found DoD's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Reserve Component Transformation in Wyoming

Recommendation # 49 (Army 103)

One-time Cost:	$72.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($4.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$9.0M
Payback Period:	21 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Wyoming Army National Guard (WYARNG) Army Aviation Support Facility (AASF) in Cheyenne, WY (DA leased facility) and relocate Army National Guard units and aviation functions to a new WYARNG AASF, Readiness Center, and Field Maintenance Shop (FMS) on F.E. Warren Air Force Base, WY. The new readiness center/FMS shall have the capability to accommodate Army National Guard units from the Joint Force Headquarters Complex in Cheyenne, WY, if the state decides to relocate those units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Wyoming. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes a WYARNG AASF, two WYARNG armories and constructs an AASF, readiness center and FMS on F.E. Warren Air Force Base, WY. This recommendation reduces costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing an AASF and consolidating with other units in the Cheyenne area into a single facility onto an existing Air Force Base. The Department understands that the State of Wyoming will close the Thermopolis Armory (vacant- no units relocating) and the Joint Force Headquarters Armory (adjacent to F.E. Warren Air Force Base). The new facility will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate those units.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $22.2M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. In addition, the Commission notes that the Army's process was well thought-out and inclusive of the leadership of the Reserve Components and the State.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Single Drill Sergeant School

Recommendation # 50 (Army 105)

One-time Cost:	$1.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($31.4M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Benning, GA, and Fort Leonard Wood, MO, by relocating the Drill Sergeant School at each location to Fort Jackson, SC.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation consolidates Drill Sergeant's Training from three locations (Fort Benning, Fort Jackson, and Fort Leonard Wood) to one location (Fort Jackson), which fosters consistency, standardization and training proficiency. It enhances military value, supports the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address unforeseen requirements. This recommendation supports Army Transformation by collocating institutional training, MTOE units, RDTE organizations and other TDA units in large numbers on single installations to support force stabilization and engage training. It improves training capabilities while eliminating excess capacity at institutional training installations and provides the same or better level of service at a reduced cost.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found DoD's proposal to consolidate drill sergeant training at one site to be consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Fort Jackson has adequate facilities for consolidation of all three existing drill sergeant schools when augmented with proposed construction. Savings occur rapidly, reflecting the efficiencies of collocation. The Commission views the consolidation as desirable so long as the ability to foster consistency and proficiency in this critical Army asset is not affected during implementation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

US Army Garrison Michigan (Selfridge)

Recommendation # 51 (Army 106)

One-time Cost:	$9.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($18.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($260.9M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close United States Army Garrison Michigan at Selfridge, which is located on Selfridge Air National Guard Base. Retain an enclave to support the Dynamic Structural Load Simulator (Bridging) Laboratory and the Water Purification Laboratory on Selfridge.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation closes the US Army Garrison Michigan (USAG-M) at Selfridge, which is located on federally owned property at Selfridge Air National Guard Base. USAG-M at Selfridge is the primary provider of housing and other support and services to certain military personnel and their dependents located in the Detroit area. Sufficient housing is available in the Detroit Metropolitan area to support military personnel stationed in the area. Closing USAG-Michigan at Selfridge avoids the cost of continued operation and maintenance of other unnecessary support facilities. A Bridging Lab and Water Purification Lab located on Selfridge, which are part of the Tank Automotive Army Research and Development Center at Detroit Arsenal, will be retained and enclaved. Six garrison personnel (Garrison Commander and staff) will be relocated to Detroit Arsenal. This recommendation enhances military value, supports the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address unforeseen requirements.

Community Concerns

The community asks that the Army land be transferred to the Air Force when the Army's activities cease to preclude private development that could lead to encroachment problems for the flight mission. They also expressed concern that the loss of housing areas, lodging operation, post exchange, commissary, and other Garrison activities would have a negative impact on recruiting and retention for the remaining units, and would negatively affect the retiree and veterans' community as well.

Commission Findings

The Commission carefully considered the community's expressed concerns that closure of the Army Garrison Activity creates the potential for future encroachment that could affect the continuing flying mission at Selfridge Air National Guard Base. The Commission found that the BRAC implementation screening process provides sufficient protections from development and possible encroachment. Federal and state agencies, – such as the US Air Force, US Air Force Reserve, National Guard Bureau, Michigan Air National Guard, or other federal or state agencies – have the opportunity to claim this land during the federal screening process. The Commission found that this, and community concerns for the effects of withdrawal of services provided by the Army Garrison, did not rise to the level of a substantial deviation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

USAR Command and Control New England

Recommendation # 52 (Army 107)

One-time Cost:	$96.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($8.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($21.8M)
Payback Period:	13 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Westover Armed Forces Reserve Center, Chicopee, MA, the MacArthur United States Army Reserve Center, Springfield, MA, the United States Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity, Windsor Locks, CT, and realign the Malony United States Army Reserve Center on Devens Reserve Forces Training Area by disestablishing the 94th Regional Readiness Command, and relocate all units from the closed facilities to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. Establish an Army Reserve Maneuver Enhancement Brigade headquarters in the new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. Realign Devens Reserve Forces Training Area by relocating the 5th JTF, 654th ASG and the 382nd MP Battalion to the new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. The new Armed Forces Reserve Center shall have the capability to accommodate Massachusetts Army National Guard units from the Massachusetts Army National Guard Armory in Agawam, MA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities and command and control structure throughout the New England Region of the United States. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a nation-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation supports the Army Reserve's Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four by disestablishing one major peacetime administrative headquarters, the 94th Regional Readiness Command, and creating a new deployable headquarters on Westover Air Reserve Base.

This recommendation closes one Armed Forces Reserve Center in Chicopee, MA, one United States Army Reserve Center in Springfield, MA, one United States Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity in Windsor Locks, CT, and constructs a multicomponent, multifunctional Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. The Marine Corps Reserve units located in the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Chicopee will relocate to the new AFRC on Westover Air Reserve Base. The Department understands that the State of Massachusetts will close one Massachusetts Army National Guard Armory in Agawam, MA. The Armed Forces Reserve Center will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from the closed facilities into the new AFRC.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $21.6M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

USAR Command and Control—Northeast

Recommendation # 53 (Army 109)

One-time Cost:	$171.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($35.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($302.1M)
Payback Period:	5 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Pitt USARC, Coraopolis, PA, by disestablishing the HQ 99th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Northeast Regional Readiness Command Headquarters at Fort Dix, NJ. Close Camp Kilmer, NJ, and relocate the HQ 78th Division at Fort Dix, NJ. Realign Fort Totten, NY, by disestablishing the HQ 77th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Sustainment Brigade at Fort Dix, NJ. Realign Fort Sheridan, IL, by relocating the 244th Aviation Brigade to Fort Dix, NJ. Realign Fort Dix, NJ, by relocating Equipment Concentration Site 27 to the New Jersey Army National Guard Mobilization and Training Equipment Site joint facility at Lakehurst, NJ. Close Charles Kelly Support Center and relocate units to Pitt US Army Reserve Center, Coraopolis, PA. Close Carpenter USARC, Poughkeepsie, NY, close McDonald USARC, Jamaica, NY, close Fort Tilden USARC, Far Rockaway, NY, close Muller USARC, Bronx, NY, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center at Fort Totten, NY. Close the United States Army Reserve Center on Fort Hamilton, NY and relocate the New York Recruiting Battalion Headquarters and Army Reserve units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Hamilton, NY. The new AFRC shall have the capacity to accommodate units from the NYARNG 47th Regiment Marcy Armory, Brooklyn and the Brooklyn Bedford Armory/OMS, Brooklyn, NY, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities and command and control structure throughout the Northeast Region of the United States. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a nation-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation transforms Army Reserve command and control by consolidating four major headquarters onto Fort Dix, NJ; this recommendation supports the Army Reserve's nationwide Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four. The realignment of Pitt USARC, Coraopolis, PA, by the disestablishment of the 99th Regional Readiness Command allows for the establishment of the Northeast Regional Readiness Command Headquarters at Fort Dix, NJ, which will further support the re-engineering and streamlining of the Command and Control structure of the Army Reserves throughout the United States. This restructuring will allow for the closure of Camp Kilmer, NJ, and the relocation of the HQ 78th Division to Fort Dix and establishment of one of the new Army Reserve Sustainment Units of Action, which establishes a new capability for the Army Reserve while increasing the support capabilities of the Army Reserve to the Active Army. To further support restructuring; the realignment of Fort Totten and the disestablishment of the HQ 77th RRC will enable the establishment of a Maneuver Enhancement Brigade at Fort Dix, resulting in a new operational capability for the Army Reserve. The realignment of Fort Sheridan, IL, by relocating

the 244th Aviation Brigade to Fort Dix coupled with the Department of the Navy recommendation to close NAS Willow Grove, PA, and relocate Co A/228th Aviation to Fort Dix consolidates Army aviation assets in one location. Other actions supporting restructuring include realigning maintenance functions on Fort Dix, the closure of Charles Kelly Support Center, PA, and relocation of multiple subordinate units to Pitt USARC, PA; and the closure of five US Army Reserve Centers in the greater New York City area with relocation of those units to Fort Totten. These actions will significantly enhance training, mobilization, equipment readiness and deployment.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by closing one Camp, five Army Reserve Centers, realigning five facilities and relocating forces to multiple installations throughout the Northeast Region of the United States. These actions will also improve business processes. The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new command structures will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives. The Department understands that the State of New York will close NYARNG Armories: 47th Regiment Marcy Armory, Brooklyn and Brooklyn Bedford Armory/OMS 12. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into a new AFRC on Fort Hamilton, NY.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $168.3M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidance associated with meeting Anti Terror / Force Protection construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communication requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

Community representatives from the area near the Kelly Support Center, in Pittsburgh, PA, expressed concerns about the base's Commissary and Exchange facilities. The next nearest comparable facilities are 188 miles away in Carlisle, PA. The community stated that 69,000 active and reserve military personnel, as well as retirees, are supported by these facilities. All other activities on the post will be moved to the nearby 99th RRC Reserve Center, but DoD has not indicated a plan to place the Commissary and Exchange facilities at nearby sites.

Commission Findings

The Commission found DoD's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Community concerns were carefully weighed and considered, but the Commission did not find they rose to the level of substantial deviation. The Commission also notes that DoD will address the further requirements for the commissary and exchange at the Kelly Support Center after the BRAC recommendations are approved and the effects on the area population can be assessed.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

USAR Command and Control—Northwest

Recommendation # 54 (Army 112)

One-time Cost:	$80.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($11.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($65.0M)
Payback Period:	9 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Vancouver Barracks and relocate the 104th Division (IT) to Fort Lewis, WA. Relocate all other units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Vancouver, WA. Close Fort Lawton by disestablishing the 70th Regional Readiness Command, relocate all other units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Lewis, WA, and establish a Maneuver Enhancement Brigade. Realign Fort Snelling, MN, by disestablishing the 88th Regional Readiness Command and establish the Northwest Regional Readiness Command Headquarters at Fort McCoy, WI. Realign the Wichita US Army Reserve Center by disestablishing the 89th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Sustainment Unit of Action at the Wichita Army Reserve Center in support of the Northwest Regional Readiness Command at Fort McCoy, WI. Realign Fort Douglas, UT, by disestablishing the 96th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Sustainment Unit of Action in support of the Northwest Regional Readiness Command at Fort McCoy, WI.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities and command and control structure throughout the Northwest Region of the United States. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a nation-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation supports the Army Reserve's Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four. This recommendation transforms Army Reserve command and control by consolidating two major headquarters onto Fort Lewis, WA. This sets the conditions for establishing one of three new operationally capable Army Reserve Maneuver Enhancement Brigades, which will increase the support capabilities of the Army Reserve to the Active Army and is a new operational capability for the Army Reserve. The realignment of Fort Snelling, MN, by the disestablishment of the 88th Regional Readiness Command allows for the establishment of the Northwest Regional Readiness Command Headquarters at Fort McCoy, WI, which will support the re-engineering and streamlining of the Command and Control structure of the Army Reserves throughout the United States.

This recommendation also realigns Fort Douglas, UT, and the Wichita Army Reserve Center, establishing Sustainment Units of Action in those locations in support of the Northwest Regional Readiness Command Headquarters. Relocation of multiple subordinate units from Vancouver Barracks and Fort Lawton, WA, to new Armed Forces Reserve Centers contributes significantly to enhanced training, mobilization and deployment.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by closing two Reserve facilities and relocating the units onto an Active component installation and thereby significantly reducing operating costs and creating improved business processes.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $70.7M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs

and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

USAR Command and Control—Southeast

Recommendation # 55 (Army 115)

One-time Cost:	$29.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($1.5M)
Payback Period:	16 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Birmingham Armed Forces Reserve Center, AL, by disestablishing the 81st Regional Readiness Command and establishing the Army Reserve Southeast Regional Readiness Command in a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Jackson, SC. Close Louisville United States Army Reserve Center and relocate the 100th DIV(IT) headquarters to Fort Knox, KY.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities and command and control structure throughout the Southeast Region of the United States. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a nation-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation supports the Army Reserve's Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four. This recommendation transforms Army Reserve command and control by relocating one major headquarters from inadequate facilities in Birmingham, AL, to Fort Jackson, SC. This supports the initiative to consolidate command structure and responsibilities on Active Army installations, which will in turn increase the support capabilities of the Army Reserve to the Active Army while establishing a new operational capability for the Army Reserve. The relocation of the 100th Division (Institutional Training) to Fort Knox, KY, supports the re-engineering and streamlining of support delivered by Army Reserve training base units in order to significantly enhance training in support of mobilization and deployment.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by closing one Armed Forces Reserve Center, and moving two major commands onto Active Army installations, thus significantly reducing operating costs and creating improved business processes.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $13.1M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

USAR Command and Control—Southwest

Recommendation # 56 (Army 117)

One-time Cost:	$55.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($3.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$9.8M
Payback Period:	23 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign the Joint Force Training Base Los Alamitos, CA, by disestablishing the 63rd Regional Readiness Command (RRC) Headquarters, Robinson Hall, USARC and activating a Southwest Regional Readiness Command headquarters at Moffett Field, CA, in a new AFRC. Realign Camp Pike Reserve Complex, Little Rock, AR, by disestablishing the 90th RRC and activating a Sustainment Brigade. Close the Major General Harry Twaddle United States Armed Forces Reserve Center, Oklahoma City, OK, and relocate the 95th DIV (IT) to Fort Sill, OK. Realign Camp Parks Reserve Forces Training Area, CA, by relocating the 91st Div (TSD) to Fort Hunter Liggett, CA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities and command and control structure throughout the Southeast Region of the United States. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a nation-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation supports the Army Reserve's Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four. This recommendation transforms Army Reserve command and control by eliminating nondeployable command and control headquarters, transforming excess spaces into deployable units and moving institutional training units onto major training areas. It supports the Army Reserve's Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four by disestablishing two major peacetime administrative headquarters—the 63d Regional Readiness Command in Los Angeles, CA, and the 90th Regional Readiness Command in Little Rock, AR,—and creating a new consolidated headquarters in their place at Moffett Field, CA. It supports the transformation of Army Reserve Operational Force Structure by activating a sustainment brigade in Little Rock, AR in the place of the 90th RRC, which will increase the deployable capability of the Army Reserve to support the Active Army. The Sustainment brigade is a new operational capability for the Army Reserve. This proposal transforms the Army's training support to the Reserve Component by re-locating the 95th DIV (Institutional Training) from the Major General Harry Twaddle United States Army Reserve Center, Oklahoma City, OK, to Fort Sill, OK, and relocating the 91st Div (Training Support) from Camp Parks Reserve Forces Training Area, CA, to Fort Hunter Liggett, CA which improves operational effectiveness by putting these Training Divisions at major training sites in their regions.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components' ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units affected by this recommendation.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated $16.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance homeland security and homeland defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE, BARSTOW, CA

RECOMMENDATION # 57 (DON 6)

ONE-TIME COST:	$26.0M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	($18.4M)
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	($230.6M)
PAYBACK PERIOD:	IMMEDIATE

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA. Disestablish the depot maintenance of Aircraft Other Components, Aircraft Rotary, and Strategic Missiles. Consolidate depot maintenance of Engines/Transmissions, Other Components, and Small Arms/Personal Weapons at Anniston Army Depot, AL. Consolidate the depot maintenance of Conventional Weapons, Engines/Transmissions, Material Handling, Powertrain Components, Starters/Alternators/Generators, Test Measurement Diagnostic Equipment, and Wire at Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Consolidate depot maintenance of Electronic Components (Non-Airborne), Electro-Optics/Night Vision/Forward-Looking-Infrared, Generators, Ground Support Equipment, Radar, and Radio at Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA. Consolidate depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles at Letterkenny Army Depot, PA. Realign Fleet Support Division Maintenance Center Barstow and Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow operations to increase efficiencies and reduce infrastructure.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation follows the strategy of minimizing sites using maximum capacity of 1.5 shifts while maintaining a West Coast depot maintenance presence at Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow to provide West Coast operating forces with a close, responsive source for depot maintenance support. Required capacity to support workloads and core requirements for the DoD is relocated to other DoD Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence, thereby increasing the military value of depot maintenance performed at these sites. This recommendation decreases the cost of depot maintenance operations across DoD through consolidation and elimination of 30 percent of duplicate overhead structures required to operate multiple depot maintenance activities. This recommendation supports transformation of DoD's depot maintenance operations by increasing the utilization of existing capacity by up to 150 percent while maintaining capability to support future force structure. This recommendation also results in utilization of DoD capacity to facilitate performance of interservice workload. In addition, based on present and future wartime surge projections, Marine Corps Logistics Center Barstow will establish an additional 428,000 hours of amphibious vehicle capacity.

This recommendation, along with other recommendations affecting supply and storage functions, optimizes the depot maintenance operations at Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

The Barstow community argued DoD's recommendation concerning ground depot maintenance performed at Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow substantially deviated from BRAC selection criteria 1, 3 and 6, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. They claimed Marine Corps and Army models of ground combat maintenance are fundamentally and qualitatively different, and these differences significantly affect combat-readiness and combat-effectiveness. The community said DoD erred by leaving cycle time (turnaround time) out of the computation of military value, incorrectly based comparisons on a commodity-to-commodity rather than depot-to-depot basis, and that adopting the Army model of depot maintenance for Marine Corps equipment would greatly increase cycle times. The community stated the Marine Corps, not the Army, is America's "9-1-1 Emergency Response Force" and that the recommendation, if adopted, would violate the National Military Strategy and the 20-Year Force Structure Plan. Barstow representatives also claimed DoD sought savings at

the expense of readiness. The community asserted DoD substantially deviated from Criteria 6 in assessing local economic impact, estimating the impact at 8 percent of Barstow's labor force rather than the one-tenth of one percent estimated by DoD.

Lastly, Barstow advocates opposed the idea of closing two Marine Corps depots and transferring the workload to Red River Army Depot, TX, as an alternative to the DoD recommendation to close Red River Army Depot. The combined workload from two Marine Corps depots would not make a significant difference in Red River's capacity utilization rate, and Army depots do not have the facilities, equipment or workforce to handle the Marines' unique amphibious vehicle requirements.

Commission Findings

The Commission agreed with the Secretary of Defense that the proposed realignment of Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA will decrease the cost of depot maintenance operations across DoD while increasing the military value to the Warfighter. The community's contentions that cycle times would be degraded, and the quality of work would suffer, were not supported by the Commission's review and analysis. The realignment recommendation will leave in place sufficient depot surge capacity while generating cost savings.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Naval Support Activity Corona, CA

Recommendation # 58 (DoN 7)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Naval Support Activity Corona, CA. Relocate Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona, CA, to Naval Base Ventura County (Naval Air Station Point Mugu), CA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona performs three required missions for Department of the Navy (Independent Assessment Capability, Metrology and Calibration Laboratories, and Tactical Aircrew Combat Training System Ranges). It was analyzed under 11 Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation functions (Air Platforms Development & Acquisition; Air Platforms Test & Evaluation; Ground Vehicles Test and Evaluation; Information Systems Technology Development & Acquisition; Information Systems Technology Test & Evaluation; Sea Vehicles Development & Acquisition; Sea Vehicles Test & Evaluation; Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare Development & Acquisition; Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare Test & Evaluation; Weapons Technology Development & Acquisition; and Weapons Technology Test & Evaluation). In each functional area, Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona's quantitative military value scores fell in the bottom half of facilities performing the same function and thus were reviewed for relocation and/or consolidation with like functions. The Department of the Navy determined it would lose a critical capability if the 11 functions were relocated to a variety of locations, since this would fracture the full-spectrum warfare center and independent assessment capability. Considering the overall military value and the fact that Naval Support Activity Corona was a single function facility, the Department reviewed the possibility of relocating the Naval Surface Warfare Center functions to a multi-functional location with the capability to host these functions. Relocation of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona to Naval Air Station Point Mugu collocates it with other Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation activities and with fleet assets at Naval Air Station Point Mugu. This consolidation of space will provide a more efficient organization with greater synergies and increased effectiveness.

Relocation of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation functions to Naval Air Station Point Mugu removes the primary mission from Naval Support Activity Corona and eliminates or moves the entirety of the workforce at Naval Support Activity Corona except for those personnel associated with the base operations support function. As a result, retention of Naval Support Activity Corona is no longer necessary.

Community Concerns

Community advocates focused on three primary issues. First, DoD's proposal would result in a brain drain, with fewer than 20 percent of existing employees likely to move. As evidence, they cited: (a) the large percentage of retirement eligible employees, (b) recent hiring almost exclusively from nearby universities, (c) Ventura County housing costs, twice those near Norco/Corona, and (d) projected three-to-six fold increases in Naval Base Ventura County area property taxes. Second, NSA's mission critical independence would be threatened by status as a tenant or subordinate command. Third, the community believes DoD's proposal will cost significantly more than projected, making an already thin net present value of savings ($360,000 after 20 years and one-time costs of $80.2 million) even less worthwhile. Last, DoD's figures do not include the cost of training about 650 new employees at a cost in excess of $70K per employee.

Commission Findings

The Commission carefully considered all of the concerns voiced by the community, as well as the justification provided by the Secretary of Defense. The Commission's analysis found that from a cost perspective, the proposed move was not advisable because even if the DoD estimates were correct, the $360,000 in anticipated savings over a 20-year period were minuscule in comparison to the plan's likely risks and implementation challenges. Furthermore, the Commission shared community concerns regarding the likelihood that a large percentage of the employees were unlikely to make the proposed move, creating program-related disruptions and increasing cost. Finally, the Commission found substantial issues regarding the feasibility of constructing the needed specialized facilities, including the fact that a major and respected contractor estimate for construction of two key buildings was $40 million more than DoD's military construction projections.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary.

Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, CA

Recommendation # 59 (DoN 9)

One-time Cost:	$14.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($16.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($199.7M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Inland area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, CA, except retain such property and facilities as are necessary to support operations in the Tidal area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord. The Tidal area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord, along with the retained portion of the Inland area, shall be transferred to the Army.

Secretary of Defense Justification

While Department of the Navy weapons stations have no excess capacity for loading and distribution of munitions, there is an excess of munitions storage capacity. Because of the departure of Fleet units from the San Francisco area in the 1990s, Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord's Inland magazine field has been in a reduced operating status since 1999. At that time, the Inland area was retained in an effort to minimize risk should a future need develop to expand

storage capacity. The Explosive Safety Quantity Distance arcs in the Inland area were available to allow safe, temporary holding of railcars with munitions destined for loading by the Army-managed Marine Ocean Terminal Concord (at the Tidal area) during high-tempo operations. After consultation with Combatant Commanders, the Army Material Command and the Army component of the US Transportation Command, the Department of the Navy has concluded this capability is no longer necessary. The Inland area is excess to Department of the Navy/DoD needs and is severable. The closure of the Inland area, therefore, will save money and have no impact on mission capability.

The City of Concord requested closure of both the Inland and Tidal portions of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord. Munitions loading requirements preclude closing the Tidal area, but the Inland area is excess and may be closed. Because Tidal area operations are in support of the Army component of the US Transportation Command, transfer of the property to the Army aligns the property holder with the property user.

Community Concerns

The local community indicated to the Commission that they supported the closure of the Inland Portion of the Naval Weapons Station as the Navy phased out its activities there and strongly supported DoD's recommendation. They noted that the land in question has been unused since 1999, and activity was phased down over the years leading up to the 1999 deactivation. The city has already drawn up redevelopment plans and believes the parcel offers an unparalleled opportunity for smart growth and transit-oriented development in central Contra Costa County that could create up to 13,000 housing units and 9,000 jobs.

Commission Findings

The Commission found the Navy no longer had any use for most of the Inland portion of the base, that the community expressed a desire to have the base realigned and the Inland portion closed, that no jobs would be lost, and that the Tidal portion of the base would be turned over to the Army for its continued use. Therefore, the Commission had no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The Commission noted, however, that the estimated savings appeared to be significantly overstated.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Submarine Base New London, CT

Recommendation # 60 (DoN 10)

One-time Cost:	$5.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($4.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($55.5M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Naval Submarine Base New London, CT. Relocate its assigned submarines, Auxiliary Repair Dock 4 (ARDM-4), and Nuclear Research Submarine 1 (NR-1) along with their dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Submarine Base Kings Bay, GA, and Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Relocate the intermediate submarine repair function to Shore Intermediate Repair Activity Norfolk, at Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA, and Trident Refit Facility Kings Bay, GA. Relocate the Naval Submarine School and Center for Submarine Learning to Submarine Base Kings Bay, GA. Consolidate the Naval Security Group Activity Groton, CT, with Naval Security Group Activity Norfolk, VA, at Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Consolidate Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory Groton, CT, with Naval Medical Research Center at Walter Reed Army Medical Center Forest Glenn Annex, MD. Relocate Naval Undersea Medical Institute Groton, CT, to Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, and Fort Sam Houston, TX. Consolidate Navy Region Northeast, New London, CT, with Navy Region, Mid-Atlantic, Norfolk, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The existing berthing capacity at surface/subsurface installations exceeds the capacity required to support the Force Structure Plan. The closure of Submarine Base New London materially contributes to the maximum reduction of excess capacity while increasing the average military value of the remaining bases in this functional area. Sufficient capacity and fleet dispersal is maintained with the East Coast submarine fleet homeports of Naval Station Norfolk and Submarine Base Kings Bay, without affecting operational capability. The intermediate submarine repair function is relocated to Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk at Norfolk Naval Shipyard, and the Trident Refit Facility Kings Bay, GA, in support of the relocating submarines. Consolidating the Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory with assets at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center Forest Glen Annex will create a DoD Center of Hyperbaric and Undersea Medicine that will increase synergy by consolidating previously separate animal and human research capabilities at a single location. The consolidation of Navy Region, Northeast with Navy Region, Mid-Atlantic is one element of the Department of the Navy efforts to reduce the number of Installation Management Regions from twelve to eight. Consolidation of the Regions rationalizes regional management structure and allows for opportunities to collocate regional entities to align management concepts and efficiencies.

Community Concerns

The New London community argued the closure of the Submarine Base would eliminate a critical US military strategic presence. Advocates repeatedly expressed concerns that the closure would sever longstanding synergies with the Submarine School, Submarine Development Squadron 12, Electric Boat Company (which designs, constructs, and maintains nuclear submarines), Naval Undersea Medical Institute and such nearby facilities at Newport, RI, as the Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Surface Warfare Officers School and the Naval War College, as well as loss of nearby college and university centers of undersea research. They argued DoD's closure recommendation deviated from the 20-year Force Structure Plan because it was premised on fewer attack submarines than their understanding of the requirement, and would restrict the future Navy because of insufficient basing capacity. Further, they asserted DoD undervalued New London's military value by not considering tenant commands such as the Submarine School, piers, Submarine Support Facility, and synergy relationships. Advocates claimed closure costs were greatly underestimated due to environmental considerations, personnel relocation and reconstitution of facilities at Norfolk, VA, and Kings Bay, GA. Similarly, savings were overestimated because of unrealistic personnel savings and construction requirements at Norfolk and Kings Bay to accommodate relocations. Last, the community projected a much greater economic impact on the local and extended area because of jobs associated with not only the base, but also those losses attendant with supporting facilities, including Electric Boat.

The Norfolk, VA, community expressed confidence that they and the Naval Station can support all personnel, submarines and equipment.

The Camden County, GA, community supported the closure recommendation, claiming the Navy can adequately support the current 55 Fast Attack Submarines. They claimed a lower force structure number would simply add to excess capacity. They backed DoD's assessment of relative military value for submarine bases. Kings Bay, a multi-use base, would provide synergy opportunities by collocating Fast Attack Submarines with a Fleet Concentration area that provided operating, training and maintenance interchange with Fleet Ballistic Missile Submarines as well as Fleet Surface and Aviation units. They asserted that DoD calculations adequately considered construction costs, environmental considerations and potential savings. Advocates for Kings Bay indicated that with several thousand acres of unencumbered, developable land, there is ample capacity to accommodate relocated personnel, submarines, support and equipment. The community adamantly claimed there would be more than an adequate amount of high quality housing, educational and quality-of-life facilities to support an increased military population since the military presence would still be less than that supported in Camden County ten years ago.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that excess capacity exists in the surface-subsurface category, that significant savings would accrue, and that a solid business case was made for closure of Submarine Base New London. However, the Commission also found that decoupling and displacing long-standing collocation relationships with undersea centers of excellence, the Submarine School and a nearby submarine construction company could adversely affect operational readiness. In addition, the Commission found the argument of overall economic impact compelling. Further, the Commission's analysis found serious doubts about the threat assessment and resultant Force Structure Plan basis for the number of required Fast Attack

Submarines. These factors combined to present an inherently unknowable and therefore unacceptable security risk to national security if the base were to close.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Naval Submarine Base New London, Connecticut by consolidating Navy Region Northeast, New London, CT, with Navy Region, Mid-Atlantic, Norfolk, VA.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all other recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Officer Training Command, Pensacola, FL

Recommendation # 61 (DoN 12)

One-time Cost:	$34.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.79M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($7.6M)
Payback Period:	6 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL by relocating Officer Training Command Pensacola, FL, to Naval Station Newport, RI, and consolidating with Officer Training Command Newport, RI.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Navy Officer Accession Training is currently conducted at three installations: (1) US Naval Academy Annapolis, MD, hosts Midshipman Training; (2) Naval Station Newport, RI, hosts Naval Academy Preparatory School and Officer Training Command Newport, which includes Officer Indoctrination School and Seaman to Admiral-21 Program courses; and (3) Naval Air Station Pensacola hosts Officer Training Command Pensacola, which includes Navy Officer Candidate School, Limited Duty Officer Course, Chief Warrant Officer Course, and the Direct Commissioning Program. Consolidation of Officer Training Command Pensacola and Officer Training Command Newport will reduce inefficiencies inherent in maintaining two sites for similar training courses through reductions in facilities requirements, personnel requirements (including administrative and instructional staff), and excess capacity. This action also supports the Department of the Navy initiative to create a center for officer training at Naval Station Newport.

Community Concerns

The Pensacola, FL, community argued that thorough analysis of military value and COBRA data, in combination with clarification of inconsistent and often incorrect data provided by the Navy, proved that OTC Pensacola should remain in place. They claimed that OTC Newport, RI, should have been consolidated at Pensacola. The community presented information contending there were no cost savings from moving OTC Pensacola to OTC Newport.

For example, they claim differing responses to environmental data-call questions to the competing installations resulted in significant and inexplicable differences in military value scores. Also, the Navy's use of June Average on Board (AOB) figures to measure surge capacity distorted the comparison since June was the only month when there were more AOB at OTC Newport. In every other month of the year OTC Pensacola had more AOB than OTC Newport by at least 100 and in one case over 300.

Community advocates claimed OTC Pensacola had more than enough capacity, both classroom and otherwise, to accommodate OTC Newport's workload. In addition, the cost savings for moving OTC Newport to OTC Pensacola would be at least $13.5 million over twenty years and most likely much higher than that. Even after factoring in a new $1.14 million

fire and rescue training facility, Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) savings would reduce to 10 years from "never" the period needed to achieve a positive Return on Investment (ROI) for consolidating OTC Newport at OTC Pensacola.

The community believed the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the BRAC Criteria in the areas of capacity analysis, cost of operations, and potential costs and savings as stated above

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The Commission found that while the realignment was not cost effective, it produced an improvement to military value, and therefore it supported the Department of the Navy's initiative to create a center for officer training at Naval Station Newport.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA

Recommendation # 62 (DoN 13)

One-time Cost:	$40.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($33.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($446.0M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA. Relocate its aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA; Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX; and Robins Air Force Base, Robins, GA. Relocate Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem, Forest Park, GA. Relocate depot maintenance Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication and Manufacturing, and Support Equipment in support of F/A-18, C-9 and C-12 aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX. Relocate intermediate maintenance in support of E-2C aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA. Consolidate the Naval Air Reserve Atlanta with Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Atlanta located at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Marietta, GA. Retain the Windy Hill Annex.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation reduces excess capacity while maintaining reserve forces in regions with favorable demographics. The aviation assets will be located closer to their theater of operations and/or will result in increased maintenance efficiencies and operational synergies. Relocating Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem creates synergies with joint intelligence assets while maintaining the demographic base offered by the Atlanta area for this function. The Fleet Readiness Center portion of this recommendation realigns and merges depot and intermediate maintenance activities. It supports both DoD and Navy transformation goals by reducing the number of maintenance levels and streamlining the way maintenance is accomplished with associated significant cost reductions.

Community Concerns

The community expressed concern that relocating Navy/Marine Corps Reserve squadrons to areas where the presence of qualified and trained personnel resources are uncertain would significantly degrade the military readiness of the combat ready and tested Atlanta area Reserve forces. These forces are presently engaged in the Global War on Terror and actively monitoring and deterring drug trafficking along the southern US coast. They further argued that DoD's stated savings would not be realized by closing NAS Atlanta, because the remaining infrastructure of hangars, ramps, and administration and support buildings would be absorbed by Dobbins Air Reserve Base, and other Department of Defense and governmental agencies.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. However, the original cost savings were overstated because of incorrect data submitted by Naval Air Station Atlanta. Consequently, the cost data was revised by the Department of Defense and recertified.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA

Recommendation # 63 (DoN 14)

One-time Cost:	$23.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.6M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$1.4M
Payback Period:	18 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the naval installation at Athens, GA. Relocate the Navy Supply Corps School and the Center for Service Support to Naval Station Newport, RI. Disestablish the Supply Corps Museum.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation closes a single-function installation and relocates its activities to a multi-functional installation with higher military value. Naval Station Newport has a significantly higher military value than Navy Supply Corps School and the capacity to support the Navy Supply Corps School training mission with existing infrastructure, making relocation of Navy Supply Corps School to Naval Station Newport desirable and cost efficient. Relocation of this function supports the Department of the Navy initiative to create a center for officer training at Naval Station Newport.

The Center for Service Support, which establishes curricula for other service support training, is relocated to Naval Station Newport with the Navy Supply Corps School to capitalize on existing resource and personnel efficiencies.

Relocation of the Navy Supply Corps School and Center for Service Support to Naval Station Newport removes the primary mission from the naval installation at Athens and removes or relocates the entirety of the Navy workforce at the naval installation at Athens, except for those personnel associated with base support functions. As a result, retention of the naval installation at Athens is no longer required.

Community Concerns

The Athens, GA, community argued the base is efficiently run and school officials are dual-hatted as base officials. They contended there is little or no synergy between the school and other prospective tenants at Newport, and the school was particularly vulnerable to the BRAC process because it was assigned a low military value due to its mis-designation as a single-mission base. In sum, the Athens community believes the DoD proposal provides very little if any enhancement of military value, and with less than five percent course overlap between Officer Candidate School students and Navy Supply Corps School students, there are no synergies or efficiencies to be gained. Last, they believed the real adjusted payback will be in more than 100 years, with little or no savings for the first 20 years. Most of the savings are attributable to the questionable practice of counting savings from eliminated military billets without cutting end strength.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. After carefully considering the community concerns and DoD's justifications, the Commission found that while the realignment was not

particularly cost effective, it enhanced military value by contributing to a center for officer training at Naval Station Newport, and the BRAC statute required the Commission to prioritize military value over cost and other non-military considerations.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA

Recommendation # 64 (DoN 15)

One-time Cost:	$46.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($35.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($387.7M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA. Relocate the Navy Reserve Personnel Command and the Enlisted Placement and Management Center to Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN, and consolidate with the Navy Personnel Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN. Relocate the Naval Reserve Recruiting Command to Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN, and consolidate with the Navy Recruiting Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN. Relocate the Navy Reserve Command to Naval Support Activity Norfolk, VA, except for the installation management function, which consolidates with Navy Region Southwest, Naval Station San Diego, CA, Navy Region Northwest, Submarine Base Bangor, WA, and Navy Region Midwest, Naval Station Great Lakes, IL. Relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA, and consolidate with Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command, which is relocating from Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, MO. Relocate Naval Air Systems Command Support Equipment Facility New Orleans, LA, Navy Recruiting District New Orleans, LA, and the Navy Reserve Center New Orleans, LA, to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA. Relocate 8th Marine Corps District to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX. Consolidate Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA, installation management function with Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The collocation of the Navy Reserve Personnel Command, the Enlisted Placement Management Center, and Naval Reserve Recruiting Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington creates a Navy Human Resources Center of Excellence, improves personnel life-cycle management, and furthers active and reserve component total force integration and effectiveness. This recommendation consolidates Reserve personnel and recruiting headquarters with like active component functions in a single location and eliminates stand-alone headquarters. In addition, activities of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Manpower Analysis Center and Navy Personnel Research and Development Center are currently located at Naval Support Activity Mid-South.

The relocation of the Navy Reserve Command comprised of Navy Reserve Forces Command, Navy Reserve Forces, and Naval Reserve Air Forces, to Naval Support Activity Norfolk, VA, will enhance internal active and reserve component interoperability. By locating the reserve headquarters elements on the same base with Fleet Forces Command, its active component headquarters, this recommendation will significantly increase interaction between the two components, produce a reduction in force size by eliminating duplicative staff, and allow for further decrease in staffing size for common support functions. The consolidation of the Navy Reserve Command installation management functions with other Navy Regional organizations is part of the Department of the Navy efforts to streamline regional management structure and to institute consistent business practices.

The relocation of Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans maintains a central location for management of widely-dispersed Marine Corps Reserve elements and allows consolidation of Marine Reserve management functions.

Marine Corps Reserve Support Command is currently the only geographically separated element of the Marine Forces Reserve. Consolidation with its Headquarters will significantly increase interaction and operational efficiency as well as eliminate duplicative staff. Location of this consolidated headquarters at a joint reserve base will enhance joint service interoperability concepts.

Relocation of 8th Marine Corps District to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth moves this management organization within their geographic area of responsibility. It also places them at a major transportation node with reduced average distance to managed recruiting stations.

Relocating these functions removes the primary missions from Naval Support Activity New Orleans, and eliminates or moves the entirety of the workforce except for those personnel associated with the base operations support function and a number of smaller tenant activities.

As a result, retention of Naval Support Activity New Orleans is no longer required. Accordingly, this recommendation closes the installation and eliminates or relocates the remaining base operations support personnel and tenant activities. Base operations support organizations and tenant activity services currently shared between Naval Support Activity New Orleans and Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans consolidate at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans to support the remaining area population.

Community Concerns

The community argued that Naval Support Activity (NSA) New Orleans ranked 41st out of 334 bases in DoD's ranking of military installations providing headquarters and administrative support functions, It ranked higher than the two bases slated to receive the bulk of the units leaving New Orleans—NSA Mid-South and NSA Norfolk—by 27 and 36 slots, respectively. Beyond this apparent deviation from the selection criteria, the community also claimed there were no compelling justifications in the DoD BRAC recommendation for moving major tenants from NSA New Orleans. Second, advocates stated that cost savings attributed to the closing of NSA New Orleans were overstated by $256 million. The community asserted their Federal City counter-proposal option offered $230M more in savings than the adjusted costs of DoD's recommendation. Third, they claimed that DoD's finding of no significant impact on the New Orleans economy from the closure of NSA was false. The community argued DoD failed to account for approximately 863 full-time contractors and 940 drilling reservists who would leave the area or lose their jobs and salaries. Also, the community felt DoD failed to take into account: (a) New Orleans' difficulty in attracting new businesses, (b) its flat job growth over the last five years, and (c) declines in NASA and shipbuilding employment. Finally, if the base closes, the Department of the Navy will have a multi-million dollar liability because of Public Private Venture (PPV) Housing.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of the Navy is negotiating a "Federal City Project" with Louisiana state and local officials. This project calls for a "state-of-the-art and move-in-ready" complex to be constructed on Naval Support Activity (NSA) New Orleans West Bank property, at no cost to the government. In addition, the project would allow other federal tenants to participate and share operating costs. To ensure Federal City's success, the state guaranteed funding and invested one million dollars in the project. The Commission found two viable tenants for the Federal City Project—Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve New Orleans, LA and the Marine Corps Mobility Command, Kansas City, MO. Because their functions are financial and administrative, realigning Marine Corps operations to the West Bank would not affect their mission or operational readiness. The Commission further found that after closing NSA East Bank Property, the Federal City Plan offers greater savings than DoD's projections, has an immediate payback, and avoids $106 million in military construction.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 2, 3, 4 and 5 as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA. Relocate the Navy Reserve Personnel Command and the Enlisted Placement and Management Center to Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN and consolidate with the Navy Personnel Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN. Relocate the Naval Reserve Recruiting Command to Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN and consolidate with the Navy Recruiting Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN. Relocate the Navy Reserve Command to Naval Support Activity

Norfolk, VA, except for the installation management function, which consolidates with Navy Region Southwest, Naval Station San Diego, CA, Navy Region Northwest, Submarine Base Bangor, WA, and Navy Region Midwest, Naval Station Great Lakes, IL. The remaining tenants will be relocated as stated in the DoD recommendation. If the State of Louisiana obtains funding and commences construction of the Federal City project proposed for the Naval Support Activity West Bank property on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to the Naval Support Activity West Bank property, New Orleans, LA. If the State of Louisiana fails to do so on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA, and consolidate with Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command, which is relocating from Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, MO. Relocate Naval Air Systems Command Support Equipment Facility New Orleans, LA, Navy Recruiting District New Orleans, LA, and the Navy Reserve Center New Orleans, LA, to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA. Relocate 8th Marine Corps District to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX. Consolidate Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA installation management function with Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME

Recommendation # 65/191 (DoN 18)

One-time Cost:	$193.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($88.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($797.9M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME, to a Naval Air Facility and relocate its aircraft along with dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL. Consolidate Aviation Intermediate Maintenance with Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Jacksonville, FL. This recommendation was modified to Close Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME as an addition the Secretary's recommendation list.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The realignment of Naval Air Station Brunswick will reduce operating costs while single-siting the East Coast Maritime Patrol community at Naval Air Station Jacksonville. This recommendation retains an operational airfield in the northeast that can be used to support the homeland defense mission, as needed, and maintains strategic flexibility. The Fleet Readiness Center portion of this recommendation realigns and merges depot and intermediate maintenance activities. It supports both DoD and Naval transformation goals by reducing the number of maintenance levels and streamlining the way maintenance is accomplished with associated significant cost reductions.

Community Concerns

The Brunswick community argued that the facility is the last active duty DoD airfield in New England and, other than McGuire Air Force Base, NJ, in the Northeast. DoD's realignment recommendation would harm US homeland defense, and forgo a militarily strategic location near North Atlantic sea lanes and the closest point to Europe and the Middle East. NAS Brunswick, with over $130 million of recapitalization since 2001, had modern facilities that could support the entire military aircraft inventory and Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) with parallel runways, unimpeded access to the ocean with over 60,000 square miles of unencumbered training airspace, and the only hangar in the Navy that will accommodate the Multimission Aircraft (MMA), which is the follow-on to the P-3. They further argued that realignment would result in redeployment of P-3 forces back to the same base for little if any savings while adding additional aviation excess capacity due to required construction at the receiving site to accommodate relocated aircraft. DoD's savings were overestimated because of unrealistic personnel eliminations associated with aircraft maintenance support that are not required with MMA. The community maintained that economic impacts on the local community were grossly understated in DoD calculations, as were costs associated with aircraft relocation.

With respect to the Commission's vote to formally consider closure of Brunswick, the community argued that closure of the Naval Air Station raised all the issues attendant with DoD's realignment recommendation, plus the loss of the only cold weather survival school as well as Reserve facilities supporting the entire New England area and crews of Naval ships at nearby Bath Shipyard. They further argued closure would violate Criteria 2 (homeland defense). Also noted were the arguments made by Northern Command and Fleet Forces Command, which opposed closure by emphasizing Brunswick's strategic location and future capability (Criteria 2 and 3). DoD's senior deliberative body, the IEC, concurred in the assessment that Brunswick's strategic location was essential. Brunswick supports one of the last reserve force populations in the Northeast, and could support Coast Guard and UAV air assets as future missions. The community has worked hard to prevent any encroachment issues at the base and staunchly support the air station and its personnel.

Commission Findings

Closure of Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME was initially added by the Commission for consideration so that it could fairly and properly evaluate all possible options for this facility: full closure, realignment, or remaining open. The Commission's review and analysis of the certified data found that closure would reduce excess capacity and result in significant savings while realignment would accomplish neither. The Commission found DoD's realignment proposal would remove military value from the installation, while still incurring many ongoing base operation support (BOS) costs. Moreover, realignment would eliminate the vast majority of the jobs, while making it virtually impossible for the community to successfully redevelop the site.

The Commission found there were suitable detachment operating sites for Maritime Patrol and Reconnaissance Squadrons to support homeland defense and other Department of Defense mission support responsibilities in New England. The Multimission Aircraft (MMA), when developed, procured, and deployed, will not replace P-3s on a one-for-one basis, and therefore there will continue to be excess installations, making a backfill at NAS Brunswick unlikely. Furthermore, the MMA could be deployed from other civilian or Air National Guard airfields in the event of future mission requirements in the New England region. The Commission found that other realignments under this bill addressed the homeland defense needs of New England. The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially by not recommending closure of Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary deviated from selection criteria 2 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore the Commission recommends the following:

Close Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME. Relocate its aircraft along with dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL. Consolidate Aviation Intermediate Maintenance with Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Jacksonville, FL.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO

Recommendation # 66 (DoN 19)

One-time Cost:	$8.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($6.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($67.0M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, MO. Relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA, and consolidate with Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve. Retain an enclave for the 9th Marine Corps District and the 24th Marine Regiment.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The relocation of Marine Corps Reserve Support Command and its parent command, Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve, to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans maintains a central location for management of widely dispersed Marine Corps Reserve elements and allows consolidation of Marine Reserve management functions. Marine Reserve Support Command is currently the only geographically separated element of the Marine Forces Reserve. Consolidation with its headquarters will significantly increase interaction and operational efficiency as well as eliminate duplicative staff. Location of this consolidated headquarters at a joint reserve base will enhance joint service interoperability concepts.

Relocating these functions removes the primary missions from Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City and eliminates or moves the entirety of the workforce except for those personnel associated with the 9th Marine Corps District and the 24th Marine Regiment. This recommendation closes the Marine Corps Support Activity but retains an enclave for these organizations.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of the Navy did not analyze the Naval Support Activity (NSA) New Orleans, LA capabilities nor the operational and economical advantages of the Federal City Project. This project, as discussed previously in Commission Recommendation #64 (Naval Support Activity New Orleans), is a "state-of-the-art and move-in-ready" complex on NSA's West Bank offering operational efficiencies and significant savings. The Commission found the Marine Corps Mobilization Command Kansas City, MO was one of two tenants well-suited for Federal City. The Mobilization Command functions are financial and administrative and realigning the Marine Corps operations to the NSA West Bank New Orleans does not affect its mission or operational readiness. The Commission further found that after closing NSA East Bank Property and realigning to the NSA West Bank Property, the Federal City Plan will offer greater savings for the Kansas City Marine Corps realignment. These savings would generate an immediate payback and avoid millions in military construction costs. The Commission found that DoD's failure to consider this viable alternative constituted a substantial deviation, and it therefore amended the recommendation to allow DoD to take advantage of the more suitable facilities at Federal City.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 2, 4 and 5, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, MO. If the State of Louisiana obtains funding and commences construction of the Federal City project proposed for the Naval Support Activity West Bank property on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to that facility on the Naval Support Activity West Bank property, New Orleans, LA, and consolidate with Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve. The remaining tenants will be retained as stated in the DoD recommendation. If the State of Louisiana fails to do so on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA, and consolidate with Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve. Retain an enclave for the 9th Marine Corps District and the 24th Marine Regiment.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Naval Station Pascagoula, MS

Recommendation # 67 (DoN 20)

One-time Cost:	$17.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($47.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($665.7M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Naval Station Pascagoula, MS. Relocate its ships along with dedicated personnel, equipment, and support to Naval Station Mayport, FL. Relocate the ship intermediate repair function to Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity Mayport, FL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation will reduce excess berthing capacity while allowing for consolidation of surface ships in a fleet concentration area. Sufficient capacity and fleet dispersal is maintained with East Coast surface fleet homeports of Naval Station Norfolk and Naval Station Mayport, FL. Gulf Coast presence can be achieved as needed with available Navy ports at Naval Air Station Key West, FL, and Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL. The Guided Missile Cruisers (CG-47 Class) at Naval Station Pascagoula are scheduled for decommissioning prior to FY 2006 and will not relocate. This recommendation also supports mission elimination at Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity Pascagoula and reduces excess repair capacity. The Defense Common Ground Station-Navy 2 facility can be relocated to another Naval activity or remain in its present location as a tenant of the US Coast Guard, if the Coast Guard elects to assume property ownership of some or all of the Pascagoula facility.

Community Concerns

Community advocates, criticized what they regard as DoD's built-in bias in favor of mega-bases (fleet concentrations) during calculations of excess capacity and overall military value; DoD failed to fully consider the importance of the base's secure and cost-effective design in supporting DoD's emerging role in Homeland defense and security; strategic cost of losing a permanent Navy homeport on the Gulf of Mexico; and degradation of DoD's ability to defend against threats to maritime approaches and regional infrastructure. They noted that while some bases seem to have been recommended for closure because they are old or too costly to maintain and recapitalize, Naval Station Pascagoula appears to have been penalized for being one of the Navy's newest, best designed installations. They claimed DoD's proposal would unfairly burden the local hotel market and will not result in actual budget savings because most of the annual savings would result from eliminating military personnel without reducing end strength.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, as reuniting these isolated ships with the rest of the fleet will enhance military value and achieve cost savings by eliminating excess capacity. None of the issues raised by the community rose to the level of a substantial deviation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA

Recommendation # 68 (DoN 21)

One-time Cost:	$239.5 M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($73.9 M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($757.8 M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA. Relocate all Navy and Marine Corps squadrons, their aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to McGuire Air Force Base, Cookstown, NJ. Relocate the minimum amount of manpower and equipment to support intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Tire and Wheel, non-destruction inspections, and Aviation Life Support System equipment to McGuire Air Force Base. Relocate intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication & Manufacturing, and Support Equipment to Fleet Readiness Center East, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC. Deactivate the 111th Fighter Wing (Air National Guard) and relocate assigned A-10 aircraft to the 124th Wing (Air National Guard), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, ID (three primary aircraft authorized); 175th Wing (Air National Guard), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, MD, (three primary aircraft authorized); 127th Wing (Air National Guard), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, MI (three primary aircraft authorized) and retired (six primary aircraft authorized). Relocate Armed Forces Reserve Center Expeditionary Combat Support manpower to Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Relocate Co A/228th Aviation to Fort Dix, Trenton, NJ. Relocate Reserve Intelligence Area 16 to Fort Dix. Establish an enclave for the Army Reserve units remaining on or relocating to Willow Grove and the Air National Guard 270th Engineering Installation Squadron. Realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA, by relocating Marine Light Attack Helicopter Squadron 775 Detachment A, to include all required personnel, equipment, and support, to McGuire Air Force Base.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation will reduce excess capacity while creating new joint opportunities in the McGuire Air Force Base/Fort Dix/Naval Aviation Engineering Station Lakehurst military concentration area. This recommendation leverages maintenance and operational efficiencies within Marine Corps Reserve Aviation and maintains reserve forces in areas with favorable demographics. Inclusion of the realignment of Cambria Regional Airport in this recommendation allows the assets currently housed there to be collocated with their headquarters at McGuire Air Force Base. The major intermediate maintenance functions are consolidated into a Fleet Readiness Center, which reduces the number of maintenance levels and streamlines the way maintenance is accomplished with associated significant cost reductions.

This recommendation enables Air Force Future Total Force transformation by consolidating the A-10 fleet at installations of higher military value, and contributes to Army's establishment of the Northeast Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

The USAF KC-135E model aircraft (16 primary aircraft authorized) at McGuire Air Force Base, NJ, retire. The capacity created by the Air Force force structure retirement of KC-135Es (16 primary aircraft authorized) from McGuire Air Force Base enables the execution of this recommendation.

Community Concerns

The Willow Grove community argued the recommendation to close Willow Grove Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base (NAS JRB), the associated deactivation of the 111th Fighter Wing (Pennsylvania Air National Guard), and the removal of the 913th Airlift Wing (AFRES) substantially deviated from the established final selection criteria and was based on flawed analyses. The substantial deviations cited by the community include: erroneous assumptions and lack of analysis in assessing jointness, substantial miscalculations in the assessment of the availability of land, facilities, and associated airspaces, lack of consideration of the base's strategic location with respect to homeland defense and homeland security, substantial deviations and inconsistencies in the evaluation process; improper deactivation of an Air National Guard Wing; inadequate consideration of demographics, manpower, and skill-set losses; and inadequate consideration of future mission capabilities.

Numerous formatted letters and petitions have been received citing the installation as a model of joint use base facilities whose strengths include: working joint operations, including all services except the Coast Guard, critical strategic location near Northeast Corridor major metropolitan and port areas, vital part of homeland defense and security for the East Coast, huge economic impact to their local region, an 8,000 foot runway, modern Digital Radar Air Control System—one of only four in the US—available for emergency preparedness and operations, and strong community support. Advocates repeatedly raised the question: "Why close a joint base in light of the stated DoD objective of moving to jointness?"

The announced loss of jobs will have a negative economic impact on the area.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the majority of community concerns as they pertained to the 111th Fighter Wing (Air National Guard) had merit. Moreover, the Commission notes that the 913th Airlift Wing (AFRES) was not included in the recommendation by the Department. As best could be determined, the Navy had forwarded their proposal to Air Force for their review, and the Air Force recommended action addressed only the Air National Guard unit.

The Commission also found, however, that the Navy recommendation to close NAS/JRB Willow Grove was analytically sound for the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve assets assigned there and at Cambria. The movement and consolidation at the new Joint Base located at McGuire/Fort Dix/Lakehurst makes efficient use of a larger joint military establishment while ameliorating many of the demographic effects of moving reserve units. The Commission therefore determined that the majority of NAS/JRB Willow Grove could be closed, while also retaining an enclave for the 111th Fighter Wing and the 913th Airlift Wing. The Commission encourages the Department of Defense to not retire service-capable A-10 aircraft. The Commission notes the quality and contributions of the 111th Fighter Wing and encourages the Department of Defense to consider identifying A-10 aircraft to form an A-10 wing or detachment using the 111th Fighter Wing of the Air National Guard located at Willow Grove, PA.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA. Relocate all Navy and Marine Corps squadrons, their aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to McGuire Air Force Base, Cookstown, NJ. Relocate the minimum amount of manpower and equipment to support intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Tire and Wheel, non-destruction inspections, and Aviation Life Support System equipment to McGuire Air Force Base. Relocate intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication & Manufacturing, and Support Equipment to Fleet Readiness Center East, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC. Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG), the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 124th Wing (ANG), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, Idaho, the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 175th Wing (ANG), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, Maryland, and the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 124th Wing (ANG), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, Idaho.

Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 175th Wing (ANG), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, Maryland.

Establish 24 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan.

If the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Pennsylvania Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements

in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth. Relocate Co A/228th Aviation to Fort Dix, Trenton, NJ. Relocate Reserve Intelligence Area 16 to Fort Dix.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) and the 270th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG) sufficient to support operations of those units, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the former Naval Air Station as a civilian airport. The Army Reserve units not relocated from Willow Grove by this recommendation, as amended, and those relocated to Willow Grove by other recommendations, as amended, will be incorporated into the Armed Forces Reserve Center established by Army Recommendation 82. The property retained under Federal title to construct the AFRC shall be limited to the absolute minimum essential to construct that facility, shall be encompassed within the enclave established by the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) and the 270th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), and shall be sited to minimize interference with the Air Guard enclave and joint civilian use of the former Naval Air Station as a civilian airport. The Commission defines the authority granted to the Army by the words "retain essential facilities to support activities of the Reserve Components" where they appear in Army Recommendation 82, to be limited to the property necessary to construct AFRC itself. Should the Secretary of the Army determine that access to more property would be beneficial, a joint use agreement should be executed to obtain a tenancy from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA, by relocating Marine Light Attack Helicopter Squadron 775 Detachment A, to include all required personnel, equipment, and support, to McGuire Air Force Base.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME

Recommendation # 69 (DoN 23)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME. Relocate the ship depot repair function to Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA, Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility Pearl Harbor, HI, and Naval Shipyard Puget Sound, WA. Relocate the Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning and Procurement Command to Naval Shipyard Norfolk.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation retains one nuclear-capable shipyard on each coast, plus sufficient shipyard capacity to support forward deployed assets. There are four Naval Shipyards performing depot-level ship refueling, modernization, overhaul and repair work. There is sufficient excess capacity in the aggregate across the four shipyards to close either Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor or Naval Shipyard Portsmouth. There is insufficient excess capacity to close any other shipyard or combination of shipyards. Naval Shipyard Portsmouth was selected for closure, rather than Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor, because it is the only closure which could both eliminate excess capacity and satisfy retention of strategically-placed shipyard capability. Planned force structure and force positioning adjustments reflected in the 20-year Force Structure Plan led to the selection of Naval Shipyard Portsmouth as the preferred closure candidate between the two sites. Additional savings, not included in the payback analysis, are anticipated from reduced unit costs at the receiving shipyards because of the higher volume of work.

Relocating the ship depot repair function and Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning and Procurement Command removes the primary missions from Naval Shipyard Portsmouth and eliminates or moves the entirety of the workforce at Naval Shipyard Portsmouth except for those personnel associated with the base operations support function. Naval Shipyard Portsmouth had a low military value compared to operational homeports, and, its berthing capacity is not required to support the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, closure of Naval Shipyard Portsmouth is justified.

Community Concerns

Community, Congressional and labor union officials disputed DoD's measurement of shipyard capacity, and asserted DoD seriously underestimated the true military value of Portsmouth Naval Shipyard (PNSY). They believe DoD overestimated capacity to perform work without PNSY and underestimated the Navy's future maintenance workload. Advocates claimed the costs associated with moving the shipyard's workload are inaccurate; therefore, the cost of closure is inaccurately calculated. In addition, they contended important skills and knowledge would be lost because the highly skilled workforce will probably not relocate. This workforce makes PNSY one of the Navy's most productive shipyards. Last, they noted the facility's non-DoD reuse potential is constrained by a non-nuclear toxic waste site within the fenceline, exacerbating the dramatic adverse economic effect of the DoD proposal.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that reducing excess capacity was a primary consideration in formulating the Secretary's recommendation. The Commission examined a number of past shipyard capacity studies and determined that the capacity study submitted by the Navy in support of its base closure recommendation was a reasonable measure of shipyard capacity. The Commission also found that while excess capacity exists in the shipyard depot maintenance category, that level of excess capacity did not justify closing one of four public yards. The Commission also found that the closure of the Portsmouth shipyard would increase the risk of not maintaining acceptable surge capability across the public shipyards. Given the uncertainties of future threats, the Commission found that these concerns rose to the level of a substantial deviation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 3, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary. The Commission found that this recommendation is consistent with the final selection criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Naval Station Newport, RI

Recommendation # 70 (DoN 25)

One-time Cost:	$11.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.02M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($2.1M)
Payback Period:	13 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Naval Station Newport, RI, by relocating the Navy Warfare Development Command to Naval Station Norfolk, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Navy Warfare Development Command performs the functions of warfare innovation, concept development, fleet and joint experimentation, and the synchronization and dissemination of doctrine. Relocating the Navy Warfare Development Command to Norfolk better aligns the Navy's warfare development organization with those of the other joint force components and Joint Forces Command, as well as places Navy Warfare Development Command in better proximity to Fleet Forces Command and the Second Fleet Battle Lab it supports, resulting in substantial travel cost savings to conduct experimentation events. Location of Navy Warfare Development Command in Hampton Roads area places it in proximity to Army Training and Doctrine Command, Fort Monroe, VA, and Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, VA, as well as in closer proximity to the Air Force Doctrine Center at Maxwell Air Force Base, AL, which furthers joint interoperability concepts.

Community Concerns

Community representatives and employees of the Navy Warfare Development Command noted that workers would be highly unlikely to move to the Tidewater area, resulting in a loss of experience, and that it would take several years to train a new staff. They also noted DoD's proposal would adversely affect the close synergy with the Naval War College, a relationship which was instrumental in the decision to locate the NWDC at Newport in the first place.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The Commission's review and analysis concluded that while the realignment was not particularly cost effective, it met the Department of the Navy's goals to improve military value by relocating the Navy Warfare Development Command to Norfolk so it would be in close proximity to Fleet units. The community's arguments about potential losses of human capital were found to be insufficiently supported and did not rise to the level of a substantial deviation because the labor force in and around Norfolk is more than adequate to implement the recommendation during the BRAC six year implementation period.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Naval Station Ingleside, TX, and Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX

Recommendation # 71 (DoN 26)

One-time Cost:	$177.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($59.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($614.2M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Naval Station Ingleside, TX. Relocate its ships along with dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Station San Diego, CA. Relocate the ship intermediate repair function to Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity San Diego, CA. Consolidate Mine Warfare Training Center with Fleet Anti-submarine Warfare Training Center San Diego, CA. Realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX. Relocate Commander Mine Warfare Command and Commander Mobile Mine Assembly Group to Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Center, Point Loma, CA. Relocate Helicopter Mine Countermeasures Squadron 15 (HM-15) and dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Disestablish Commander Helicopter Tactical Wing US Atlantic Fleet Aviation Intermediate Maintenance Detachment Truax Field at Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX, and relocate its intermediate maintenance function for Aircraft Components, Fabrication & Manufacturing, and Support Equipment to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Norfolk, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation moves mine warfare surface and aviation assets to major fleet concentration areas and reduces excess capacity. Gulf Coast presence can be achieved as needed with available Navy ports at Naval Air Station Key West, FL, and Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL. The Minehunter Coastal ships at Naval Station Ingleside are scheduled for decommissioning between FY 2006 and FY 2008 and will not relocate. Additionally, US Coast Guard presence is expected to remain in the Gulf Coast region. Relocation of Commander Mine Warfare Command and the Mine Warfare Training Center to San Diego, CA, creates a center of excellence for Undersea Warfare, combining both mine warfare and anti-submarine warfare disciplines. This reorganization removes the Mine Warfare community from a location remote from the fleet, thereby better supporting the shift to organic mine warfare. This recommendation also supports mission elimination at Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity Naval Reserve Maintenance Facility Ingleside, TX, and Aviation Intermediate Maintenance Detachment Truax Field at Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, and reduces excess repair capacity. The

relocation of Helicopter Mine Countermeasures Squadron 15 (HM-15) to Naval Station Norfolk single sites all Mine Warfare Aircraft in a fleet concentration area. This location better supports the HM-15 mission by locating them closer to the C-5 transport Air Port of Embarkation for overseas employment and mine countermeasures ship and helicopter coordinated exercises.

Community Concerns

The community expressed concerns that the loss of civilian jobs and high quality military personnel would have a negative economic impact. The Navy would lose synergies from collocating air and surface mine warfare communities. They believe Ingleside's military value score did not give appropriate credit for the facilities' unique mine warfare mission and training ranges or modern base facilities (including double decker piers and a one of a kind Electro-Magnetic Roll facility). The recommendation would weaken military presence in an area vulnerable to terrorist threats.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that naval assets in the Gulf of Mexico are important to homeland defense because over 50 percent of imported oil and gas comes into the United States through the Gulf of Mexico ports. Additionally, 50 percent of the US refining capability is located in the Gulf of Mexico.

The Commission also found that DoD has other air and ground assets in the region that can be tasked as needed and that naval assets can also be tasked as required if the seaborne threat conditions escalate. The Commission found that the staff of the Mine Warfare Command, considered the essence of the Mine Warfare Center of Excellence that will relocate to San Diego, will have better access to the various Strike Group Commanders and that the surface minesweepers can integrate more readily with the fleet and participate in exercises to improve the operational effectiveness of the Mine Warfare Force. This is a prelude to the next generation of air and surface Mine Warfare assets that will be organic units assigned to Strike and Expeditionary forces for operations and training.

The Commission found that the original cost savings were overstated by 33.8 percent because of incorrect data submitted by Naval Station Ingleside. Consequently, the cost data was revised by the Department of Defense and recertified with a resulting savings projected in 2025 to be $614.2 million dollars.

In view of the Commission's finding that Department of Defense recommendations to close Naval Station Ingleside and Naval Station Pascagoula are consistent with BRAC selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan, the Secretary of Defense is encouraged, in conjunction with the Department of homeland security, to ensure that there is an adequate response plan in place for Naval forces to respond to threats in the Gulf of Mexico, and that response plan be shared as appropriate with Governors responsible for the protection of their citizens.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Engineering Field Division/Activity

Recommendation # 72 (DoN 28)

One-time Cost:	$37.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($9.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($81.8M)
Payback Period:	4 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South leased space in Charleston, SC. Consolidate Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South, Charleston, SC, with Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Southeast, Jacksonville, FL, at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL; Naval Facilities Midwest, Great Lakes, IL, at Naval Station Great Lakes, IL; and

Naval Facilities Atlantic, Norfolk, VA, at Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast leased space in Lester, PA. Consolidate Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast, Philadelphia, PA, with Naval Facilities Atlantic, Norfolk, VA at Naval Station Norfolk, VA and relocate Navy Crane Center Lester, PA, to Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation enhances the Navy's long-standing initiative to accomplish common management and support on a regionalized basis by consolidating and collocating Naval Facilities commands with the installation management Regions in Jacksonville, FL, Great Lakes, IL and Norfolk, VA. This collocation aligns management concepts and efficiencies and may allow for further consolidation in the future.

Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South, Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast and Navy Crane Center are located in leased space, and this recommendation will achieve savings by moving from leased space to government-owned space. Naval Facilities Engineering Command is undergoing organizational transformation, and this recommendation facilitates the evolution of organizational alignment. This recommendation will result in an increase in the average military value for the remaining Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division/Engineering Field Activity activities, and it relocates the Navy Crane Center to a site with functional synergy.

Community Concerns

Community representatives from South Carolina claimed the recommendation overstates the number of facility personnel and would break apart the "most efficient engineering engine in NAVFAC." The community proposed either relocating EFD South personnel to a Charleston facility that may become available through an unassociated BRAC recommendation or to a facility yet to be built within the Charleston area.

The Pennsylvania community, including union representatives, disputed DoD's plan to move to Norfolk instead of to the Philadelphia Business Center and stated a move to Philadelphia has a lower cost and quicker return than Norfolk. They also noted the number of personnel likely to relocate was overstated, and moving NCC to Norfolk would create a conflict of interest, causing one shipyard to have undue influence over NCC's decisions.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. Community issues were carefully assessed and examined, but they either did not rise to the level of a substantial deviation, or were more properly categorized as manageable implementation issues that can be successfully resolved during the six-year implementation period.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers

Recommendation # 73 (DoN 29)

One-time Cost:	$62.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($9.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($76.8M)
Payback Period:	6 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Encino, CA, and relocate the Marine Corps units to Marine Corps Reserve Center Pasadena, CA.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Moundsville, WV, and relocate the Marine Corps units to Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Pittsburgh, PA.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Reading, PA, and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers Lehigh Valley, PA.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Los Angeles, CA, and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Bell, CA.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Akron, OH, and Navy Reserve Center Cleveland, OH, and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Akron, OH.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Madison, WI, Navy Reserve Center Lacrosse, WI, and Navy Reserve Center Dubuque, IA, and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Madison, WI.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA, and relocate the Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Tulsa, OK, and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Broken Arrow, OK.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Mobile, AL, and relocate the Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Mobile, AL.

Close Inspector-Instructor West Trenton, NJ, and relocate Marine Corps reserve units and support staff to Navy Reserve Center Ft. Dix, NJ.

Close Inspector-Instructor Rome, GA, and relocate Marine Corps reserve units and support staff to Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Atlanta, GA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation will reduce excess capacity through the consolidation of 12 Navy Reserve Centers and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers with other reserve centers in the affected areas or into Armed Forces Reserve Centers. Nine of 12 of the reserve center closures are joint actions with the Department of the Army that support relocation into Armed Forces Reserve Centers. This recommendation will also relocate two Inspector-Instructor activities to existing reserve facilities aboard active duty bases. Sufficient capacity for drilling reserves is maintained throughout the United States, and all states will continue to have at least one Navy/Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center. This recommendation reduces excess capacity in the Department of the Navy reserve center functional area, but existing capacity in support of the Department of the Navy Reserve component continues to be in excess of force structure requirements. This recommendation is part of the closure of 37 Department of the Navy reserve centers, which includes 35 Navy centers (Navy Reserve Centers, Navy Reserve Facilities and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers) and two Marine Corps centers (Inspector-Instructor activities). The closure of 35 Navy centers will result in a capacity reduction of 12.7 percent of total current square footage. The closure of two Marine Corps centers will result in a capacity reduction of 5.5 percent of total current square footage.

Community Concerns

The Naval Air Station, Atlanta community noted that the local reservists at NAS Atlanta will face a hardship in fulfilling their duty requirements if the station were moved to Florida, Louisiana, or Virginia. The proposed move would create drastic employment difficulties for 160 full-time military civilians. Expertise and experience at previous jobs may be applicable to available jobs at the next installation. There may be opportunity if some operations merge with Dobbins Air Force Base, GA. Some jobs might be saved but there will be significant competition for scarce billets.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Navy Recruiting Districts

Recommendation # 74 (DoN 34)

One-time Cost:	$2.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($14.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($214.5M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the following Navy Recruiting Districts: Montgomery, AL; Indianapolis, IN; Kansas City, MO; Omaha, NE; Buffalo, NY.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation achieves economies of scale and scope by reducing excess capacity in management overhead and physical resources in the Navy Recruiting District functional area. Through the elimination of leased space, the recommendation results in an annual lease savings of over $0.7M. The recommendation is consistent with the Commander, Navy Recruiting Command's Transformation Plan, which envisions consolidation of active and reserve recruiting functions, and supports the reallocation of management oversight over all Navy recruiting functions. This recommendation involves the closure of the specified Navy Recruiting Districts only and does not affect the storefront recruiting offices currently assigned to the closing Navy Recruiting Districts. The recruiting offices and associated personnel and resources will be reassigned to the remaining 26 Navy Recruiting Districts.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Navy Regions

Recommendation # 75 (DoN 35)

One-time Cost:	$3.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($34.6M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by consolidating Navy Region Gulf Coast, with Navy Region Southeast at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL. Realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX, by consolidating Navy Region South with Navy Region Midwest at Naval Station Great Lakes, IL, and Navy Region Southeast at Naval Station Jacksonville, FL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

In conjunction with other recommendations that consolidate Navy Region Commands, this recommendation will reduce the number of Installation Management regions from twelve to eight, streamlining the regional management structure and allowing for opportunities to collocate other regional entities to further align management concepts and efficiencies. Sufficient Installation Management capability resides within the remaining regions. As part of the closures of Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA, and Submarine Base New London, CT, the Navy Reserve Forces Command installation management function and Navy Region Northeast are also consolidated into the remaining regions, significantly increasing operational efficiency.

This recommendation supports the Department of the Navy establishment of Commander, Navy Installations in order to align shore assets in support of Navy requirements, to find efficiencies through common business practices, and to provide consistent shore installation services to allow the operational commander and major claimants to focus on their primary missions. Consolidating Navy Regions allows for more consistency in span of responsibility and better enables Commander, Navy Installations to provide operational forces support, community support, base support, and mission support to enhance the Navy's combat power.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Navy Reserve Centers

Recommendation # 76 (DoN 37)

One-time Cost:	$2.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($15.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($236.6M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the following Navy Reserve Centers: Tuscaloosa, AL; St. Petersburg, FL; Pocatello, ID; Forest Park, IL; Evansville, IN; Cedar Rapids, IA; Sioux City, IA; Lexington, KY; Bangor, ME; Adelphi, MD; Duluth, MN; Cape Girardeau, MO; Lincoln, NE; Glens Falls, NY; Horseheads, NY; Watertown, NY; Asheville, NC; Central Point, OR; Lubbock, TX; Orange, TX.

Close the Navy Reserve Facility in Marquette, MI.

Close the following Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers: Grissom Air Reserve Base, Peru, IN, and Tacoma, WA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation will reduce excess capacity through the consolidation of 23 Navy Reserve Centers/Navy Reserve Facilities and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers with other reserve centers in the affected areas. These reserve centers will close and their drilling population supported by other existing centers thereby reducing management overhead. Sufficient capacity for drilling reserves is maintained throughout the United States, and all states will continue to have at least one Navy Reserve Center/Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center. This recommendation reduces excess capacity in the Department of the Navy Reserve Center functional area, but existing capacity in support of the Department of the Navy Reserve

component continues to be in excess of force structure requirements. This recommendation is part of the closure of 37 Department of the Navy reserve centers, which includes 35 Navy centers (Navy Reserve Centers, Navy Reserve Facilities and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers) and two Marine Corps centers (Inspector-Instructor activities). The closure of 35 Navy centers will result in a capacity reduction of 12.7 percent of total current square footage. The closure of two Marine Corps centers will result in a capacity reduction of 5.5 percent of total current square footage.

Community Concerns

The community representing the Navy Reserve Center in St. Petersburg, FL, noted that reservists that drill at the center are expected to transfer to the reserve center at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa. There are no civilians employed at the reserve center.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendations. However, the Commission found that its subsequent decision to close Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME and its associated reserve unit would leave the state of Maine without a Navy reserve presence and subsequently deleted the Navy Reserve Center Bangor, ME from the list of closures in order to maintain a Navy Reserve Center in the state.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close the following Navy Reserve Centers: Tuscaloosa, AL; St. Petersburg, FL; Pocatello, ID; Forest Park, IL; Evansville, IN; Cedar Rapids, IA; Sioux City, IA; Lexington, KY; Adelphi, MD; Duluth, MN; Cape Girardeau, MO; Lincoln, NE; Glens Falls, NY; Horseheads, NY; Watertown, NY; Asheville, NC; Central Point, OR; Lubbock, TX; Orange, TX.

Close the Navy Reserve Facility in Marquette, MI.

Close the following Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers: Grissom Air Reserve Base, Peru, IN, and Tacoma, WA.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Navy Reserve Readiness Commands

Recommendation # 77 (DoN 44)

One-time Cost:	$2.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($6.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($91.7M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, by consolidating Navy Reserve Readiness Command South with Naval Reserve Readiness Command Midwest at Naval Station Great Lakes, IL. Realign Naval Station Newport, RI, and the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC, by consolidating Naval Reserve Readiness Command Northeast with Naval Reserve Readiness Command Mid-Atlantic and relocating the consolidated commands to Naval Station, Norfolk, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation enhances the Navy's long-standing initiative to accomplish common management and support on a regionalized basis by consolidating and collocating reserve readiness commands with the installation management Regions. This collocation aligns management concepts and efficiencies and ensures a reserve voice at each region as well as enabling future savings through consolidation of like functions. This recommendation will result in an increase in the average military

value for the remaining Naval Reserve Readiness Commands and ensures that each of the installation management Regions has an organization to manage reserve matters within the region.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, CA

Recommendation # 192 (Add)

One-time Cost:	$77.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($39.7M)
Payback Period:	73 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

None. The Secretary's proposed list submitted on May 13, 2005 did not include this facility. It was added by the Commission on July 19, 2005 for further consideration.

Secretary of Defense Justification

None.

Community Concerns

Community and Congressional representatives supported redevelopment of the Broadway complex, but preferred redevelopment occur outside the BRAC process, under a detailed development agreement that expires on January 1, 2007, between the City of San Diego and the Navy.

Commission Findings

The Commission found the Navy can reduce excess property, improve force protection, and improve efficiencies by collocating support functions with operational assets on a Navy installation in San Diego, and the Department should aggressively pursue disposal of its 14-acre, stand-alone administrative office complex located in a development area of downtown San Diego, using the BRAC process. The Commission found that the Navy and the Community are again actively pursuing a plan, as authorized by Section 2732 of Public Law 99-661, permitting the Navy to enter into a long-term lease of the Broadway property in return for new facilities on the property. The Commission found that the City of San Diego supports the Navy's plan to out-lease the property, and believes private redevelopment on the Navy's Broadway property should be accomplished under the terms and conditions of a 1992 development agreement between the City and the Navy (which is set to expire on January 1, 2007). Furthermore, the Commission found the City agrees the Broadway property should be privatized and redeveloped outside the BRAC process in order to avoid delay. However, the Commission determined that if the previously authorized option is not implemented on time, the next best alternative would be closure

of the Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, California through the BRAC process. Enough time has lapsed since the 1987 legislation was passed to cause the Commission to act.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary deviated from selection criteria 1, 3, and 4. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following: "If the Secretary of the Navy does not enter into a long-term lease on or before January 1, 2007 that provides for the redevelopment of the Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, California, under the authority granted by Section 2732 of Public Law 99-661, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987, close Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, California, and relocate the units and functions on Navy Broadway Complex to other Department of the Navy owned sites in San Diego." The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia

Recommendation # 193 (Add)

One-time Cost:	$410.37M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($17.10M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$33.39M
Payback Period:	18 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

None. The Secretary's proposed list submitted on May 13, 2005 did not include this facility. It was added by the Commission on July 19, 2005 for further consideration.

Secretary of Defense Justification

None.

Community Concerns

The Virginia Beach, Virginia community places high value on the military's contribution to the community and fears the loss of over 11,000 direct jobs would devastate the local economy. The state has invested significant resources in improved roads around the base and moving schools out of the Accident Potential Zones. They acknowledged noise complaints by a small, but vocal, minority of residents but pointed out that planning commissions are developing new community planning overlays to limit encroachment and reduce development in the Accident Potential Zones. They argued funds needed to implement the Commission's consideration to relocate the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida could be better spent on the Navy's more pressing needs. They believe the Navy has no better or affordable alternative than remaining at NAS Oceana and managing encroachment.

The Jacksonville, Florida community offered to return all of the former NAS Cecil Field property, improved and unencumbered – free and clear. Local governments are prepared to absorb and support the approximately 11,000 personnel that would be associated with the relocation of the Navy's Atlantic Fleet Master Jet Base to Cecil Field. The community has invested $133 million to upgrade Cecil Field's infrastructure and has secured $130 million in funding for a high speed access road from Cecil Field to Interstate Highway 10. All required base conversion activities, including a new or updated Environmental Impact Statement, can be completed in time to allow the Navy to establish and occupy a new Master Jet Base within the BRAC timeframe.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that significant residential and commercial encroachment had continued around NAS Oceana and Naval Auxiliary Landing Fields (NALF) Fentress for many years and was exacerbated when the 1995 BRAC Commission redirected F-18 aircraft and supporting assets from MCAS Cherry Point, NC and MCAS Beaufort, SC to NAS Oceana to

take advantage of the excess capacity at NAS Oceana. It was the sense of the Commission that the encroachment issues were having a detrimental effect on the operations and training of the Navy's Atlantic Fleet Strike Fighter Wings and on the safety and welfare of the citizens of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake, VA. Consequently, the future for NAS Oceana as a Master Jet Base was severely limited, whereas Jacksonville, FL had taken effective and positive measures to protect the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zones (AICUZ) around Cecil Field, FL, and Naval Outlying Landing Field (NOLF) Whitehouse.

The intent of the Commission is to ensure that the State of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake take immediate and positive steps to halt the encroaching developments that are pending before them now and in the future, and also to roll back the encroachment that has already occurred in the Accident Potential Zones (APZ) around NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress, particularly in the APZ-1 areas. The Commission also considers that the more severe encroachment problems were created by the state and local governments by ignoring the Navy's repeated objections to incompatible residential and commercial developments under the AICUZ guidelines. Consequently, the funds to halt and reverse the encroachment should not come from federal funds, but rather from state and local funding sources.

It is the sense of the Commission that the Secretary of Defense deviated from the BRAC criteria by failing to consider NAS Oceana for closure or realignment. The longstanding and steadily worsening encroachment problem around NAS Oceana, without strong support from state and city governments to eliminate current and arrest future encroachment, will in the long term create a situation where the military value of NAS Oceana will be unacceptably degraded. The remedies presented to the Commission thus far have been unconvincing. It is also the sense of the Commission that the future of naval aviation is not Naval Air Station Oceana. The Commission urges the Navy to begin immediately to mitigate the noise encroachment and safety issues associated with flight operations around the Virginia Beach area by transitioning high-density training evolutions to other bases that are much less encroached, such as NOLF Whitehouse, FL, or Kingsville, TX.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to cause a rapid, complete due diligence review of the offer of the State of Florida to reoccupy the former NAS Cecil Field and to compare this review against any plan to build a new master jet base at any other location. This review is to be completed within 6 months from the date that the BRAC legislation enters into force and is to be made public to the affected states for comment. After review of the states' comments, which shall be submitted within 120 days after publishing the review, the Secretary of Defense shall forward to the oversight committees of Congress the review, the state comments, and his recommendation on the location of the Navy's future Atlantic Fleet Master Jet Base.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that when the Secretary of Defense failed to recommend the realignment of Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia, he substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and the Force Structure Plan; that the Commission add to the list of installations to be closed or realigned the recommendation:

Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, FL, if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, VA, and Chesapeake, Virginia, fail to enact and enforce legislation to prevent further encroachment of Naval Air Station Oceana by the end of March 2006, to wit: enact state-mandated zoning controls requiring the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to adopt zoning ordinances that require the governing body to follow Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) guidelines in deciding discretionary development applications for property in noise levels 70 dB Day-Night, average noise Level (DNL) or greater; enact state and local legislation and ordnances to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the incompatible use property located within the Accident Potential Zone 1 areas for Naval Air Station Oceana, as depicted in the 1999 AICUZ pamphlet published by the US Navy and to fund and expend no less than $15 million annually in furtherance of the aforementioned program; codify the 2005 final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study recommendations; legislate requirements for the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to evaluate undeveloped properties in noise zones 70 dB DNL or greater for rezoning classification that would not allow uses incompatible under AICUZ guidelines; establish programs for purchase of development rights of the inter-facility traffic area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress; enact legislation creating the Oceana-Fentress Advisory Council. It shall be deemed that the actions prescribed to be taken by the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Cities of Virginia Beach, and Chesapeake respectively, by the end of March 2006 have not been taken in their entirety, unless the Department of Defense Inspector General so certifies in writing to the President and oversight committees of Congress by June 1, 2006; and, if the State of Florida appropriates sufficient funds to relocate commercial tenants presently located at Cecil Field, Florida, appropriates sufficient funds to secure public-private ventures for all the personnel housing required by the Navy at Cecil Field to accomplish this relocation and turns over fee simple title to the property comprising the former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, including all infrastructure improvements that presently exist, to the Department on or before December 31, 2006, if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal government of Virginia Beach, VA, and Chesapeake, VA, decline from the outset to take the actions required above or within 6 months of

the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, VA, and Chesapeake, VA, failing to carry through with any of the actions set out above, whichever is later. The State of Florida may not encumber the title by any restrictions other than a reversionary clause in favor of the State of Florida and short-term tenancies consistent with the relocation of the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field. It shall be deemed that the actions prescribed to be taken by the State of Florida and the City of Jacksonville respectively by the end of 31 December 2006 have not been taken in their entirety unless the Department of Defense Inspector General so certifies in writing to the President and oversight committees of Congress by June 1, 2007. If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, VA, and Chesapeake, VA, fail to take all of the prescribed actions and the State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation, the units and functions that shall relocate to Cecil Field will include but are not limited to all of the Navy F/A-18 strike fighter wings, aviation operations and support schools, maintenance support, training, and any other additional support activities the Navy deems necessary and appropriate to support the operations of the Master Jet Base.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

BIRMINGHAM INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, AL

RECOMMENDATION # 78 (AIR FORCE 5)

ONE-TIME COST:	N/A
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	N/A
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	N/A
PAYBACK PERIOD:	N/A

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), AL. Distribute the 117th Air Refueling Wing's (ANG) KC-135R aircraft to the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport AGS, ME (two aircraft); the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport AGS, TN (four aircraft); and the 161st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport AGS, AZ (two aircraft). The 117th Air Refueling Wing's firefighter positions will move to Dannelly Field AGS, AL, and the remaining expeditionary combat support (ECS) will remain in place.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

Phoenix Sky Harbor (37) scored higher than Birmingham (63) in military value for the tanker mission. This recommendation takes advantage of available capacity at Phoenix by increasing the air refueling squadron size from eight to ten aircraft, making the wing's overall capability more robust. It also capitalizes on the favorable recruiting environment of the greater Phoenix region, which can sustain this increased squadron size. Although McGhee-Tyson (74) and Bangor (123) ranked lower, military judgment argued in favor of retaining and adding force structure to these installations to increase their overall effectiveness. Bangor was increased in squadron size from 8 to 12 aircraft because of its critical role in the Northeast Tanker Task Force, as well as its participation in the transatlantic air bridge. The Air Force considered McGhee-Tyson's available capacity and Air National Guard experience in replacing aging, high maintenance KC-135E aircraft with re-engined KC-135R models and in increasing the squadron from 8 to 12 aircraft. Birmingham's ECS remains in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained and experienced Air National Guard personnel.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

The community argued DoD failed to properly calculate the base's military value, mission capability and infrastructure. It objected to transferring tankers to bases with lower Tanker Mission Compatibility Index (MCI) scores. It criticized the unspecified structure and implementation of "Enclaves" and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) units, and claimed moving aircraft without altering infrastructure misused the BRAC process. It felt the national tanker lay-down plan and MCI did not address homeland defense or security requirements. The community stated DoD did not give sufficient weight to an ongoing runway lengthening project, their "world-class" tanker infrastructure, collocation with a contract depot repair and maintenance facility, and ability to accommodate contingency and surge operations.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

The Commission found that the aggregate of both programmatic and BRAC-related aircraft movements into and out of the Southeastern United States, including Air Force, Navy and Marine aircraft, could lead to a potential shortage of regional air refueling aircraft for efficient, cost-effective training opportunities and homeland defense mission support. The Commission found that the potential shortfall is one of economic efficiency, not operational deficiency. The Commission found that the potential shortfall of cost-effective air-refueling support could be mitigated by rejecting one of the Department of Defense's recommendations reducing the quantity of KC-135 tanker aircraft in the Southeast. The Commission noted the significant operational capability advantage that Birmingham will soon have as a result of its ongoing runway lengthening project (from 10,000' to 12,000'), and additional military value of the installation. The Commission assesses that Birmingham IAP AGS,

AL should continue to operate as an eight-PAA KC-135 installation. The Commission found that this action is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 2, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary.

Eielson AFB, AK; Moody AFB, GA; and Shaw AFB, SC

Recommendation # 79 (Air Force 6)

One-time Cost:	$32.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($12.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($126.9M)
Payback Period:	3 years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Eielson Air Force Base, AK. The 354th Fighter Wing's assigned A-10 aircraft will be distributed to the 917th Wing Barksdale Air Force Base, LA (three aircraft); to a new active-duty unit at Moody Air Force Base, GA (12 aircraft); and to backup inventory (three aircraft). The 354th Fighter Wing's F-16 aircraft will be distributed to the 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (18 aircraft). The Air National Guard Tanker unit and rescue alert detachment will remain as tenants on Eielson. Realign Moody Air Force Base, by relocating base-level ALQ-184 intermediate maintenance to Shaw Air Force Base, SC, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Shaw Air Force Base, SC, for ALQ-184 pods. Realign Shaw Air Force Base, relocating base-level TF-34 engine intermediate maintenance to Moody Air Force Base, establishing a CIRF at Moody Air Force Base for TF-34 engines.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Eielson's (11) military value is high because of its close proximity to valuable airspace and ranges; however, Eielson is an expensive base to operate and improve (build). The Air Force recommends realigning Eielson, but keeping the base open in a "warm" status using the resident Air National Guard units and a portion of the infrastructure to continue operating the base for USAF/Joint/Combined exercises. The Air Force distributes the F-16s to Nellis (13) a base with high military value, and the A-10s to Moody (11-SOF/CSAR), which also ranks high in military value. The CIRFs at Moody and Shaw compliment force structure moves and anticipate these bases as workload centers for these commodities.

Community Concerns

The Eielson, AK, community argued that DoD's proposed realignment deviated from military value criteria, would not produce estimated savings, undermined joint training, and ignored the strategic value of military presence in Alaska. First, although the Air Force acknowledged Eielson's high military value, it subordinated this value to cost savings. Further, the cost to maintain Eielson in a "warm" status is not realistic. A site survey subsequent to the original DoD proposal showed an additional 1,000 personnel would be needed to properly maintain the installation.

Second, the community asserted the loss of close air support aircraft at Eielson would reduce joint training opportunities with the Army and degrade readiness of the Stryker Brigade at Fort Wainwright, AK, and the Airborne Brigade at Fort Richardson, AK. Further, they questioned the affordability of large-scale exercises at Eielson if the Air Force has to pay higher than projected costs to properly maintain the base in "warm" status. These costs could result in underutilization of Eielson's valuable range complex.

Finally, the community contended DoD's recommendation ignored Eielson's strategic location in the Pacific theater, claiming that operational units at Eielson are even more critical given plans to reduce US forces in Korea and Japan. Removing aircraft could send an unintended message that the US is reducing its interests in the Pacific and increase response times to regional contingencies.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that a risk of the realignment of Eielson would be under-use of one of the Air Force's best airspace and range complexes. Eielson's military value is distinguished from other bases by its airspace and range complex, which is about three times the size of the Air Force's Red Flag complex at Nellis AFB, NV. The investment in the complex's range instrumentation is also significant. The Air Force justified its recommendation by its intention to increase the number of large scale exercises at Eielson. Eielson would have greater capacity to host these exercises without aircraft permanently based there. However, the Commission found that plans to expand exercises are not yet formalized. In order to maintain air combat forces in the region and further utilize the range, the Commission rejected the portion of the recommendation that relocates the 354th Wing's F-16s.

The Commission found permanently basing A-10s in Alaska would have a negligible impact on the ability to respond to a contingency in the Pacific Theater. While there would be a delay in getting forces into theater, the timing would still meet operational plan requirements. The Commission also found that the lack of permanently assigned A-10 aircraft at Eielson may somewhat limit joint training opportunities with the Army in Alaska, but those losses would be offset by far more training opportunities at Moody AFB, GA, which is close to a large number of Army and Special Forces units.

The Commission found that the Air Force significantly underestimated the costs of maintaining Eielson as a "warm base." The Commission was unable to determine how many more personnel are needed to maintain the base. The Commission found that portions of the base needed for future use, such as supporting a contingency or exercise, must be properly maintained. The Commission found that savings attributable to military personnel reductions represented an estimated 86 percent of Eielson's net present value savings.

Finally, the Commission notes that the economic impact in the Fairbanks, AK area would be substantial. Nearly nine percent of jobs in the area would be lost.

Separately, the Commission found the air sovereignty mission could be conducted from Eielson Air Force Base and recommended closure of Galena Forward Operating Location, AK. Eielson will become the northernmost air defense site in the United States.

The Commission found no substantial deviation in paragraph 79.b and 79.c of the bill (see Appendix Q) related to the TF-34 and ALQ-184 maintenance realignments.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 5, and from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Eielson Air Force Base, AK. The 354th Fighter Wing's assigned A-10 aircraft will be distributed to the 917th Wing Barksdale Air Force Base, LA (three aircraft); to a new active-duty unit at Moody Air Force Base, GA (12 aircraft); and to backup inventory (three aircraft). The Air National Guard Tanker unit and rescue alert detachment will remain as tenants on Eielson.

Realign Moody Air Force Base, by relocating base-level ALQ-184 intermediate maintenance to Shaw Air Force Base, SC, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Shaw Air Force Base, SC for ALQ-184 pods.

Realign Shaw Air Force Base, relocating base-level TF-34 engine intermediate maintenance to Moody Air Force Base, establishing a CIRF at Moody Air Force Base for TF-34 engines.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Kulis AGS AK, Elmendorf AFB, AK

Recommendation # 80 (Air Force 7)

One-Time Cost:	$147.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($16.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($70.6M)
Payback Period:	10 years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Kulis Air Guard Station (AGS), AK. Relocate the 176th Wing (ANG) and associated aircraft (eight C-130Hs, three HC-130Ns, and five HH-60s) and the Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements to Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK. Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base. With the addition of four aircraft from another installation (see Air Force recommendation for Ellsworth Air Force Base and Dyess Air Force Base), the 176th Wing at Elmendorf will form an ANG/active duty association with 12 C-130H aircraft. The 3d Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 24 of 42 assigned F-15C/D aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation distributes C-130, HC-130 and HH-60 aircraft from Kulis AGS (110) to Elmendorf Air Force Base (51), which has a higher military value. Moving these aircraft to Elmendorf Air Force Base consolidates two installations in the same city, reduces infrastructure, creates an active/ARC association, and retains the skilled, highly trained ANG personnel from Kulis AGS. This recommendation also distributes a portion of the F-15C/Ds at Elmendorf Air Force Base (36-fighter) to Langley Air Force Base (2-fighter). Elmendorf retains one squadron (18 aircraft) for air sovereignty missions and distributes the remaining 24 F-15Cs to Langley Air Force Base.

Community Concerns

Alaskan community representatives argued DoD underestimated the costs of the move, citing a recent Air Force site survey estimating the relocation would require more than initially estimated. While acknowledging the move would benefit development of Anchorage International Airport, the community notes Air Guard operations would suffer if the move is underfunded. The Governor stated that his consent to the proposed relocation would be contingent on adequate funding.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the relocation of the C-130s and helicopters from Kulis to Elmendorf, while consistent with the BRAC selection criteria, would be considerably more expensive than originally estimated. The Commission notes that the Governor of Alaska as well as its Adjutant General supports the relocation of Kulis AGS to Elmendorf, if properly funded. If significantly under-funded, the commission is concerned that the readiness of the Air National Guard unit could be negatively impacted. Therefore, the Commission supports the DoD recommendation to move the ANG C-130 and HH-60 on Kulis AGS, contingent on the availability of adequate military construction funds to provide the necessary facilities at Elmendorf AFB.

The Commission identified no impediments to the proposed realignment of Elmendorf AFB, and relocation of some of its F-15 aircraft to Langley AFB, VA. Elmendorf is scheduled to receive F/A-22 aircraft outside of the BRAC process. The F-15s that remain at Elmendorf would continue to conduct the air sovereignty and other mission in Alaska. Because of changes in other recommendations, the full complement of C-130s may have to come from elsewhere than locations noted in the original recommendation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 5, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Contingent on the availability of adequate military construction funds to provide the necessary facilities at Elmendorf AFB, AK, close Kulis Air Guard Station (AGS), AK. Relocate the 176th Wing (ANG) and associated aircraft (eight C-130Hs, three HC-130Ns, and five HH-60s) and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) to Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK.

Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base. The 176th Wing at Elmendorf will form an ANG/active duty association with 12 C-130H aircraft. The Commission recommends 3d Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 18 of 42 assigned F-15C/D aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, VA and 6 to an Air National Guard unit.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Fort Smith Air Guard Station, AR, and Luke Air Force Base, AZ

Recommendation # 81 (Air Force 8)

One-time Cost:	$17.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($2.0M)
Payback Period:	16 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport (MAP) Air Guard Station (AGS), AR. Distribute the 188th Fighter Wing's (ANG) F-16s to the 144th Fighter Wing (ANG) Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA (seven aircraft) and retirement (eight aircraft). The 144th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements remain in place. Firefighter positions realign to Tulsa, OK, and the Home Station Training Site moves to Savannah, GA. Realign Luke Air Force Base, AZ. The 56th Fighter Wing, Luke Air Force Base, AZ, distributes its F-16 Block 25s (13 aircraft) and F-16 Block 42s (24 aircraft) to retirement. The 944th Fighter Wing distributes its F-16s to the 144th Fighter Wing at Fresno (11 aircraft).

Secretary of Defense Justification

Military value played the predominant role coupled with homeland defense. The Air Force recommendation realigns 15 aircraft from Fort Smith (110) to Fresno (87), which supports the homeland defense Air Sovereignty Alert mission. Additionally, this recommendation helps align the eight different F-16 models across the Air Force. Finally, this recommendation makes experienced airmen available to support the new ANG flying training unit created at Little Rock Air Force Base, AR.

Community Concerns

The Fort Smith, AR, community disputed DoD's Mission Compatability Index (MCI) scores, claiming the Air Force's one-size-fits-all approach for both active and reserve bases creates a built-in bias favoring large-active-duty bases. It argued that in fact, Fort Smith is the most cost-efficient fighter wing in the Air National Guard. DoD's recommendations could adversely affect joint training opportunities, both at Fort Smith and nearby Fort Chafee. The community noted the recommendation undermines recruiting and retention. The loss of fighter interceptors for homeland defense is a major concern for one of the five fastest growing communities in the United States. The commercial airport authority and surrounding communities would lose significant civil support and emergency disaster relief services. It would cost $7.5 million initially, and at least $2 million annually thereafter, to replicate lost air rescue and airport firefighting services.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport Air Guard Station and Luke Air Force Base was not cost effective. The Commission estimated a 20-year Net Present Value cost of $13.8 million and a payback in excess of 100 years for the recommendation. However, the Commission found that the military value calculation for Fort Smith did not give proper credit to airspace, low level routes, and auxiliary airfields and nearby Fort Chaffee. The Commission agreed with the Secretary of Defense that the F-16s at Fort Smith should be withdrawn due to a shrinking inventory of this weapon system but found Fort Smith to be an ideal location for the A-10

aircraft. No objections were found to the part of the recommendation related to Luke Air Force Base. The Commission found that this action is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Reserve Laydown plan.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport (MAP) Air Guard Station (AGS), AR, and Luke Air Force Base, AZ. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) at Fort Smith Air Guard Station, AR, 37 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 56th Fighter Wing at Luke Air Force Base, and the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 144th Fighter Wing (ANG) at Fresno Air Terminal Air Guard Station, CA, to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission;

Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG), Fort Smith Air Guard Station, AR.

Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 144th Fighter Wing (ANG), Fresno Air Terminal Air Guard Station, CA.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport. The Home Station Training Site moves to Savannah, GA.

If the State of Arkansas decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Arkansas and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Arkansas Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Beale Air Force Base, CA, and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI

Recommendation # 82 (Air Force 10)

One-time Cost:	$40.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$1.7M
20-Year Net Present Value:	$57.9M
Payback Period:	Never

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA. The 940th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) will realign its KC-135R tanker aircraft while its expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place. Beale's KC-135R aircraft will be distributed to the Air National Guard at Selfridge ANGB, MI (four aircraft) and 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, TN (four aircraft). Realign Selfridge Air Reserve Base, MI. The 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) at Selfridge will distribute its eight KC-135 aircraft to the 127th Wing (ANG) at Selfridge. The 127th Wing will retire its 15 F-16 aircraft and eight C-130E aircraft, and will convert to A-10 and KC-135R aircraft.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation capitalizes on Beale's (7-C2ISR and 33-UAV) high military value and emerging Global Hawk unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) mission. Realigning KC-135 force structure enables Beale to have one primary operational flying mission—manned and unmanned high altitude reconnaissance—balances the Reserve and Air National Guard KC-135 force structure, and retains reserve component manpower and experience for the new Global Hawk mission. The receiver locations for Beale's tankers—Selfridge (57) and McGhee-Tyson (74)—each have above average military value for reserve component bases in the tanker mission.

Beale's more modern KC-135R aircraft will replace the older, higher maintenance KC-135E models at McGhee-Tyson and help increase the new ANG tanker mission at Selfridge to an effective size of 12 aircraft. The resulting KC-135R increase at Selfridge and McGhee-Tyson increases the tanker force structure into squadron sizes that are more operationally effective.

As a reserve component base, Selfridge ANGB has above average military value as both a tanker installation (57) and fighter installation (70) as rated for those respective mission areas. This recommendation streamlines operations at Selfridge ANGB by realigning the Reserve air refueling mission, currently operating as a tenant unit, and divesting the ANG wing of its retiring force structure. The ANG wing's older, less capable C-130E and F-16 aircraft will retire and be replaced with Reserve KC-135R aircraft from Selfridge and Beale, and 15 A-10 aircraft realigned by the recommended closures of W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI, and NAS Willow Grove, PA. Reorganizing the flying operations under one component (ANG) will maximize organizational effectiveness and allow the installation to accommodate two effectively sized squadrons. The 927th Air Refueling Wing will realign to associate with the 6th Air Mobility Wing at MacDill Air Force Base, FL, to capture reserve experience in the region and enhance that unit's capability.

Community Concerns

The Beale, CA, community supported DoD's recommendation to focus the base on one primary operational flying mission (UAVs). They raised concerns about the lack of specific information as to when and how the emerging UAV mission would unfold. They felt that recruiting and retention could be difficult during the temporary period between departure of the tanker mission and arrival of the new Global Hawk mission. Experienced and skilled reservists may leave the wing without a clear sense of the new mission's opportunities.

Commission Findings

The Commission found realigning the 940th Air Refueling Wing and associating it with the 9th Reconnaissance Wing would, in fact capitalize on Beale's high Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Mission Compatibility Index (MCI) score and emerging Global Hawk mission. The Commission additionally found that the projected savings from this recommendation were modest and the primary aim of this recommendation was to realign the force structure and to maximize organizational effectiveness at Selfridge, MI. Further, this recommendation enables conversion of Selfridge ANGB from F-16s to A-10s, in

line with the Department's intent to retire older F-16s while maintaining a flying mission, and retaining skilled Airmen, in the Michigan area.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 3, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA. Distribute the 940th Air Refueling Wing's (AFR) KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 940th Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place.

Establish 12 PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, Tennessee. The KC-135E aircraft assigned to the 134th Air Refueling Wing will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.

Realign Selfridge Air Reserve Base, MI. Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 927th Air Refueling Wing's (AFR) and the 8 C-130E aircraft assigned to the 127th Wing (ANG) at Selfridge Air Reserve Base, Michigan to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 127th Wing will convert from C-130E to KC-135R/T aircraft.

Establish 8 PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge Air Reserve Base, Michigan.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

March Air Reserve Base, CA

Recommendation # 83 (Air Force 11)

One-time Cost:	$5.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($6.1M)
Payback Period:	7 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA. The 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will distribute its nine KC-135R aircraft to the 452d Air Mobility Wing (AFR), March Air Reserve Base (four aircraft); the 157th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Pease International Tradeport Air Guard Station, NH (three aircraft); the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, TN (one aircraft); and the 22d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell Air Force Base, KS (one aircraft). The 163d Air Refueling Wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) will remain in place.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation realigns aircraft and organizationally optimizes March Air Reserve Base. With the highest military value (16) of all air reserve component bases for the tanker mission, March Air Reserve Base is retained and streamlined from two wing organizational structures to one reserve component flying mission with a more effectively sized KC-135 unit of 12 aircraft. This action distributes the remaining Air National Guard force structure at March to the higher-ranking active installation, McConnell (15), and two ANG installations, McGhee-Tyson (74) and Pease (105). McGhee-Tyson, though rated lower in military value, receives one aircraft due to military judgment to increase the squadron to a more effective size of 12 aircraft. Military judgment also placed additional force structure at Pease to support the Northeast Tanker Task Force and also increase the squadron to a more effective size of 12 aircraft. All receiver installations are increased in operational

capability with the additional aircraft because of their proximity to air refueling missions. March's ECS remains in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained and experienced Air National Guard personnel.

Community Concerns

The community opposed DoD's recommendation, claiming it is unfounded, adding that moving KC-135 tankers from March ARS, the highest military value ranking reserve component tanker base, to bases of substantially lower military value deviates from the selection criteria and is incongruous with optimizing the force structure.

Commission Findings

The Commission found the recommendation redistributes March's KC-135 aircraft to installations with lower military value. The Commission realigned March Air Reserve Base according to the Commission's Air National Guard and Reserve plan. This realignment would reduce the KC-135 inventory in accordance with DoD's 2025 Force Structure Plan.

The Commission's Air National Guard and Reserve Laydown plan also permits retiring aircraft and strengthening forces to achieve the highest military value. This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 3, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA. Distribute the 163d Air Refueling Wing's (ANG) KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the following KC-135R/T PAA:

The 452nd Air Mobility Wing (AFR), March Air Reserve Base, CA (12 PAA KC-135R/T);

The 157th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Pease International Tradeport Air Guard Station, NH (eight PAA KC-135R/T);

The 108th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGuire Air Force Base, NJ (eight PAA KC-135R/T). The 108th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft;

If the State of California decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force:

the 163d Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remain in place;

reassign a sufficient number of aircrews and maintenance personnel of the 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), a C-130 unit located at Channel Islands Air Guard Station, California, to bring that unit to a fully manned status, with the Air Force providing retraining where necessary, and;

all other personnel allotted to the 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of California and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, rescue operations or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the California Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 163rd Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Onizuka AFS, CA

Recommendation # 84 (Air Force 12)

One-time Cost:	$123.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($25.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($211.0M)
Payback Period:	5 years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Onizuka Air Force Station, CA. Relocate the Air Force Satellite Control Network (AFSCN) mission and tenant Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) Defense Satellite Communication System (DSCS) mission and equipment to Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation consolidates satellite command and control operations while reducing excess infrastructure. Onizuka AFS (124) hosts the AFSCN Second Node and scheduling backup mission, but has no primary assigned Air Force Space Command operational mission. Onizuka AFS also supports classified tenant missions that are anticipated to phase out during the BRAC 2005 timeframe. Schriever Air Force Base, CO, (1) ranked highest in military value for satellite operations, but hosts the AFSCN Primary Node. Vandenberg Air Force Base (2) currently hosts one of the AFSCN remote tracking stations. An Air Force Space Command policy directive on backup satellite control operations prescribes the requirements for backup operations and geographical separation to preclude simultaneous degradation of both primary and secondary nodes from natural or man-made threats. During major command capacity briefings to Headquarters Air Force, Onizuka AFS was identified as having seismic and antiterrorism/force protection constraints, with no buildable land to mitigate these. Vandenberg Air Force Base offers better protection for the DSCS Sun East and Sun West antenna complexes, which are designated a Protection-Level 1 resource.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The commission found no deviation with the Secretary of Defense's recommendation to realign Onizuka. Onizuka AFS was realigned during the 1995 BRAC, maintaining a backup satellite mission at Onizuka along with a classified tenant mission. The Commission found closing Onizuka to be justified with the phase out of the classified mission. Relocating the mission to Vandenberg is consistent with existing policy on geographic separation of primary and secondary nodes.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Air Guard Station, MD

Recommendation # 85 (Air Force 14)

One-time Cost:	$14.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($17.8M)
Payback Period:	7 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT. The A-10s assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing will be distributed to the 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA (nine aircraft) and retirement (six aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley, and Bradley will retain capability to support a homeland defense mission. Realign Barnes Air Guard Station, MA; Selfridge ANGB, MI; Shaw Air Force Base, SC; and Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, MD, by relocating base-level TF-34 engine intermediate maintenance to Bradley, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Bradley for TF-34 engines.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Barnes (97) and Bradley (98) are located approximately 12 miles apart. The Air Force placed one full squadron at Barnes because it ranked higher in military value. By combining the two units into one squadron, the Air Force retains the trained A-10 pilots and maintenance technicians in the area and creates an optimum-sized and more effective squadron. The recommendation to close Otis ANGB, MA, generated a requirement to build an air sovereignty alert (ASA) site in the region. The Air Force priced an alert facility at both Barnes and Bradley, and chose Bradley on the basis of lower cost. The Bradley ECS elements remain in place to support the ASA mission.

Establishing a CIRF at Bradley for TF-34 engine maintenance compliments the realignment of the A-10 fleet. The CIRF at Bradley will consolidate TF-34 engine maintenance for ANG A-10 aircraft from Barnes, Selfridge, Martin State and active-duty aircraft at Spangdahlem, Germany.

Establishing this CIRF at Bradley rather than at Barnes avoids relocation of a hush house facility at an estimated cost of $3.5M, and avoids construction of additional 18,000 square feet of maintenance facilities already existing at Bradley that will be available.

Community Concerns

The East Granby, CT, community, including its elected representatives, challenged DoD's Mission Compatability Index (MCI) scores, claiming the Air Force's one-size-fits-all approach for both active and reserve bases creates a built-in bias favoring large active-duty bases. The community claimed Bradley is one of the Air National Guard's most efficient A-10 installations. It also claimed the Air Force significantly understated Bradley's military value, ignoring infrastructure available through an agreement with the local airport authority. Advocates noted the loss of experienced and skilled personnel would reduce combat capability and could jeopardize homeland security. Even though the ANG facility proposed to receive Bradley's A-10 aircraft is only 15 miles away, East Granby community leaders emphasized that Barnes' location in a different state would pose major employment challenges for those who wished to relocate to Westfield, MA.

Commission Findings

The Commission placed F-15s at Barnes Air Guard Station, located 12 miles to the north of Bradley. There is essentially no difference in MCI scores between Barnes and Bradley. No objections were found with any other part of this recommendation. This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the

Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT. Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) at Bradley Field, Connecticut and the 15 A-10 aircraft at the 104th Fighter Wing (ANG), Barnes Air Guard Station, Massachusetts to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 104th Fighter Wing (ANG), Barnes Air Guard Station, MA.

The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut and Bradley will retain capability to support a homeland defense mission.

If the State of Connecticut decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 103d Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 103d Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Connecticut and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Connecticut or the Massachusetts Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 103d and 104th Fighter Wings (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state or the commonwealth.

Realign Barnes Air Guard Station, MA; Selfridge ANGB, MI; Shaw Air Force Base, SC; and Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, MD, by relocating base-level TF-34 engine intermediate maintenance to Bradley, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Bradley for TF-34 engines.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

New Castle Airport Air Guard Station, DE

Recommendation # 86 (Air Force 15)

One-time Cost:	N/A*
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A*
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A*
Payback Period:	N/A*

* *No COBRA data available*

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign New Castle County Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), DE. Distribute the wing's eight C-130H aircraft to the 145th Airlift Wing (ANG), Charlotte/Douglas International Airport (IAP) AGS, NC (four aircraft), and 165th Airlift Wing (ANG), Savannah IAP AGS, GA (four aircraft). Move flying related Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) to McGuire Air

Force Base, NJ (Aeromedical Squadron), and Dover Air Force Base, DE (aerial port and fire fighters). Other ECS remains in place at New Castle.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation makes experienced airmen from New Castle (120) available for employment at these nearby installations. Military value was the predominant consideration; New Castle had a low military value ranking and was near other bases keeping or gaining aircraft. Charlotte (33) and Savannah (77) were selected to receive aircraft because of higher military value rankings and avoiding conversion training costs. The Air Force also considered active/Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve manning mix, recruiting, cost factors (to include cost avoidance), environmental factors, and base capacity in its analysis of this recommendation.

Community Concerns

The community objected to the complete loss of the Delaware Air National Guard's air mission, leaving behind only an undefined enclave. It pointed out several errors in DoD's justification, including no credit for Landing Zones within 150 nautical miles when two are located on New Castle County Air National Guard Base itself and a third in West Virginia (approximately 120 nm); reduced credit for condition and capability of ramp infrastructure even though significant renovation was in progress; and failure to consider the personnel effects on over 500 drilling guardsmen. Correcting these errors would boost the base's MCI score from 120th to 26th of the 154 bases ranked. Additionally, the community challenged the legality of the recommendation and stated the unit's homeland security missions under FEMA were not considered, nor its role under the Governor's authority.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Secretary did not consider the unit's homeland security missions under the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). It also found that data gathered by the Department was inaccurate in that it did not consider the two landing zones located on the Air Guard Station itself nor the landing zone located in West Virginia within the Air Force's 150 nautical mile range parameter. The commission also found the Air Force assessment did not reflect significant improvements to the ramp infrastructure of the Air Guard Station. Therefore the Commission rejected this recommendation. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

The 166th Airlift Wing (ANG) at New Castle County Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), Delaware, maintains its 8 PAA C-130 aircraft. Establish 10 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 145th Airlift Wing (ANG), Charlotte/Douglas International Airport AGS, North Carolina. The 165th Airlift Wing (ANG) at Savannah International Airport Air Guard Station, Georgia maintains its 8 PAA C-130 aircraft.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Robins Air Force Base, GA

Recommendation # 87 (Air Force 16)

One-time Cost:	$6.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($14.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($171.7M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA. The 19th Air Refueling Group's KC-135R aircraft will be distributed to the 22nd Air Refueling Wing, McConnell Air Force Base, KS (nine aircraft), and to backup aircraft inventory (three aircraft). The 202d Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), a geographically separated unit at Middle Georgia Regional Airport, will be relocated into available space at Robins Air Force Base.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation realigns active-duty KC-135R aircraft from Robins (18) to McConnell (15), a base higher in military value for the tanker mission and with available capacity to receive the additional aircraft at no cost. This consolidation increases McConnell's active-duty tanker squadrons to optimum size. This recommendation also enables the Air National Guard to transfer its KC-135R aircraft based at McConnell to Forbes Field AGS, KS (35), retaining one of the higher-ranking air reserve component tanker bases. The vacated infrastructure and capacity resulting from the realignment of the tenant 19th Air Refueling Group will accommodate US Navy aircraft realigning to Robins from Naval Air Station Atlanta. The Navy will pay any costs to reconfigure the AF facility for their use. By realigning geographically separated units onto Robins, the Air Force can use excess capacity and reduce leased facilities in the community. This recommendation does not affect the blended active duty/Air National Guard Air Control Wing at Robins, which remains the major operational flying mission at Robins.

Community Concerns

The community had no specific concerns regarding departure of the KC-135 mission and supported DoD recommendations to relocate functions to Robins. It sought to rebut arguments from the Atlanta, GA, community alleging poor Reserve recruiting demographics around Robins AFB. In response, the Robins community argued its close proximity to Atlanta provides recruiting demographics virtually identical to Atlanta's. It also contended that because of extra capacity at Robins, it could absorb further flying missions without difficulty.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that Robins AFB has ample capacity and conditions for current and future flying missions. The Commission also found that the Secretary of Defense's overall intent and concept of realigning active-duty KC-135s out of Robins AFB was acceptable.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 3, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA. Distribute the 19th Air Refueling Group's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the PAA requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 202d Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), a geographically separated unit at Middle Georgia Regional Airport, will be relocated into available space at Robins Air Force Base

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID

Recommendation # 88 (Air Force 17)

One-time Cost:	$16.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($6.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($57.0M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station (AGS), ID. Distribute the four C-130H aircraft of the 124th Wing (ANG) to the 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG), Cheyenne, WY. The new, larger unit at Cheyenne will create an active duty/ANG association.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Currently, Boise (66-SOF/CSAR, 66-airlift) operates a mix of C-130 and A-10 aircraft. These aircraft have very different missions. This recommendation realigns Boise to operate only A-10s and distributes its C-130 aircraft to Cheyenne (118-airlift). Boise is a valuable A-10 base because of its proximity to air-to-ground ranges with score-able strafing and bombing, threat emitters, and integrated air combat training. In turn, the C-130 squadron in Cheyenne is increased to a more effective size. Additionally, Cheyenne's proximity to an active-duty Air Force installation (F.E. Warren Air Force Base) allows it to host an active/ANG associate unit.

Community Concerns

The Boise, ID, community criticized DoD's Mission Compatability Index (MCI) scores, claiming the Air Force's one-size-fits-all approach for both active and reserve bases creates a built-in bias favoring large active-duty bases. In fact, Boise Air Guard Station's mission capability is greater than that of eight other bases scheduled to gain C-130s under DoD's proposals. The Air Force failed to account for personnel losses associated with relocating Boise's aerial port flight mission. The data cut-off year of 2003 did not capture the full extent of almost $25 million in infrastructure improvements over the last decade. Additionally, the community believes realigning Boise's C-130 tactical airlifters would jeopardize transportation of civil support teams to major homeland security events in the Pacific Northwest. Last, advocates asserted DoD's proposal would affect several tenant organizations, including the National Interagency Fire Center.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station was supportable despite concerns over homeland security, military value and overstated savings raised by the community. The Commission acknowledged that the Air National Guard inventory of C-130s is shrinking and that it is not efficient to maintain the current strength of four C-130 aircraft at Boise.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station (AGS), ID. Distribute the 4 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 124th Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 6 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG), Cheyenne, Wyoming. The 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG) will create an active duty/ANG association at Cheyenne. The Air Force will supply an additional 6 PAA C-130 aircraft to establish an optimally-sized 12 PAA C-130 aircraft active duty/ANG associate airlift wing at Cheyenne.

If the State of Idaho decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 124th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 124th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Idaho and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Idaho Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 124th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK

Recommendation # 89 (Air Force 18)

One-time Cost:	$91.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($23.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($189.3M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID. Distribute the 366th Fighter Wing assigned F-15Cs (18 aircraft) to the 57th Fighter Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (nine aircraft), to the 125th Fighter Wing, Jacksonville International Airport AGS, FL (six aircraft), and to retirement (three aircraft). The 366th Fighter Wing will distribute assigned F-16 Block 52 aircraft to the 169th Fighter Wing McEntire AGS, SC (nine aircraft), the 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (five aircraft), and to backup inventory (four aircraft). Realign Nellis Air Force Base. The 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, will distribute F-16 Block 42 aircraft to the 138th Fighter Wing Tulsa International Airport AGS, OK (three aircraft), and retire the remaining F-16 Block 42 aircraft (15 aircraft). The 57th Wing also will distribute F-16 Block 32 aircraft (six aircraft) to the 144th Fighter Wing Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA, and to retirement (one aircraft). Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK. The 366th Fighter Wing, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, will receive F-15E aircraft from the 3d Wing, Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK (18 aircraft), and attrition reserve (three aircraft).

Secretary of Defense Justification

Military value was the predominant consideration in moving the F-15Es from Elmendorf (36) to Mountain Home (23) and F-16s to Nellis (12) and McEntire (48). Additionally, realigning the eight F-16 models and four F-16 engine types weighed in the final F-16 force structure laydown. Mountain Home currently operates several types of aircraft; this recommendation realigns Mountain Home to fly only F-15Es, streamlining operations at a location that is well suited for air-to-ground, low-level and air-to-air flight training. This recommendation also aligns common versions of F-16s and F-15Cs.

Community Concerns

The Idaho community maintained that Mountain Home AFB is ideally located and postured to receive future weapon systems such as the F-22 and Joint Strike Fighter, as well as additional personnel. Mountain Home's remoteness provides training and expansion opportunities with no encroachment, no environmental impacts to training, nor any noise complaints. The size and location of the Mountain Home range complex, currently undergoing expansion, has allowed the base to support the training of airmen in numerous weapons systems over the years. The community contended that after a recently completed $3 million renovation, Mountain Home has one of the largest ramps in Air Combat Command and is designed to support both bomber and tanker aircraft. As many as 220 aircraft can be parked on the ramp. In addition, the base has built 600 of 1,400 new housing units planned in a ten-year program. Last, the community contended that DoD's recommended realignment will result in a personnel loss that would have noticeable economic impacts on such a small community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that a potential 6 percent job loss in the Mountain Home area could have an economic impact given the small size of the community. However, not all jobs will be lost at once and GAO has reported that as local economies grow during the 2006–2011 implementation period, total employment is also likely to grow, reducing the overall percentage of job losses.

The Commission found that Mountain Home Air Force Base is well suited for various types of flight training. It also has the capacity and the infrastructure available to receive future missions. Though the realignment results in the base losing some of its weapon systems, the Air Force indicated that the base is being considered as a potential location for the beddown of the Joint Strike Fighter as well as a training ground for international squadrons. Therefore, the Commission found that the Secretary of Defense's overall intent and concept of streamlining operations at Mountain Home and realigning aircraft is approved. The Commission revised the DoD recommendation to be consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 5, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID. Distribute the 18 F-15C/D aircraft and 18 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 366th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 18 PAA F-15C/D aircraft at the 125th Wing (ANG), Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, Florida.

Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 169th Fighter Wing (ANG), McEntire Air Guard Station, South Carolina.

Realign Nellis Air Force Base, NV. Distribute 25 of the F-16 aircraft assigned to the 57th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 21 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 138th Fighter Wing Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station, Oklahoma.

Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 144th Fighter Wing Fresno Air Terminal Air Guard Station, California.

Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK. The 366th Fighter Wing, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID will receive F-15E aircraft from the 3d Wing, Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK (18 aircraft) and attrition reserve (three aircraft).

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Capital Air Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN

Recommendation # 90 (Air Force 20)

One-time Cost:	$22.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($1.6M)
Payback Period:	17 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL. Distribute the 183d Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 122d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN, (15 aircraft). Retire the 122d Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements, the Illinois ANG State Headquarters, and the 217th Engineering Installation Squadron remain in place. Realign Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN. The 181st Fighter Wing's F-16s are distributed to the 122d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN (nine aircraft), and retirement (six aircraft). The 181st Fighter wing's ECS elements remain in place. Realign Dane County Regional Air Guard Station/Truax Field, WI, Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station, SD, Des Moines Air Guard Station, IA, Fort Wayne Air Guard Station, IN, and Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating baselevel F-110 intermediate maintenance to Capital, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Capital for F110 engines.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Capital (115) and Hulman (119) were both ranked low in military value by the fighter MCI. Although somewhat lower (130), the ANG recommended Fort Wayne be retained because of its record of recruiting and its proximity to Hulman—allowing the experienced airmen there to remain available to the Indiana ANG. This recommendation also helps align common versions of the F-16.

Establishing a CIRF at Capital consolidates F-110 engine intermediate maintenance for F-16 aircraft from five air reserve component units, and compliments other Air Force CIRF recommendations. The Capital CIRF is centrally located in proximity to the serviced installations and utilizes Capital's experienced people and existing facilities as part of an Air Force effort to standardize stateside and deployed intermediate-level maintenance concepts.

Community Concerns

The Illinois community objected to DoD's proposal to send Capital's aircraft to installations ranked lower in military capability and importance. Community leaders disagreed with DoD's assertion that the recruiting base will be stronger in Indiana, and emphasized Capital AGS is located close to St Louis, Chicago, and Louisville and is strategically located for homeland defense missions. They noted that DoD's overall proposals hurt Illinois significantly, with 2,700 jobs slated to move out of the state, and added that the installation's 355 full-time and 774 part-time Guardsmen contribute an estimated $44.7 million into the region's economy each year. The airport authority and state are willing to contribute land and some of the funds necessary to construct a needed munitions storage facility there.

The Hulman, IN, community argued its ANG unit has a long and distinguished history of flying fighter aircraft in support of combat operations around the world. The community understands older aircraft eventually need to be retired, and that another ANG unit in the state is proposed to gain more F-16s. The community proposes that its unit receive a Predator UAV mission and the Distributed Common Ground System. It also encouraged the Commission to recommend that any movement of aircraft or personnel be delayed until the Air Force releases a detailed realignment and re-missioning plan.

Commission Findings

The Commission supports the Department of Defense recommendation to realign Capital Air Guard Station and Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station. While valid community concerns were expressed over these realignments, the Commission found that the Air National Guard F-16 inventory is shrinking and that these two bases should have the capability to transition to emerging missions as they become defined. Therefore the Commission revised the DoD recommendation to be consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

A second aspect of the Department of Defense recommendation is related to a realignment of Dane County Regional Air Guard Station/Truax Field, Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station, Des Moines Air Guard Station, Fort Wayne Air Guard Station and Lackland Air Force Base. The Commission found the relocation of base-level F-110 intermediate maintenance to Capital, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Capital for F-16 engines, consistent with selection criteria and Force Structure Plan.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 183d Fighter Wing, Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL and the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 122d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN, to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 183d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN.

The Illinois ANG State Headquarters and the 217th Engineering Installation Squadron remain in place at Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL.

If the State of Illinois decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 183d Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 183d Fighter Wing, including the wing Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Illinois and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to the Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Capital for F110 engines, air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Illinois Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 183d Fighter Wing is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

Realign Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 181st Fighter Wing to meet the PAA requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 181st Fighter Wing's ECS elements remain in place.

If the State of Indiana decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 181st Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 181st Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Indiana and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Indiana Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 181st Fighter Wing is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

Realign Dane County Regional Air Guard Station/Truax Field, WI; Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station, SD; Des Moines Air Guard Station, IA; Fort Wayne Air Guard Station, IN; and Lackland Air Force Base, TX; by relocating base-level F-110 intermediate maintenance to Capital Air Guard Station, IL, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Capital for F110 engines.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA

Recommendation # 91 (Air Force 22)

One-time Cost:	$55.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($8.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($41.5M)
Payback Period:	8 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign NAS New Orleans ARS, LA. Distribute the 926th Fighter Wing's A-10 aircraft to the 442d Fighter Wing (AFR), Whiteman Air Force Base, MO (nine aircraft), and the 917th Wing (AFR) at Barksdale Air Force Base, LA (six aircraft). The 442nd wing HQ element realigns to Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and the wing Expeditionary Combat Support realigns to Buckley Air Force Base, CO.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Both Whiteman (28) and Barksdale (33) bases have a higher military value for the A-10 operational mission than New Orleans (49). These realignments bring the units at Whiteman and Barksdale to optimal size. Additionally, the Barksdale A-10 unit provides close air support to the US Army's Joint Readiness Training Center, one of the nation's premier joint training opportunities. Finally, realigning these A-10s to reserve units helped keep the active/Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve force structure mix constant.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found DoD's recommendation supportable, but revised the language to correct an oversight directing manpower movements from Whiteman AFB, rather than New Orleans ARS.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 3, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign NAS New Orleans ARS, LA. Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 926th Fighter Wing (AFR) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 24 PAA A-10 at the 442d Fighter Wing (AFR), Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri

Establish 24 PAA A-10 at the 917th Wing (AFR) at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana.

The 926th Wing HQ element realigns to Nellis Air Force Base, NV and the wing Expeditionary Combat Support realigns to Buckley Air Force Base, CO.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Andrews Air Force Base, MD, Will Rogers Air Guard Station, OK, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, and Randolph Air Force Base TX

Recommendation # 92 (Air Force 23)

One-time Cost:	$19.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($6.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($70M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD, by relocating the Air Force Flight Standards Agency (AFFSA) and its two C-21 aircraft to Will Rogers World Airport Air Guard Station, OK. Realign Randolph Air Force Base, TX, by relocating the USAF Advanced Instrument School (AIS) to Will Rogers Air Guard Station. Realign Tinker Air Force Base, OK, by relocating the Global Air Traffic Operations Program Office (GATOPO) to Will Rogers Air Guard Station. Realign Will Rogers Air Guard Station by relocating the 137th Airlift Wing (ANG) to Tinker Air Force Base and associate with the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR). The 137th's C-130H aircraft are distributed to the 136th Airlift Wing (ANG), Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX (four aircraft), and 139th Airlift Wing (ANG), Rosecrans Memorial Airport Air Guard Station, MO (four aircraft). The aerial port squadron at Will Rogers moves to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, the Aeromedical Squadron and firefighters move to Rosecrans AGB. Other elements of the 137th's Expeditionary Combat Support remain in place at Will Rogers.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Consolidating AFFSA, AIS, and GATOPO at Will Rogers World Airport creates synergy between the Air Force administrative aviation functions and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) located at Will Rogers World. Associating the ANG operation at Will Rogers (64-airlift) with the AFR operation at Tinker (four-tankers) consolidates and streamlines Air Force reserve component operations in Oklahoma City at a base of high military value. Additionally, this realignment creates two larger C-130 squadrons at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth (53) and Rosecrans Air Guard Station (114) from three undersized squadrons. Finally, this recommendation moves federal assets out of the National Capital Region, reducing the nation's vulnerability.

Community Concerns

No formal comments were received from community officials or civic organizations, but individual concerns were expressed in support of "community basing," recommending that existing ANG units be increased in size by assigning active-duty personnel and their associated aircraft to ANG facilities. Individuals maintained that this approach would allow the Air Force to close more active bases and realize greater savings than closing relatively inexpensive ANG bases. Other individual proposals suggested that the VIP transportation mission be transferred from the active Air Force to the ANG.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that this realignment was consistent with the Air Force's goals of creating larger, more efficient fighter aircraft squadrons and improving intermediate level maintenance processes. The Commission also found that the Secretary of Defense's overall intent and concept of realigning C-130 aircraft out of Will Rogers Air Guard Station was supportable. The Commission found that efficiencies would be gained by consolidating all Air Force aviation administration functions at Will Rogers Air Guard Station.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible

adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD, by relocating the Air Force Flight Standards Agency (AFFSA) and its two C-21 aircraft to Will Rogers World Airport Air Guard Station, OK.

Realign Randolph Air Force Base, TX, by relocating the USAF Advanced Instrument School (AIS) to Will Rogers Air Guard Station.

Realign Tinker Air Force Base, OK, by relocating the Global Air Traffic Operations Program Office (GATOPO) to Will Rogers Air Guard Station.

Realign Will Rogers Air Guard Station by relocating the 137th Airlift Wing (ANG) to Tinker Air Force Base and associate with the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR). Distribute the 137th Air Airlift Wing's (ANG) C-130 aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

If the State of Okalahoma decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 137th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 137th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Okalahoma and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Oklahoma Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 137th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 136th Airlift Wing ANG, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.

Establish 10 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 139th Airlift Wing (ANG), Rosecrans Memorial Airport Air Guard Station, MO.

The 137th Airlift Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support remains in place at Will Rogers Air Guard Station, Oklahoma.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Martin State Air Guard Station, MD

Recommendation # 93 (Air Force 24)

One-time Cost:	$24M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$27.4M
20-Year Net Present Value:	$353.7M
Payback Period:	Never

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

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

Secretary of Defense 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 two 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.

Community Concerns

The Maryland community opposed removing aircraft from the only fully operational C-130J organization in the Air Force. The proposed receiver sites do not have the demographics to support additional aircraft, as they are currently unable to staff their existing, smaller organizations. The 175th Airlift Wing leads the international C-130J implementation group and has developed most procedures for operating these new aircraft. Air Force analysis was based on erroneous runway length (2,000 feet short), gave no credit for landing zones although three exist within the evaluation area, and considered neither the demographic base for recruiting nor the retention effects of the realignment. The DoD proposal also failed to consider this unit's role in the National Capital Region's Continuity of Operation missions.

Commission Findings

The Commission notes the 175th Airlift Wing is the only fully operational C-130J unit in the Air Force; it plays an instrumental role in the introduction of this new aircraft, and is the leader of the international C-130J implementation group, which had developed most procedures for operating these aircraft. Further, it appears the Air Force analysis was based on erroneous runway length (2,000 feet short), gave no credit for landing zones, although three exist within the evaluation area, and considered neither the demographic base for recruiting nor the retention effects of the realignment. However, the Commission found that the factors did not rise to the level of being a substantial deviation of criteria. To support the Commission's Air National Guard and Reserve Laydown, the aircraft should be distributed from the 175th Airlift Wing.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1 , as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Martin State Air Guard Station (AGS), MD. Distribute the 8 C-130J aircraft assigned to the 175th Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 8 Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) C-130J at the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands AGS, California.

Establish 8 Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) C-130J at the 143d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport AGS, Rhode Island.

The Aerial Port Squadron located at Martin State Air Guard Station, Maryland will move to Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland.

If the State of Maryland decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 175th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 175th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Maryland and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Maryland Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 175th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert–St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO, and Atlantic City Air Guard Station, NJ

Recommendation # 94 (Air Force 25)

One-time Cost:	$53.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($27.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($305.4M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Otis ANGB, MA. The 102d Fighter Wing's F-15s will be distributed to the 125th Fighter Wing, Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, FL (three aircraft), and 177th Fighter Wing, Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, NJ (12 aircraft). The 253d Combat Communications Group, and 267th Communications Squadron will remain in place at Otis, with 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes providing administrative support as the parent wing. An air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility will be constructed at Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT. Firefighter positions from Otis will move to Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.

Realign Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, St. Louis, MO. The 131st Fighter Wing's F-15s (15 aircraft) will distribute to the 57th Fighter Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (nine aircraft), and 177th Fighter Wing, Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, NJ (six aircraft). Realign Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, NJ. The 177th Fighter Wing's F-16s will be distributed to the 158th Fighter Wing, Burlington International Airport Air Guard Station, VT (three aircraft), and retire (12 aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place. Firefighter positions move to Scott Air Force Base, IL. The 157 Air Operations Group (AOG) and the

218th Engineering Installation Group (EIG) will relocate from Jefferson Barracks geographically separated unit (GSU) into space at Lambert International. Jefferson Barracks real property accountability will transfer to the Army.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The Air Force distributed reserve component F-15C force structure to bases with higher military value than Otis (88) and Lambert-St. Louis (127). The F-15C aircraft are realigned to Nellis (13), Jacksonville Air Guard Station (24), and Atlantic City Air Guard Station (61). The Nellis bound aircraft will help form an enhanced aggressor squadron for Operation RED FLAG, and the Atlantic City bound aircraft will provide expanded capability for the homeland defense mission.

Community Concerns

The Massachusetts community, including public officials, criticized DoD's Mission Compatability Index (MCI) scores for Otis, arguing they failed to account for ample unsaturated range space and operational expansion potential at the Massachusetts Military Reservation (MMR). They attributed most data call errors and inconsistencies to the fact that distant commands, rather than local officials, submitted the responses.

They claimed closing Otis would eliminate the bill payer for the MMR and shift substantial overhead costs to remaining non-DoD tenants, including the several hundred housing units used by their families, These other tenant commands were never consulted about the additional costs to them of DoD's proposal, as required by law.

Further, they said closing Otis would compromise New England's air defense and hurt recruiting and retention. They asserted the loss of experienced maintainers and pilots would harm mission capabilities and questioned whether Atlantic City could reconstitute the same level of operational readiness.

Additionally, they stated that Otis is an alternate landing site for NASA space shuttles, the MMR is a primary training location for tens of thousands of homeland security personnel, and the base contributes critical services to the surrounding region, including firefighting, water supply, and waste management. Finally, they asserted that aircraft cannot be removed, and National Guard bases closed or realigned, without the Governor's consent.

The Missouri community also criticized MCI scores, claiming the Air Force's use of a one-size-fits-all approach is inherently biased in favor of large active-duty bases. Community leaders noted the Air National Guard (ANG) Bureau limited the size of ANG installations depending on the units' number of aircraft and mission. Lambert AGS is inherently efficient because it is co-located with an existing civilian airport.

They focused on the loss of homeland security air protection in key regions of the Midwest, and noted some data-call questions were irrelevant. They also said implementation of DoD's recommendations could adversely affect training due to limited classroom slots and increased costs, and the announced DoD recommendation has already hurt recruiting and retention. The loss of experienced people and the subsequent negative impact on combat capability has been especially ill-timed given the extensive demands of current combat missions.

Last, they asserted that aircraft cannot be removed, or National Guard bases closed or realigned, without the Governor's consent.

The Atlantic City New Jersey community supported DoD's proposal to expand and convert the 177th Fighter Wing, claiming its strategic location permits unparalleled air superiority coverage over five major US cities. New York City, in particular, can be reached within seven minutes of takeoff. The community was confident it could transfer to a new aircraft type, citing its 98.9 percent endstrength, very high Fully Mission Capable Rates, nearby training ranges, and modern infrastructure. Last, it expressed concern about retiring and relocating existing aircraft without first receiving new replacement aircraft from Otis and St. Louis.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to close Otis Air National Guard Base, and realign Lambert St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station and Atlantic City Air Guard Station should be supported in concept, but with modifications for homeland defense reasons. Despite community concerns related to Otis and Lambert, the Commission agreed with the removal of F-15 aircraft from both locations. The Commission urges the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Secretary of the Department of homeland security and the Commandant, United States Coast Guard to minimize any impact of Otis' closure on the operations of the Coast Guard. The Commission establishes an F-15

wing at Jacksonville, FL, an F-16 wing at Atlantic City, NJ, and an F-16 wing at Burlington, VT, consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Reserve Laydown.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Otis ANGB, MA. Distribute the fifteen F-15 aircraft assigned to the 102d Fighter Wing's (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 253d Combat Communications Group, and 267th Communications Squadron will remain in place at Otis, with 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes providing administrative support as the parent wing. An air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility will be constructed at Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA. Firefighter positions from Otis will move to Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.

If the Commonwealth of Massachusetts decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 102d Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 102d Fighter Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Massachusetts Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 102d Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth.

Realign Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, St. Louis, MO. Distribute the fifteen F-15 aircraft assigned to the 131st Fighter Wing to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 157th Air Operations Group (AOG) and the 218th Engineering Installation Group (EIG) will relocate from Jefferson Barracks geographically separated unit (GSU) into space at Lambert International. Jefferson Barracks real property accountability will transfer to the Army.

If the State of Missouri decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 131st Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 131st Fighter Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Missouri and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Missouri Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 131st Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 125th Fighter Wing, Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, Florida (ANG);

Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 177th Fighter Wing, Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, New Jersey (ANG);

Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 158th Fighter Wing, Burlington International Airport Air Guard Station, Vermont (ANG).

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

W.K. Kellogg Airport air guard station, MI

Recommendation # 95 (Air Force 27)

One-time Cost:	$8.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($11.2M)
Payback Period:	7 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI. Distribute the 110th Fighter Wing's A-10s (15 aircraft) to the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge ANGB, MI.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The Air Force placed one squadron at Selfridge (62) because it is significantly higher in military value than Kellogg (122). The Air Force retired the older F-16s from Selfridge and combined the two A-10 units into one squadron at Selfridge to retain trained and skilled Michigan ANG Airmen from both locations.

Community Concerns

The community cites high volunteerism for rotation to Southwest Asia, repeated outstanding operational readiness inspections, and a nearly new facility as reasons to keep the base open. The community noted it paid to extend the runway to 10,000 feet, purchased land to maintain clear zones, and matched Federal grants funding the new air traffic control tower. Kellogg Airport is conjoined with Ft Custer Army Guard with 7,500 acres of training area, and the state has offered to construct a road directly connecting the two areas. The 110th Wing is manned at over 100 percent even though the local population is small.

The community pointed out that the unit scores ahead of its ANG contemporaries in military value analysis, although it believes the scores did not fully value existing physical plant (ramp, facilities), training ranges and airspace.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that Since December 2003, the base has completed a number of military construction projects to upgrade its facilities. The Commission also found that Kellogg is used as a strategic launch platform by the Air Force, Marine Corps Reserve, and Army Reserve. Kellogg's location provides for joint training and operations with contiguous Ft. Custer. Because the Mission Compatibility Index erroneously under valued Kellogg's military value, the Commission did not support the Department's recommendation to close the base. The A-10 squadron at Selfridge will have 24 aircraft and provide more opportunities for airmen at Kellogg.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and

maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI. Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 110th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish a contiguous enclave for the 110th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport. If the State of Michigan decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 110th Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 110th Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Michigan and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Michigan Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 110th Fighter Wing is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN

Recommendation # 96 (Air Force 28)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN, by retiring the 148th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft).

Secretary of Defense Justification

Duluth (136) ranked low in military value. The reduction in F-16 force structure and the need to align common versions of the F-16 at the same bases argued for realigning Duluth to an ASA site using aircraft assigned elsewhere and operating from Duluth on rotational basis as tasked by US Northern Command. The 148th Fighter Wing's expeditionary combat support will remain at Duluth supporting the air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility.

Community Concerns

The community of Duluth stated DoD should not strip a unit with 103 percent endstrength of all its aircraft while retaining other units' aircraft with weaker recruiting and retention. It highlighted its unobstructed airspace for flight training, an

ongoing $26 million renovation building the military's newest aircraft maintenance hangar, and a new $3.5 million Naval Reserve Center as reasons to reject the DoD proposal.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to realign Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station did not accurately assess the base's military value. The Commission found that the military value calculation for Duluth did not give proper credit to new construction, ranges, airspace, low level routes, munitions storage capacity and runway length. The Department of Defense identified Duluth as retaining an air sovereignty alert facility after its realignment, thus the Commission retained F-16s at Duluth.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 2 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 148th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 15 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 148th Fighter Wing (ANG), Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Key Field Air Guard Station, MS

Recommendation # 97 (Air Force 28)

One-time Cost:	$10.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($2.6M)
Payback Period:	13 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Key Field Air Guard Station, MS. Distribute the 186th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 128th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), General Mitchell Air Guard Station, WI (three aircraft); the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, TN (three aircraft); and 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station, ME (two aircraft). One aircraft will revert to backup aircraft inventory. The 186th Air Refueling Wing's firefighter positions move to the 172nd Air Wing at Jackson International Airport, MS, and the expeditionary combat support (ECS) will remain in place.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Receiver locations General Mitchell (86) and McGhee-Tyson (74) ranked higher in military value for the tanker mission than Key Field (92). Bangor (123) also received aircraft within this recommendation. Military judgment argued for the increased unit size at Bangor because of its critical role as host base for Northeast Tanker Task Force support to the transatlantic air bridge. Key Field's newer KC-135R aircraft help replace McGhee-Tyson's older, higher maintenance KC-135E models, and help increase the unit size. The remainder of Key Field's realigned aircraft help increase the squadron size at General Mitchell and maintain critical backup aircraft inventory levels. Bangor, McGhee-Tyson, and General Mitchell gain additional KC-135 aircraft to their maximum available capacity, increasing both effectiveness and unit capability. Key Field's ECS remains in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained, experienced airmen.

Community Concerns

The community argued DoD's recommendation would negatively affect training and readiness and incur costs exceeding projected 20-year savings. Community representatives stated the Tanker Mission Compatibility Index inadequately measured the base's "Optimal Proximity" to airspace supporting its mission. They argued larger tanker presence in the Southeastern United States is needed to fulfill refueling requirements for receiver aircraft in the region, because using more distant tankers would add extra flight time and cost. They claimed Key Field was not properly evaluated for: its aircraft hangar, inexpensive expansion potential, KC-135 simulator, high historical manning rates, lack of noise and encroachment problems, potential loss of experienced personnel, negative economic impact on the region, and high Operations and Personnel Tempo in support of current worldwide missions and taskings. The community wants to keep its KC-135 mission and argued that the Governor and Adjutant General were not consulted on this recommendation.

Commission Findings

The Commission noted the Department of Defense failed to account for costs associated with relocating the KC-135 full-motion simulator at Key Field (one of only four such simulators in the Air National Guard). The aggregate of both programmatic and BRAC-related aircraft movements into and out of the Southeastern United States, including Air Force, Navy and Marine aircraft could lead to a shortage of regional air-refueling aircraft for training and homeland defense mission support. The Commission found that this potential shortfall is one of economic efficiency, not operational deficiency. The Commission further found that the Secretary of Defense's overall intent and concept of redistributing KC-135s out of Key Field AGS was supportable if the potential shortfall of cost-effective air-refueling support is mitigated by rejecting one of the Department of Defense's recommendations to reduce the number of KC-135 tanker aircraft in the Southeast. The commission found that Birmingham IAP AGS, AL had the best military value to meet the potential shortfall, and therefore found that the recommendation for Key Field Air Guard Station is supportable.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 3 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Key Field Air Guard Station, MS. Distribute the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG)'s KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 12 PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 128th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), General Mitchell Air Guard Station, Wisconsin.

If the State of Mississippi decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force:

Establish Key Field as a Regional Operations and Security Center (ROSC) location, with the 186th Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remaining in place;

Reassign a sufficient number of aircrews and maintenance personnel of the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to the 172d Airlift Wing (ANG), a C-17 unit located on Thompson Field, Mississippi to bring that unit to a fully manned status, with the Air Force providing retraining where necessary, and;

All other personnel allotted to the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Mississippi and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Mississippi Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT

Recommendation # 98 (Air Force 30)

One-time Cost:	$6.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$0.05M
20-Year Net Present Value:	$7.2M
Payback Period:	Never

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT. Distribute the 120th Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 187th Fighter Wing, Dannelly Field Air Guard Station, AL (three aircraft); the 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (three aircraft); and retire (nine aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements remain in place.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Great Falls (117) ranked low in military value. The reduction in F-16 force structure and the need to align common versions of the F-16 at the same bases argued for realigning F-16s out of Great Falls. The F-16s realign to Dannelly (60) and Des Moines (137). Although Des Moines was ranked somewhat lower in military value than Great Falls, the realignment to Des Moines creates a more effective unit of 18 aircraft. The wing's ECS will remain in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained, experienced Air National Guard personnel.

Community Concerns

The Great Falls, MT, community criticized MCI scores, claiming the Air Force's use of a one-size-fits-all approach is inherently biased in favor of large active-duty bases. Community leaders noted the Air National Guard (ANG) Bureau limited the size of ANG installations depending on the units' number of aircraft and mission. Great Falls AGS has reaped efficiencies because it is co-located with an existing civilian airport. They are particularly concerned that if DoD's recommendation is approved, they will not receive a significant emerging mission to backfill the loss. If aircraft must be realigned, they counter-proposed those aircraft be relocated to the nearby Malmstrom AFB instead of being sent to another state.

They also said implementation of DoD's recommendations could adversely affect training due to limited classroom slots and increased costs, and the announced DoD recommendation has already hurt recruiting and retention. The loss of experienced people and the subsequent negative impact on combat capability has been especially ill-timed given the extensive demands of current combat missions. Last, they asserted that aircraft cannot be removed, or National Guard bases closed or realigned, without the Governor's consent. The base has 300 full-time and 700 part-time jobs. There is concern in the community about knowing exactly how many jobs would be affected and what any (currently unidentified) new mission would be.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station could not be supported due to the fact that its outstanding airspace and lack of encroachment were not properly considered. The Commission recognized that due to a shrinking number of F-16s available, the unit would have to give up its F-16s. The tremendous airspace but no impact range in Montana implied an air sovereignty mission and the Commission found this location valuable for F-15 C/D aircraft. Further, the Commission established an F-16 squadron at Dannelly Field, Alabama and F-16 squadron at Des Moines, Iowa, which is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Reserve Laydown plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT. Distribute the fifteen F-16 aircraft assigned to the 120th Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 15 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 120th Fighter Wing (ANG), Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT.

Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 187th Fighter Wing (ANG), Dannelly Field Air Guard Station, AL.

Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 132d Fighter Wing Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (ANG).

The wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remain in place.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV

Recommendation # 99 (Air Force 31)

One-time Cost:	N/A*
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A*
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A*
Payback Period:	N/A*

* *No COBRA data available*

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV. Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 152nd Airlift Wing (ANG) to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base, AR. Flying related Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) moves to Channel Islands Air Guard Station, CA (aerial port), and Fresno Air Guard Station, CA (firefighters). The remaining ECS elements and the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) remain in place.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation distributes C-130 force structure to a higher military value base. Because of limitations to land and ramp space, Reno was unable to expand beyond 10 C-130s. This recommendation realigns Reno's (101) C-130s to the Air National Guard at Little Rock Air Force Base (17), where a larger, more effective squadron size is possible. This larger squadron at Little Rock also creates the opportunity for an association between active duty and the Air National Guard, optimizing aircraft utilization.

Community Concerns

The community opposed DoD's proposal, citing data discrepancies regarding ramp space, surge, and fuel capacity, and noted that the unit has had a positive long-term relationship with the community. The proposal would severely degrade the state's ability to deal both with natural disasters and homeland security. The local airport authority would lose Air Guard support for key responsibilities and support functions, and the Reno Fire Department would lose the unit's firefighting, airlift, and unique camera assets.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to realign Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station was based on insufficient military value data. The Commission noted that the C-130s at Reno have a special intelligence and reconnaissance mission. Therefore the Commission established a C-130 squadron at Reno-Tahoe IAP and at Little Rock AFB, Arkansas. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 3, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV. Distribute the 8 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 152d Airlift Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 9 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas.

Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 152d Airlift Wing (ANG), Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, Nevada.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Cannon Air Force Base, NM

Recommendation # 100 (Air Force 32)

One-time Cost:	$108.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($206.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($2,647.5M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Cannon Air Force Base, NM. Distribute the 27th Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 115th Fighter Wing, Dane County Regional Airport, Truax Field Air Guard Station, WI (three aircraft); 114th Fighter Wing, Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station, SD (three aircraft); 150th Fighter Wing, Kirtland Air Force Base, NM (three aircraft); 113th Wing, Andrews Air Force Base, MD (nine aircraft); 57th Fighter Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (seven aircraft), the 388th Wing at Hill Air Force Base, UT (six aircraft), and backup inventory (29 aircraft).

Secretary of Defense Justification

Cannon has a unique F-16 force structure mix. The base has one F-16 Block 50 squadron, one F-16 Block 40 squadron, and one F-16 Block 30 squadron. All active-duty Block 50 bases have higher military value than Cannon. Cannon's Block 50s move to backup inventory using standard Air Force programming percentages for fighters. Cannon's F-16 Block 40s move to

Nellis Air Force Base (seven aircraft) and Hill Air Force Base (six aircraft to right-size the wing at 72 aircraft) and to backup inventory (11 aircraft). Nellis (12) and Hill (14) have a higher military value than Cannon (50). The remaining squadron of F-16 Block 30s (18 aircraft) are distributed to Air National Guard units at Kirtland Air Force Base, NM (16), Andrews Air Force Base, MD (21), Joe Foss Air Guard Station, SD (112), and Dane-Truax Air Guard Station, WI (122). These moves sustain the active/Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve force mix by replacing aircraft that retire in the 2025 Force Structure Plan.

Community Concerns

The Clovis community, including virtually all of its elected representatives, strongly argued that Cannon Air Force Base, one of three active-duty operational F-16 fighter bases, should remain open. They opposed the DoD recommendation, arguing that it deviated substantially from BRAC selection criteria. For instance, they claimed DoD did not appropriately consider the effect of encroachment on existing and future operations, the proposed New Mexico Training Range Initiative (NMTRI), or force structure retention and quality of life. They argued a realistic evaluation of long-term military value would close bases with significant encroachment problems, rather than Cannon. The community also argued the military-value-weighted analytical process failed to properly evaluate Cannon's military value for the next 20 years for current and future missions, condition of infrastructure, contingency, mobilization, future forces and the cost of operations. Leaders argued that DoD used inaccurate, incomplete, outdated, and misleading data. The community was also deeply concerned about potential unemployment. While DoD projected the loss of approximately 20 percent of the community's jobs, the community argued that DoD considered only Clovis and did not consider the nearby town of Portales. The community estimates the cumulative economic impact on the affected region to be approximately 30 percent, which in its view is a major deviation from Selection Criteria 6.

Commission Findings

DoD's justification for closing Cannon was the Air Force's overriding strategy to more effectively employ the shrinking Air Force structure by organizing its weapon systems into fewer, larger squadrons and by eliminating excess physical capacity. The Commission found this recommendation would allow the Air Force to relocate newer model F-16s as backup inventory to Active and to Air National Guard units. These moves would sustain the Active, the Air National Guard, and the Reserve force mix by replacing F-16 aircraft that will be retired in the 2025 Force Structure Plan.

The Commission found that prior to BRAC the Air Force had approved a programmatic out year reduction of 1,150 personnel at Cannon. This action, when combined with BRAC would result in an economic impact on the Clovis area of about 29 percent, which is about 10 percent greater than the economic impact reported by the DoD.

The Commission found that the 20-year Net Present Value savings for closing Cannon, while still significant, were substantially reduced when military personnel savings were eliminated.

The Commission further found that there is merit in disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing and distributing its aircraft as recommended by DoD. The Commission also found that realigning Cannon Air Force Base as an enclave would enable DoD to meet potential needs for additional air base capacity.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 6 and 7, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM by disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing and distributing its aircraft to meet the primary Aircraft Authorization (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. After disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing, the Air Force shall establish an enclave at Cannon Air Force Base that shall remain open until December 31, 2009 during which time the Secretary of Defense shall seek other newly-identified missions with all military services for possible assignment to Cannon Air Force Base, NM. If the Secretary designates a mission for Cannon Air Force Base during this period, the enclave would revert to the status appropriate for the designated mission. If the Secretary does not find a mission for Cannon Air Force Base by December 31, 2009, Cannon Air Force Base and the enclave shall be closed. Nothing in this directive shall prohibit the State of New Mexico and the Department of Defense from entering into an agreement to close the enclave at Cannon Air Force Base earlier than December 31, 2009.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY

Recommendation # 101 (Air Force 33)

One-time Cost:	$4.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.26M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$1.2M
Payback Period:	26 YEARS

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station (ARS), NY. Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 914th Airlift Wing (AFR) to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR. The 914th's headquarters moves to Langley Air Force Base, VA, the Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) realigns to the 310th Space Group (AFR) at Schriever Air Force Base, CO, and the Civil Engineering Squadron moves to Lackland Air Force Base, TX. Also at Niagara, distribute the eight KC-135R aircraft of the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station, ME. The 101st will subsequently retire its eight KC-135E aircraft, and no Air Force aircraft remain at Niagara.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation distributes C-130 force structure to Little Rock (17-airlift), a base with higher military value. These transfers move C-130 force structure from the Air Force Reserve to the active duty, addressing a documented imbalance in the active/reserve manning mix for C-130s. Additionally, this recommendation distributes more capable KC-135R aircraft to Bangor (123), replacing the older, less capable KC-135E aircraft. Bangor supports the Northeast Tanker Task Force and the Atlantic air bridge.

Community Concerns

Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station (NFARS) community representatives highlighted the proximity of NFARS to the busy US-Canadian border, and claimed that closure would harm America's homeland defense capabilities. They pointed out that NFARS supports elements of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army Reserves and National Guard, Coast Guard, Drug Enforcement Agency, and Customs and Border Protection. Local agencies benefiting from NFARS include Red Cross, the fire department, county sheriff, and the Niagara Falls Police. A chief concern of the community was how these agencies would be supported in the event NFARS closed.

Community representatives felt the Air Force recommendations were based on outdated or incomplete information. The "WIDGET" model, used to develop the MCI scores, did not allow for the use of 388,503 square feet of Federally owned ramp space available for use by NFARS. Further, the use of data for fiscal year 2003 did not capture significant reductions for base operating support that occurred in fiscal years 2004 through 2005. Had these factors been incorporated into DoD's analysis, the Community believes the outcome might have been different.

Last, community advocates noted that the base is located in an economically depressed region and is the second largest employer in the area. Community leaders maintained that the COBRA model underestimated the economic impact on the locality by including Niagara Falls in the Buffalo, NY, Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) population estimates.

The Department of Defense estimated a job loss of 1,072. However, members of the Niagara Military Affairs Council (NIMAC) contend that closing NFARS will result in the loss of 2,906 jobs, eliminating 3.5 percent of Niagara County's job base and potentially increasing the area's unemployment rate from 6.1 percent to 7 percent. They maintain that this will create an "economic tipping point" that will cause irreversible damage. Community representatives indicated that conditions for successful redevelopment of NFARS do not exist. Since 2001; manufacturing employment is down 19.4 percent, information technology employment is down 27.6 percent, employment in the financial services sector is down 5.6 percent, and employment in the transportation and utilities industries is down by 3.9 percent.

Commission Findings

The DoD justification for closing Niagara Falls ARS was part of a larger effort to restructure the C-130 fleet from reserve units to active-duty units at Little Rock, in order to address an imbalance in the C-130 active/reserve manning structure. It also was intended to relocate the KC-135Rs to replace older KC-135E tankers at Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station.

The Commission found that Niagara Falls ARS has won Air Force Reserve Command's recruiting awards for the last two years. Both Guard and Reserve wings exceeded their recruiting goals by 20 percent and have retention rates exceeding 95 percent. The Commission found that closing this installation would have affected future manpower requirements and would degrade current and future nighttime operations.

The Air Reserve Station is used jointly by the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, and the Army Reserve and is one of only two Air Force installations on which Guard and Reserve units are collocated with shared facilities. Finally, the installation supports other Federal users with homeland defense missions, including the: FBI, Army Guard, Coast Guard, Civil Air Patrol, Customs and Border Protection, and DEA. The Commission found that closing Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station would be detrimental to joint warfighting and homeland defense operations.

The Commission found that the savings associated with closing Niagara Falls ARS were overestimated by the Department of Defense as a result of recent cost reductions.

Niagara Falls is the second largest employer in an economically depressed region. According to data provided by the community, the closure of Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station would have resulted in the loss of 2,906 jobs as opposed to the 1,072 estimated by the Department of Defense. This figure represents 3.5 percent of the county's job base and would have increased the area's unemployment rate from 6.1 percent to over 7 percent.

The Commission also found the need to strengthen the Atlantic Air Bridge by transferring eight KC-135Rs from Niagara Falls ARS. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Niagara Falls ARS, NY. Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 10 PAA KC-135R/T at the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station, Maine. The 101st Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aircraft Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.

All personnel allotted to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and form an Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve associate wing with the 914th Airlift Wing. Establish a contiguous enclave for the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operation of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Air Reserve Station as a civilian airport. Guard personnel will be provided the training necessary to support the airlift mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the New York Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft

concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY

Recommendation # 102 (Air Force 34)

One-time Cost:	N/A*
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A*
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A*
Payback Period:	N/A*

* *No COBRA data available*

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station (Air Guard Station), NY. The 109th Airlift Wing (ANG) will transfer four C-130H aircraft to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base, AR.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation distributes C-130 force structure to Little Rock (17), which has higher military value. Adding aircraft to the ANG unit at Little Rock creates a larger, more effective squadron. The LC-130 aircraft (ski-equipped) remain at Schenectady (117).

Community Concerns

Community representatives indicated that most full time and traditional Guard members will not follow the aircraft to Little Rock AFB, AR. The nearest bases from which Guard members could operate are more than 50 miles away, with some in excess of 100 miles. Additionally, they suggested that removing the C-130H will increase the usage of the ski-mounted LC-130s and shorten their operable lifespan by approximately 25percent. The community reiterated its challenge to the legality of the proposed realignment, stating that (1) the proposed movement of aircraft is not related to infrastructure restructuring, (2) recommendations to relocate, withdraw, disband, or change the organization of an ANG unit, unless done so for infrastructure rationalization, is inconsistent with the intent of BRAC legislation, and (3) programmatic moves of aircraft are inconsistent with BRAC objectives. Last, community advocates stated that DoD's recommendations diminished the Governor's and DoD's ability to defend the State by reducing the Governor's ability to respond with airlift to high terror threat areas such as New York City, Buffalo and other highly populated northeast centers.

Commission Findings

The Secretary of Defense recommended realigning Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, New York by transferring four C-130H aircraft to Little Rock Air Force Base, AR as "part of a larger effort to restructure the C-130 fleet at Little Rock, which has a higher military value. By adding aircraft to the Air National Guard unit in Little Rock, the Department of Defense believes a larger, more effective squadron could be created."

The Commission found the 109th Airlift Wing at Schenectady provides the nation's only air cargo lift capability to polar destinations. The unit flies four C-130s and six LC-130s. Removing the C-130s would eliminate the unit's unique summer mission serving the Arctic and Antarctica. The Commission established a 10-PAA C-130 squadron wing at Schenectady and this finding is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Reserve Laydown plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, 2 and 3, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station (Air Guard Station), NY. Establish 10 Primary Authorized Aircraft (PAA) (L)C-130H at the 109th Airlift Wing (ANG), Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, and Yeager Air Guard Station, WV

Recommendation # 103 (Air Force 35)

One-time Cost:	$191.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($209.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($2,711.5M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Pope Air Force Base, NC. Distribute the 43rd Airlift Wing's C-130E aircraft (25 aircraft) to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR; realign the 23rd Fighter Group's A-10 aircraft (36 aircraft) to Moody Air Force Base, GA; transfer real property accountability to the Army; disestablish the 43rd Medical Group and establish a medical squadron. At Little Rock Air Force Base, AR, realign eight C-130E aircraft to backup inventory; retire 27 C-130Es; realign one C-130J aircraft to the 143rd Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station, RI; two C-130Js to the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands Air Guard Station, CA; and transfer four C-130Js from the 314th Airlift Wing (AD) to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base.

Realign Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), WV, by realigning eight C-130H aircraft to Pope/Fort Bragg to form a 16 aircraft Air Force Reserve/active duty associate unit, and by relocating flying-related expeditionary combat support (ECS) to Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport/Shepherd Field AGS (aerial port and fire fighters). Close Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), PA, and relocate 911th Airlift Wing's (AFRC) eight C-130H aircraft to Pope/Fort Bragg to form a 16 aircraft Air Force Reserve/active duty associate unit. Relocate AFRC operations and maintenance manpower to Pope/Fort Bragg. Relocate flight related ECS (aeromedical squadron) to Youngstown-Warren Regional APT ARS.

Relocate all remaining Pittsburgh ECS and headquarters manpower to Offutt Air Force Base, NE. Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Downsizing Pope Air Force Base takes advantage of mission-specific consolidation opportunities to reduce operational costs, maintenance costs and the manpower footprint. The smaller manpower footprint facilitates transfer of the installation to the Army. Active-duty C-130s and A-10s will move to Little Rock (17-airlift) and Moody (11-SOF/CSAR), respectively, to consolidate force structure at those two bases and enable Army recommendations at Pope. At Little Rock, older aircraft are retired or converted to back-up inventory and J-model C-130s are aligned under the Air National Guard. Little Rock grows to become the single major active-duty C-130 unit, streamlining maintenance and operation of this aging weapon system. At Pope, the synergistic, multi-service relationship will continue between Army airborne and Air Force airlift forces with the creation of an active duty/Reserve associate unit. The C-130 unit remains as an Army tenant on an expanded Fort Bragg. With the disestablishment of the 43rd Medical Group, the Air Force will maintain the required manpower to provide primary care, flight and occupational medicine to support the Air Force active-duty military members. The Army will maintain the required manpower necessary to provide primary care, flight, and occupational medicine to support the Army active-duty military members. The Army will provide ancillary and specialty medical services for all assigned Army and Air Force military members (lab, X-ray, pharmacy, etc).

The major command's capacity briefing reported Pittsburgh ARS land constraints prevented the installation from hosting more than 10 C-130 aircraft, and Yeager AGS cannot support more than eight C-130s. Careful analysis of mission capability indicates that it is more appropriate to increase the proposed airlift mission at Fort Bragg to an optimal 16 aircraft C-130 squadron, which provides greater military value and offers unique opportunities for Jointness.

Community Concerns

Representatives from the Pope Air Force Base (AFB) community expressed concerns about the effect of the recommendations on safety and Army operations. They maintained that safety is paramount at Pope AFB. It was noted that DoD's recommendation would not change the mission at Pope and that air transport is the most critical aspect of the nation's power projection capability. Community representatives stated "current leadership at Pope/Fort Bragg would execute the mission and make it successful" but that "it would be unique [in] the Army to run an airfield of the magnitude and operations tempo of Pope." It was suggested that costs could actually increase if the Army were to take over the installation because of the additional costs associated with contracted labor. The example cited was that a civilian air traffic controller salary is three times that of a military air traffic controller. Community representatives recommended instead that Pope AFB become a C-130J Operational Center of Excellence. The C-130J is air-refuelable, making it very conducive to the mission of Fort Bragg. The same concerns were expressed about the Commission's vote to consider expanding the scope of realignment of Pope as well.

The key issues for Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station pertained to the availability of land and whether it was considered in the Air Force model used to calculate military value. Community advocates contended that 50 to 100 acres are available for expansion of the airport, and cited memoranda of agreements since 1993 with the Pittsburgh International Airport to use an additional 21.7 acres adjacent to the Air Reserve Station. Community representatives maintained that DoD's recommendations ignored opportunities for jointness and pointed to a report which noted that the installation supports the Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) by providing 9,000 applicants annually with testing, billeting, and dining, resulting in annual savings for the Army of $1.2 million. Additionally, the installation firing range is used by 50 local, State, and Federal (military and civilian) agencies and is one of the few ranges that allows for the firing of .50 caliber ammunition.

Advocates also expressed concerns about the base exchange, credit union, chapel, fitness center, consolidated club, and billeting, which are used by the 911th AW, the 171st ARW and the 99th Regional Readiness Command. The base also hosts the regional Casualty Assistance Office, and the 911th Communications Center provides Communications Security (COMSEC) and classified storage capability to over 50 Federal agencies and 100 percent of the Air National Guard's 171st Air Refueling Wing's communication needs. Last, advocates stated that the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) value used in the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) model for calculating economic impact was incorrect.

The West Virginia community, including elected officials, argued that approximately half of the 320 full-time employees would leave the unit if the planes are removed from the base and that this would cripple the mission effectiveness of a unit with over 100 percent endstrength. They also stated DoD's proposal would reduce joint training opportunities and significantly hinder the ability to rapidly transport a civil response team in the event of an emergency. The community contended DoD's claim that Yeager's ramp space could support no more than eight C-130s was refuted when 15 C-130s were on the ramp during a recent training exercise. Last, it would be difficult to recover from the loss of the base's $71 million annual contribution to the local economy.

Commission Findings

The Department of Defense recommendation for realigning Pope Air Force Base, NC; closing the Pittsburgh IAP ARS PA; and realigning Yeager Air Guard Station (AGS), WV was part of a larger effort to restructure the C-130 fleet. The need for restructuring was driven by the age of the C-130E model aircraft and the participation in the replacement C-130J procurement program.

Given the importance of airlift to the Fort Bragg mission, there was concern regarding how the Air Force recommendation would be implemented. Other than the recommendation to form an Active Duty/Reserve Associate unit with the 16 C-130s transferred to Pope from Yeager and Pittsburgh, there was no discussion of how airlift operations would continue to be conducted in support of Fort Bragg. Particular concern focused on the loss of an execution planning cell and the informal working relationships that currently exists between elements at Fort Bragg and the 43rd Airlift Wing at Pope. In light of the importance of the Fort Bragg mission to national security, the Commission found the proposed action had the potential to

detrimentally affect that mission. Therefore, the Commission modified the DoD recommendation to establish an Air Force Air Operation Support Group at Pope AFB.

The justification for realigning Yeager and closing Pittsburgh was based on a 2003 data call. These data indicated that Yeager was unable to host more than eight C-130s and that Pittsburgh was unable to host more than ten C-130s. The Air Force had previously determined that the optimal size for a C-130 squadron was 16, but that 12 was an acceptable number for an Air Force Reserve or Air National Guard Squadron. Whether the data were outdated or the response misinterpreted, the Commission found that the resulting conclusions were incorrect. The Wing Commander at Yeager AGS, WV reported that the unit can park 12 C-130s. Commission staff observed eleven aircraft parked at the installation during our base visit.

Rather than closing Pittsburgh IAP ARS, the Commission determined that it should be realigned as an enclave on which a Regional Joint Readiness Center would be established. Since the Commission retained C-130 Aircraft at Pittsburgh, the Commission urges that the Department of Defense take affirmative action to identify and permanently locate and operate an optimum number of C-130 aircraft as a detachment to the Pittsburgh IAP ARS enclave in order that it may support the mission of the Regional Joint Readiness Center as well as current Air Force Reserve Command missions.

The Commission found reason to be concerned about Little Rock AFB's ability to receive the recommended number of aircraft. BRAC staff verified that a comprehensive capacity analysis had not been conducted. Consequently, the total Military Construction costs to accommodate all the C-130 BRAC related moves to Little Rock were originally underestimated by approximately 63 percent. Recent USAF estimates are $246.7 million.

The Commission also found that the existing national security issues and the need to support the Fort Bragg mission overruled the deviations from the BRAC selection criteria. The Commission established a C-130 wing at Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station, Rhode Island; Channel Islands Air Guard Station, California; Little Rock AFB, Arkansas; and at Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia; consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Reserve Laydown plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 2 and 3, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Pope Air Force Base, NC. Distribute the 25 C-130E aircraft assigned to the 43d Air Lift Wing and the 36 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 23d Fighter Group to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 16 PAA C-130H aircraft at Pope Army Air Field, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Establish 48 PAA A-10 aircraft at Moody Air Force Base, Georgia.

Transfer real property accountability to the Army; disestablish the 43d Medical Group and establish a medical squadron. The Air Force will establish an Air Support Operations Group to provide unity of command of Air Force units on Pope Army Air Field, mission execution planning, and management of efficient loadout of Fort Bragg assets.

Realign Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas. Distribute 39 of the C-130 aircraft assigned to Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 8 PAA C-130J aircraft at the 143d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station, Rhode Island;

Establish 8 PAA C-130J aircraft at the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands Air Guard Station, California;

Establish 9 PAA C-130 aircraft at 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base.

Realign Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), West Virginia. Establish 8 PAA C-130H aircraft at Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), West Virginia.

Realign Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), Pennsylvania. Establish a contiguous enclave at the Pittsburgh ARS, Pennsylvania sufficient to support continued operations of the reserve station units, including flight operations, and compatible with combined use of the civilian airport by the Air Reserve, Air National Guard and civilian users. Within that enclave, establish a Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC) at the Pittsburgh International Air Station with the mission of providing civil-military operations, homeland security and community-based medical support to the Department of Defense and the Department of homeland security National Incident Management Plan and the National

Response Plan. The enclave and RJRC will be staffed at the current manning level of the ARS. The PAA and personnel allocations of Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected by this recommendation.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND

Recommendation # 104 (Air Force 37)

One-time Cost:	$104.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($66.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($637.1M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB), ND. Distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 126th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Scott AFB, IL (12 aircraft), which retires its eight KC-135E aircraft; the 916th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Seymour Johnson AFB, NC (eight aircraft), which will host an active duty associate unit; the 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill AFB, FL (four aircraft), which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) manpower realigned from Selfridge ANGB, MI; the 154th Wing (ANG), Hickam AFB, HI (four aircraft), which will host an active duty associate unit; and the 22nd Air Refueling Wing, McConnell AFB, KS (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, KS, 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.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Grand Forks (40-tanker) ranked lowest in military value of all active-duty KC-135 bases. However, of 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 US (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 strengthens 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.

Community Concerns

The North Dakota community welcomed the future Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) mission, while arguing DoD underestimated Grand Forks' value as a tanker base. They claimed the Mission Compatibility Index (MCI) score

undervalued "Proximity to Airspace Supporting Mission." The community noted that the base is strategically located in the north-central United States, providing reduced flight times to key worldwide locations via shorter polar routes. In addition, DoD undervalued the absence of encroachment or air quality issues; outstanding infrastructure, to include a completely new runway estimated for completion in October 2005; the base's support for nuclear missions; large amounts of available airspace; acreage and expansion opportunities; and its high Operations Tempo in support of the Global War on Terror. The community is concerned that the 24 aircraft Grand Forks will distribute to Air Reserve Component bases under DoD's recommendation would be utilized at a significantly lower rate than while at Grand Forks.

The community asks why DoD recommended realigning its tankers since the Air Force's 2003 "Tanker Roadmap" programmed Grand Forks for the first base to fully bed down KC-135 replacement aircraft (then scheduled for delivery in FY08). The community noted its strong relationship with the base, even more so since the 1997 flood, and cited its selection twice for the Abilene Trophy for most outstanding community support within Air Mobility Command. The community suggested that a recommendation to move tankers should call for distribution "as directed by the Secretary of the Air Force," and that the base's facilities, real property and housing be preserved to support a squadron of 12 KC-135s and a family of UAVs.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that Grand Forks has ample capacity and conditions for current and future flying missions, to include the Department of Defense's intent to bed down a family of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs). The Commission also found that the Secretary of Defense's overall intent and concept of realigning KC-135s out of Grand Forks AFB was supportable. The Commission found reason to maintain a limited KC-135 presence on the base to facilitate an effective and cost-efficient mission conversion pending stand-up of a UAV.

The Commission found that Fiscal Year 2004 flying hour data revealed Air National Guard and Reserve bases slated to receive Grand Forks aircraft as a result of DoD's recommendations flew their currently assigned aircraft an average of 49 percent fewer hours per aircraft per year, while Active Duty receiver bases flew their KC-135s an average of 8 percent more. DoD's original recommendation would have resulted in 67 percent of Grand Forks aircraft realigning to Air Guard and Reserve bases, though the Commission found this was consistent with Air Force proportionality goals noting that Air Guard and Reserve forces currently operate 62 percent of the KC-135 fleet.

With regard to McConnell Air National Guard Base, KS, the Commission found the Secretary of Defense's intent and concept of redistributing the Air National Guard operated KC-135s was supportable.

The Commission established Air National Guard KC-135 wings at: Scott AFB, Illinois, Seymour-Johnson AFB, North Carolina, MacDill AFB, Florida, Hickam AFB, Hawaii, McConnell AFB, Kansas, and Forbes Field, Kansas. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard Laydown plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 3, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB), ND. Distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish the following KC-135R/T PAA:

The 126th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Scott AFB, IL (eight PAA KC-135R/T). The 126th Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft;

The 916th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Seymour-Johnson AFB, NC (16 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host an active duty associate unit;

The 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill AFB, FL (16 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) manpower realigned from Selfridge ANGB, MI;

The 154th Wing (ANG), Hickam AFB, HI (12 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host an active duty associate unit; and,

The 22d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell AFB, KS (48 PAA KC-135R/T), which currently associates with the 931st Air Refueling Group (AFR).

Modify infrastructure at Grand Forks AFB to accommodate the emerging Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) mission. The Secretary of Defense will maintain eight KC-135 aircraft at Grand Forks Air Force Base to facilitate an efficient and cost effective bed down of UAVs. The Secretary will keep the tankers in place until the UAVs are operational at Grand Forks, but not later than 31 Dec 2010 unless otherwise required by the Department of Defense for National Emergencies. 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 Base by distributing the 184th Air Refueling Wing's (ANG) nine KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the PAA requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish 12 Primary Aircraft Authorization KC-135R/T aircraft at the 190th Air Refueling Wing, Forbes Field AGS, KS. The 184th Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the AMARC at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND

Recommendation # 105 (Air Force 38)

One-time Cost:	$1.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.02M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($12.9M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND. The 119th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support elements remain in place.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Hector (125) ranked low in military value. The reduction in F-16 force structure and the need to align common versions of the F-16 at the same bases argued for realigning Hector to allow its aircraft to retire without a flying mission backfill.

Community Concerns

The North Dakota community welcome the planned Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) association with Grand Forks AFB, though it argued that the DoD recommendation language calling for the retirement of the unit's F-16s "without a flying mission backfill" unfairly and unreasonably restricts future missions at Hector. The community argued that the Governor and Adjutant General were not consulted on the recommendation, and that the F-16 retirements were actions already programmed by the Air Force and should not be included in the BRAC process. Community representatives also argued that the Mission Compatibility Index (MCI) did not accurately assess Hector, particularly regarding its available ramp space, new runway, unencroached airspace, safety record, history of outstanding performance, and proximity to homeland defense and homeland security missions in the north-central United States (near the border with Canada). They felt that Air National Guard units were unfairly punished for their smaller, more efficient sizing, and DoD's overall BRAC recommendations unreasonably favored units in the southern United States. Finally, they argued the loss of the F-16 mission will hurt their recruiting and retention efforts and will have negative economic impacts on the region.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the projected 20-year Net Present Value savings from realigning Hector IAP AGS were relatively modest. Regarding the Mission Compatibility Index score (MCI), there were instances when the MCI may not have comprehensively or completely assessed the base's military value. In all cases, though, it would appear that the MCI scoring was administered consistently amongst units and bases.

The Commission found the Department of Defense's original justification language cited Hector would be realigned with "no flying mission backfill." Hector appeared to be the only base in which that phrase was used. While the Commission notes that the justification language is in itself not statutory, the Commission recognized that DoD's planned Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) associate mission for Hector is itself a form of flying mission. The Commission found that DoD's recommendation language did not sufficiently provide for future requirements related to the UAV mission Hector would support in conjunction with Grand Forks AFB, ND. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 2, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND. The 119th Fighter Wing (ANG) will be redesignated as an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle wing; the Armed Forces Reserve Center planned for construction on Hector Field will be expanded to include sufficient facilities to accommodate at minimum the UAV ground control and intelligence analysis functions and expeditionary combat support elements, including fire, crash and rescue services, of the 119th Wing (ANG), in addition to the units already identified in Army Recommendation 73, Reserve Component Transformation in North Dakota; and the Air Force will retain, adapt or construct appropriate facilities on Grand Forks Air Force Base appropriate to launch, recover, maintain and support the Unmanned Aerial Vehicles assigned to the 119th Wing (ANG). The Commission explicitly rejects the language contained in justification to the recommendation by the Secretary of Defense that there will be "no flying mission backfill" at Hector Field. The wing's expeditionary combat support elements remain in place.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Mansfield Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH

Recommendation # 106 (Air Force 39)

One-time Cost:	$8.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($6.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($79.6M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), OH. Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) to the 908th Airlift Wing (AFR), Maxwell Air Force Base, AL (four aircraft), and the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR (four aircraft). Flying related Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) moves to Louisville International Airport AGS, KY (aerial port) and Toledo Express Airport AGS, OH (firefighters).

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation distributes C-130 aircraft to two bases with higher military value: Little Rock Air Force Base (17) and Maxwell Air Force Base (21). The addition of aircraft at Maxwell Air Force Base creates an optimally sized Reserve Component squadron. Additionally, these transfers move C-130 force structure from the Air National Guard to the Air Force Reserve and active duty, addressing a documented imbalance in the active/Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve manning mix for C-130s.

Community Concerns

The Columbus, OH, community criticized Mission Compatability Index (MCI) scores, claiming Air Force use of a one-size-fits-all approach is inherently biased in favor of large active-duty bases and did not accurately reflect the site's available ramp and hangar capacity. In addition to community concerns over the 300 jobs at risk, representatives contended it would be more cost effective to increase the number of the site's aircraft because of high relocation-related military construction costs and because it has the highest personnel rating of any Air National Guard C-130 unit. Furthermore, they argued recent Congressional earmarks for infrastructure improvements could sustain the base's flying mission through 2015, and a nearby industrial park relies on Mansfield-Lahm for fire protection services.

Last, the community noted there was extremely limited communication between the Air Force, National Guard Bureau, the Adjutants General, and the State governors. They claimed Air Force failure to engage their reserve component counterparts hurt morale and jeopardized a previously longstanding and good relationship.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to close Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station was not supportable. The Commission establishes an enclave at Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio. The Commission established a C-130 wing at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard Laydown plan.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 2, 4 and 6, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), OH. Distribute the 179th Airlift Wing's C-130H aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 8 C-130H PAA at the 908th Airlift Wing (AFR), Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport as a civilian airport.

If the State of Ohio decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Ohio and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Ohio Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH

Recommendation # 107 (Air Force 40)

One-time Cost:	$30.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($5.4M)
Payback Period:	14 years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH. Distribute the 178th Fighter Wing's F-16 aircraft to the 132nd Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (nine aircraft); the 140th Wing (ANG), Buckley Air Force Base, CO (three aircraft) and 149th Fighter Wing (ANG), Lackland Air Force Base, TX (six aircraft), but retain the wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements, the 251st Combat Communications Group (ANG) and 269th Combat Communications Squadron (ANG) in place, and relocate the wing's firefighter positions, which will move to Rickenbacker Air Guard Station, OH.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The decision to realign Springfield-Beckley's F-16s and not replace force structure at Springfield-Beckley is based on considerations of military value and all other available information. Buckley (64) and Lackland (47) have higher military value than Springfield-Beckley (128), and Buckley has a role in the homeland defense mission. This recommendation optimizes the squadron size at Lackland, the only ANG F-16 Flying Training Unit. While not currently tasked with a homeland defense role, Des Moines (137) is located within the specified response timing criteria of a homeland security site of interest. The 132nd Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, will assume a role in the air sovereignty mission.

Community Concerns

The Springfield-Beckley, OH, community criticized several Mission Compatability Index (MCI) scores, claiming Air Force use of a one-size-fits-all approach is inherently biased in favor of large active-duty bases and the base's status as an F-16 formal training unit (FTU) should have exempted it from data calls pertaining to standard weapons storage requirements. DoD's military value scores reflected neither the base's mission nor mission requirements. According to the community's analysis, accurate data reflecting pavement quality, range space, training capacity, and maintenance and logistics capacity would have resulted in a significantly higher score. In addition, community representatives argued DoD failed to account for costs associated with replacing pilots and maintainers who would not move to the proposed location. They contended DoD completely ignored their proximity to Wright Patterson Air Force Base and the possibility of a community-basing program at Beckley. They felt that if quantitative military value analysis results did not satisfy the Air Force, "military judgment" was arbitrarily applied to justify the BRAC proposal. Last, the community expressed concerns about the 291 direct and 149 indirect jobs that could be lost, adding that they knew the F-16 would go away at some point but questioned if it was prudent to retire it so soon.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station should be supported even though the military value criteria were flawed and the realignment will be a cost instead of a savings to the Department. This unit is a training squadron for the F-16. There are currently two other Flying Training Units (FTUs) in the Total Force. The Commission agreed that with the total number of F-16s being reduced in the Air Force, the training requirements will be reduced commensurately. The Commission established an F-16 wing at Buckley AFB, Colorado and at Lackland AFB, Texas. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard Laydown plan.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force

will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 2 and 5, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH. Distribute the 18 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 140th Wing (ANG), Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado.

Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 149th Wing (ANG), Lackland Air Force Base, Texas.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport as a civilian airport.

If the State of Ohio decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Ohio and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Ohio Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Portland International Airport, AGS, OR

Recommendation # 108 (Air Force 41)

One-time Cost:	$70M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($3.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$19.9M
Payback Period:	28 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR. Realign the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) by distributing the wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Tinker Air Force Base, OK (four aircraft); the 190th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Forbes Field Air Guard Station, KS (three aircraft); and by reverting one aircraft to backup inventory. Operations and maintenance manpower for four aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing is realigned with the aircraft to Tinker Air Force Base. The 939th Air Refueling Wing's remaining manpower, to include expeditionary combat support, is realigned to Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA. Realign the 142nd Fighter Wing (ANG) by distributing the wing's

F-15 aircraft to the 177th Fighter Wing (ANG), Atlantic City, NJ (six aircraft) and the 159th Fighter Wing (ANG), New Orleans ARS, LA (nine aircraft). The 142nd Fighter Wing's expeditionary combat support elements, along with the 244th and 272nd Combat Communications Squadrons (ANG), will remain at Portland and Portland will continue to support a homeland defense alert commitment. The 304th Rescue Squadron (AFR) at Portland is realigned to McChord Air Force Base, WA, with no aircraft involved. The 214th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), a geographically separated unit at Jackson Barracks, LA, is relocated onto available facilities at New Orleans.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation realigns Portland's KC-135R tanker aircraft to Forbes Field and Tinker, installations with higher military value. Tinker (4) and Forbes (35) ranked higher than Portland (71) for the tanker mission, and both installations remain operationally effective due to their proximity to air refueling missions. This recommendation will strengthen the Reserve squadron size at Tinker and Air National Guard squadron size at Forbes, increasing these units' capability. An Air National Guard and Reserve KC-135 unit association will be established at Tinker to access Reserve experience and maximize regional Reserve participation in the aerial refueling mission. This recommendation will also ensure that critical KC-135 backup aircraft inventory levels are preserved.

This recommendation also realigns Portland's F-15 fighter aircraft to an installation of higher military value. Atlantic City (61) ranks higher than Portland (77) for the fighter mission, and realigning Portland's F-15 aircraft to Atlantic City helps create an optimum-sized fighter squadron (24 Primary Aircraft Assigned). While New Orleans (79) ranks slightly below Portland for the fighter mission, the Air Force used military judgment in realigning Portland's remaining F-15 aircraft to New Orleans. New Orleans has above average military value for reserve component bases, and realigning aircraft from Portland creates another optimum-sized fighter squadron at New Orleans. Although the ANG will continue to support an alert commitment at Portland, the Air Force determined it is also a priority to support North American Defense Command (NORAD) and United States Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) air sovereignty alert requirements at Atlantic City and New Orleans. Creating effective sized squadrons at these reserve component locations ensures the Air Force can maintain trained, experienced pilots and maintenance technicians and is able to fulfill its homeland defense alert requirements. Portland's ECS remains in place to support the Air Expeditionary Force and to retain trained, experienced Airmen.

By relocating the geographically separated Air National Guard squadron to New Orleans, the Air Force best utilizes available facilities on the installation while reducing the cost to the government to lease facilities in the community.

Community Concerns

The Portland Community, including its elected representatives, strongly argued that the Portland International Airport Air Guard Station should remain intact. The community asserted that the proposed realignment would put the alert force structure below the pre-September 11, 2001, posture and leave Northwest population centers, airline traffic, and maritime routes vulnerable to future threats. It further expressed the opinion that the homeland defense mission was not adequately factored into the BRAC military value selection criteria. The community asserted that DoD consulted with neither the Oregon Governor nor the Adjutant General regarding the effect on their homeland security missions. The community believes that recruitment and retention of the expeditionary combat support unit that would remain in place as an enclave would suffer dramatically. The community argued the realignment makes no economic sense because there are no real personnel savings. It pointed out that the initial presentations by the Air Force staff to the Air Force Base Closure Executive Group projected payback, excluding personnel savings, to be in excess of 100 years and annual savings of $200,000, while the final report shows payback, including personnel savings, will be realized in only seven years with an annual savings of $14 million. The community argued that the 100 year payback projection is closer to being accurate.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to realign the Portland International Airport Air Guard Station and to continue to support an alert commitment at Portland with a two-fighter-aircraft detachment on a rotational basis could not be supported. With respect to the fighter aircraft the Commission believes that the Air Force did not adequately address homeland security issues because its military value analysis was done by platform rather than by installation mission or function. The Commission found that the recommendation regarding the KC-135 tanker realignment to be adequately supported. The Commission noted that the Department of homeland security declined to participate in the public dialogue with the Commission.

The Commission found that the DoD rationale for relocating the 304th Rescue Squadron (Air Force Reserve) is no longer applicable; the Commission recommends they remain in place. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR. Realign the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR). Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Tinker Air Force Base, OK as a twelve Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) KC-135R/T wing. Operations and maintenance manpower for four PAA aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Tinker Air Force Base, OK. The 939th Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) is realigned to Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.

Realign the 142d Fighter Wing (ANG). Distribute the 15 F-15 aircraft assigned to the 142d Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 142d Fighter Wing (ANG), Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR.

Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 159th Fighter Wing (ANG), New Orleans ARS, LA.

The 142d Fighter Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support elements, along with the 244th and 272d Combat Communications Squadrons (ANG), and the 304th Rescue Squadron (AFR), will remain at Portland and Portland will continue to support a homeland defense alert commitment. The 214th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), a geographically separated unit at Jackson Barracks, LA, is relocated onto available facilities at New Orleans.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD, and Dyess Air Force Base, TX

Recommendation # 109 (Air Force 43)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD. The 24 B-1 aircraft assigned to the 28th Bomb Wing will be distributed to the 7th Bomb Wing, Dyess Air Force Base, TX. Realign Dyess Air Force Base, TX. The C-130 aircraft assigned to the 317th Airlift Group will be distributed to the active-duty 314th Airlift Wing (22 aircraft) and Air National Guard 189th Airlift Wing (two aircraft), Little Rock Air Force Base, AR; the 176th Wing (ANG), Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK (four aircraft); and the 302nd Airlift Wing (AFR), Peterson Air Force Base, CO (four aircraft). Peterson Air Force Base will have an active duty/Air Force Reserve association in the C-130 mission. Elmendorf Air Force Base will have an active duty/Air National Guard association in the C-130 mission.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation consolidates the B-1 fleet at one installation to achieve operational efficiencies. Ellsworth (39) ranked lower in military value for the bomber mission than Dyess (20). To create an efficient, single-mission operation at Dyess, the Air Force realigned the tenant C-130s from Dyess to other Air Force installations. The majority of these aircraft went to

Little Rock (17-airlift), which enables consolidation of the active-duty C-130 fleet into one stateside location at Little Rock, and strengthens the Air National Guard squadron to facilitate an active duty association with the Guard unit. The other C-130s at Dyess were distributed to Elmendorf (51-airlift) and Peterson (30-airlift) to facilitate active duty associations with the Guard and Reserve units at these installations.

Community Concerns

The Rapid City, SD, community criticized DoD's proposal on the grounds of national security, military value, cost, and economic impact. Representatives believe consolidating all B-1 bombers at one base poses significant security threats because a single accident or attack could wipe out or delay a major weapons platform. The community questioned DoD's military value criteria and selection process because Ellsworth scored higher than Dyess in three of four criteria. The one lower score, in the most heavily weighted criteria, was inaccurate according to the community because it did not reflect Ellsworth's proximity to low-level flying routes or mission supporting airspace. Further, representatives contended that operating the entire B-1 fleet at one base was inherently inefficient and would exceed the cost of maintaining two separate bases. They also questioned why Ellsworth was not considered for a tanker mission backfill when it ranked fifth for the tanker MCI score out of all Air Force bases evaluated – far higher than many other bases receiving tankers under DoD's proposal. Finally, the community asserted closure would have a very significant economic impact.

The Abilene, TX, community asserted DoD's recommendation to relocate their C-130s to bases with lower military value scores substantially deviated from the selection criteria. Further, the DoD proposal ignores the operational, training and maintenance efficiencies attained at Dyess with its 29 C-130H models. Last, it would cost more in military construction funding to relocate their aircraft to Little Rock than to keep them at Dyess along with the additional B-1s the base is slated to receive, thereby violating criteria five.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that Ellsworth is an outstanding installation. It has vast unencroached air space, is sparsely populated and has diverse terrain.

In reviewing DoD comparative military value scoring methodology for airspace and airspace training ranges the Commission found that the methodology was fairly and consistently applied, but it was narrowly focused and did not consider range utilization and the value of a range to specific aircraft. Because of this, the Commission found that Ellsworth's airspace training range was more valuable than identified in the scoring methodology.

The Commission found that consolidating the B-1 fleet would reduce the number of bomber bases from five to four. The Commission found that the closure of Ellsworth would not result in a savings, but a cost. A significant portion of Ellsworth savings are tied to military personnel savings, but those savings would not be realized since efficiencies gained by the consolidation would not occur because the Air Force planned to use those positions for other missions, thereby negating savings and adding costs to move them.

The Commission also found the cost for military construction at Little Rock Air Force Base was significantly underestimated and therefore the military construction costs associated with this recommendation were much higher. Further, the Commission found that the military personnel movement linked to the distribution of C-130s from Dyess Air Force Base, TX to Little Rock, AR, Elmendorf Air National Guard, AK and Peterson Air Reserve Station is inefficient because it resulted in a net increase in personnel managing and maintaining the C-130s.

Additionally, the Commission found that protracted litigation in the primary airspace training range at Dyess could potentially impact readiness to the B-1 fleet if the temporary restriction were made permanent. Last, the Commission found that Ellsworth is the second largest employer in South Dakota and the closing of the base will have significant economic impact on the community. This impact would be significantly higher than DoD's average impact on the community.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary.

Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN

Recommendation # 110 (Air Force 44)

One-time Cost:	$48.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$20.7M
20-Year Net Present Value:	$261.3M
Payback Period:	Never

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Nashville International Airport (IAP) Air Guard Station (AGS), TN. This recommendation distributes the C-130H aircraft of the 118th Airlift Wing (ANG) to the 182nd Airlift Wing (ANG), Greater Peoria Airport AGS, IL (four aircraft), and the 123rd Airlift Wing (ANG), Louisville IAP AGS, KY (four aircraft). Flying related ECS (aerial port and firefighters) moves to Memphis IAP AGS. The Aeromedical Squadron from Nashville moves to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth. Other ECS remains in place at Nashville.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Nashville (104) had a low military value ranking and was near other ANG bases keeping or gaining aircraft. Military judgment was the predominant factor in this recommendation. This realignment creates two right-sized squadrons, Peoria (127) and Louisville (79), from three undersized squadrons and retains experienced ANG personnel.

Community Concerns

The Nashville, TN, community, including public officials, criticized Mission Compatability Index (MCI) scores, claiming the Air Force's one-size-fits-all approach created a built-in bias favoring large active-duty bases. They argued that the Air Force's optimal primary assigned aircraft (PAA) model was inappropriate for Air Guard installations. In addition, they asserted proper credit was not given for its new state-of-the-art maintenance facility and a civilian fuel depot to which the 118th Airlift Wing (AW) has unimpeded access. The community felt that when quantitative military value analysis did not generate the Air Force's desired results, "military judgment" was arbitrarily applied to justify the BRAC proposals.

They stated the loss of experienced personnel and the subsequent negative impact on combat capability will be significant, and no members of Nashville's aero-medical evacuation squadron are expected to relocate with their mission.

Public officials protested the loss of C-130 aircraft because they are so well-suited to civil support and emergency disaster response, and DoD's proposal would hurt the area's homeland security preparedness by separating transport capability from the Nashville-based 45th Civil Support Team.

Last, unlike the Army and Navy processes related to their Reserve Components, the community noted there was extremely limited communication between the Air Force, National Guard Bureau, the Adjutants General, and the State governors. The failure to engage their reserve component counterparts has had a negative effect on morale and jeopardized what was previously a longstanding and good relationship.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to remove the flying mission from Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station can be supported despite community concerns related to military value, manpower savings and impact on the state mission. The Commission also recognized the fact that the C-130 force structure is shrinking and that the number of Air National Guard C-130 operating locations must be reduced. The Commission established a C-130 wing at Greater Peoria Air Guard Station, Illinois and Louisville International Airport, Kentucky. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and

maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Nashville International Airport (IAP) Air Guard Station (AGS), TN. Distribute the 8 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 118th Airlift Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Assigned Aircraft (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 182d Airlift Wing (ANG), Greater Peoria Airport, AGS, Illinois.

Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 123d Airlift Wing (ANG), Louisville International Airport Air Guard Station, Kentucky.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 118th Airlift Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of those units, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Nashville International Airport as a civilian airport.

If the State of Tennessee decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 118th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 118th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Tennessee and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Tennessee Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 118th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Ellington Air Guard Station, TX

Recommendation # 111 (Air Force 45)

One-time Cost:	$1.97M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.33M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($2.7M)
Payback Period:	6 years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX. The 147th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) will retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place. Ellington retains the capability to support the homeland defense mission. The 272nd Engineering Installation Squadron, an ANG geographically separated unit, moves into available space on Ellington.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Ellington (80) ranked low in military value. The reduction in F-16 force structure and the need to align common versions of the F-16 at the same bases argued for allowing Ellington's F-16s to retire in place with no fighter mission backfill. Ellington is

realigned to preserve the homeland defense Air Sovereignty Alert (ASA) site using aircraft assigned elsewhere and operating from Ellington on a rotational basis as tasked by US Northern Command. In a related recommendation, the Lackland Air Force Base, Texas Air National Guard F-16 initial training unit is increased in size to capitalize on Ellington's trained pilots and maintainers.

Community Concerns

The community objected to DoD's recommendation to remove all F-16s and convert the facility into an Air Sovereignty Alert (ASA) site with only two aircraft. They disputed DoD's military value analysis calculations, costs, and claimed the region's homeland security would be placed at risk because the 147th is the area's main source of homeland defense. Ellington's MCI score would be higher if ramp space and surge capacity had been evaluated accurately. They also asserted the recommendation will increase costs with no corresponding synergy benefits. If the ASA mission is provided by another unit, increased costs will include $2500 to $3500 per flying hour, and operating an ASA not associated with an existing unit will add approximately $4 million annual costs. The impact of a terrorist attack in the area could have national ramifications because major industries produce 25 percent of the US gasoline supply and also include the Port of Houston.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to realign Ellington Air Guard Station should be supported despite community concerns related to homeland security and the base's military value. The Commission recognized the high number of sensitive facilities in the Houston area. The Commission agreed with the alert posture plan developed by the Department of Defense to station fighters at Ellington for Air Sovereignty Alert (ASA) on a rotational basis. The Commission also understands that the Air National Guard F-16 inventory must be reduced.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 2, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of Ellington Field as a civilian airport.

If the State of Texas decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Texas and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Texas Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state. Ellington retains the capability to support the

homeland defense mission. The 272d Engineering Installation Squadron, an ANG geographically separated unit, moves into available space on Ellington.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Lackland Air Force Base, TX

Recommendation # 112 (Air Force 46)

One-time Cost:	$8.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($32.4M)
Payback Period:	2 years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX. Relocate the Standard Air Munitions Package (STAMP)/Standard Tank, Rack, Adaptor, and Pylon Packages (STRAPP) function from Lackland Air Force Base, Medina Annex to McConnell Air Force Base, KS, and transfer the mission to the Air National Guard.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation enables Air Force Total Force participation by converting one of two Air Force STAMP/STRAPP missions from active duty to the Air National Guard. Lackland Air Force Base, Medina Annex is one of two STAMP mission locations within the Air Force; Hill Air Force Base, UT, is the other. This action will retain two geographically separated munitions sites to support the Air Force's Air Expeditionary Force construct, yet reduce the active-duty manpower requirement. Current munitions out-load operations from Medina Annex to the airhead at Lackland (the former Kelly Air Force Base airfield) pose transportation challenges in that explosives shipments are moved over local and interstate highways, increasing the security threat. The Air Force does not fully control the Lackland airfield, thus access and future encroachment cannot be ensured. McConnell Air Force Base has co-located munitions storage and hot-cargo handling capability on the base, enhancing out-load effectiveness with little projected interference on existing missions. The base has sufficient 1.1 net explosive weight munitions storage capacity in existing structures that supported a former bomb wing mission, and ANG personnel at McConnell currently perform a function similar to the active duty STAMP mission. Because of this existing capability, mission conversion is expected to require fewer additional full-time ANG personnel at McConnell than active-duty personnel at Medina.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the military construction costs to realign the Standard Air Munitions Package (STAMP) and Standard Tank, Rack, Adaptor, and Pylon Package (STRAPP) at McConnell Air Force Base, KS were understated. Given this oversight, some critical military construction requirements might not be identified; and associated funding not programmed sufficiently to accommodate the storage of munitions at McConnell Air Force Base. The Commission also found an oversight in the recommendation that identified the departure of munitions personnel at Lackland Medina Annex in fiscal year 2007, yet the munitions stockpile is scheduled to be transported in fiscal year 2008. These concerns were identified to DoD who assured the Commission that adequate personnel would remain at Lackland Medina Annex until the mission was transferred. DoD also assured the Commission that any military construction shortfalls not identified would be resolved during site surveys at McConnell Air Force Base. Based on these assurances and the need to resolve the safety and security issues of transporting munitions over local and interstate highways at Lackland Medina as quickly as possible, the Commission concurred with this recommendation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Hill Air Force Base, UT, Edwards Air Force Base, CA, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Luke Air Force Base, AZ, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV

Recommendation # 113 (Air Force 47)

One-time Cost:	$28.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($8.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($85.0M)
Payback Period:	4 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT. Distribute the 419th Fighter Wing F-16s to the 482nd Fighter Wing, Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL (six aircraft) and the 301st Fighter Wing, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX (nine aircraft). The AFMC F-16s at Hill will remain in place. Realign Edwards Air Force Base, CA; Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID; and Luke Air Force Base, AZ, by relocating base-level LANTIRN intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night (LANTIRN) pods at Hill. Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV, by relocating base-level F110 engine intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a CIRF for F110 engines at Hill.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The Air Force distributed Reserve aircraft to Homestead Air Reserve Base (31) to create an optimum sized squadron that supports the homeland defense Air Sovereignty Alert mission. The remaining Reserve aircraft are distributed to the only other remaining Reserve F-16 squadron at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth (58). This laydown keeps the active/Air National Guard/

Air Force Reserve force structure mix constant. Creating CIRFs for LANTIRN pods and F110 engines establishes Hill as a maintenance workload center for these commodities. This recommendation compliments other CIRF recommendations as part of an Air Force effort to standardize stateside and deployed intermediate-level maintenance concepts, and will increase maintenance productivity and support to the warfighter.

Community Concerns

Community representatives claimed the civilian personnel office (CPO) recommendation, if approved, will have a negative impact on Hill's mission because the CPO plays a significant role in providing essential services to the base's leadership and the large (10,000+) civilian workforce. They also noted that the DoD proposal, unlike other CPO consolidations, would not leave behind a minimum number of personnel specialists to service the base.

The community also argued that moving all of Hill's Munitions Containment Group engineering positions to the Air Armament Center, Elgin AFB without also transferring the Munitions Sustainment mission leaves Hill without the technical expertise necessary to support the Air Force.

In addition, advocates opposed DoD's proposed movement of Inventory Control Pont Functions for F-16 Depot Level Reparable (DLR) to the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), noting that Hill is the F-16 Center of Excellence responsible for cradle-to-grave management of F-16s. Moving a key function such as DLR management could have an adverse mission impact. Last, the Hill community strongly supported DoD's recommendation to bed down six "block 40" F-16 aircraft at the base.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that this realignment was consistent with the Air Force goals of creating larger more efficient fighter aircraft squadrons and improving intermediate level maintenance processes. The Commission found that Hill Air Force Base had capacity and conditions for current and future flying missions. The Commission also found that the Secretary of Defense's overall intent and concept of realigning F-16 aircraft out of Hill Air Force Base was supportable. The Commission supported the recommendation to establish Hill as a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility for Low Attitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night pods and for F-110 Engines. The Commission established an F-16 wing at Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida and the Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, Texas. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 419th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission;

Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 482nd Fighter Wing, Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL.

Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 301st Fighter Wing, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.

The AFMC F-16s will remain in place at Hill AFB.

Realign Edwards Air Force Base, CA; Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID; and Luke Air Force Base, AZ, by relocating base-level LANTIRN intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night (LANTIRN) pods at Hill AFB.

Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV, by relocating base-level F110 engine intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a CIRF for F110 engines at Hill.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Langley Air Force Base, VA

Recommendation # 114 (Air Force 49)

One-time Cost:	$1.79M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($8.5M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA. Realign base-level F-15 avionics intermediate maintenance from Langley Air Force Base to Tyndall Air Force Base, FL, by establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Tyndall Air Force Base, FL, for F-15 avionics.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation standardizes stateside and deployed intermediate-level maintenance concepts, and compliments other CIRF recommendations made by the Air Force. It will increase maintenance productivity and support to the warfighter by consolidating and smoothing dispersed, random workflows. As a result of other recommendations, Tyndall is expected to have two full squadrons (48 F-22s) as compared to only one squadron (24 F-15s) at Langley.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the realignment is consistent with the Air Force goal's of improved efficacies and manpower costs savings for intermediate level maintenance for F-15 avionics. The Commission expressed concern that the Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility is transportation-centric and that delays to transportation of the F-15 avionics packages from the repair facility to Langley Air Force Base could affect unit readiness, but after discussion with DoD, the Commission determined that the Air Force has sufficient experience, planning and resources to mitigate against this possible effect.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Richmond Air Guard Station, VA, and Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA

Recommendation # 115 (Air Force 50)

One-Time Cost:	$22.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($18.7M)
Payback Period:	8 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA. Distribute the 192nd Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 132nd Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (six aircraft); 482nd Fighter Wing Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL (three aircraft) and to backup inventory (six aircraft). Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station real property accountability will transfer to the Department of the Army. The 192nd Fighter Wing's manpower will associate with the 1st Fighter Wing. Realign Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA. The F-16 aircraft currently assigned to the 132nd Fighter Wing at Des Moines are redistributed to the 180th Fighter Wing, Toledo Express Airport Air Guard Station, OH (nine aircraft) and 138th Fighter Wing, Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station, OK (six aircraft).

Secretary of Defense Justification

Prior to BRAC 2005, the USAF announced a plan for the 192nd Fighter Wing (ANG) to associate at Langley Air Force Base. This announcement was made. To accommodate the association and the F-16 Force Structure Plan, the Air Force distributed the F-16s from Richmond to other F-16 bases using military value and judgment. The F-16s from Richmond (49) are distributed to Des Moines (137) and Homestead (31) to enable the capability to support the homeland defense Air Sovereignty Alert mission. Des Moines' F-16s are distributed to Toledo (123) and Tulsa (114) to support the homeland defense Air Sovereignty Alert mission and to consolidate the precision-guided weapon employment capability that exists in the Air National Guard.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the Department of Defense recommendation to realign Richmond Air Guard Station should be supported. The Commission understands that the Air National Guard F-16 inventory must be reduced. The Commission

further understands that prior to this BRAC round Richmond entered into an agreement to associate with the active-duty F-22 unit at Langley AFB, VA. The Commission did not support the realignment of the Air Guard Station Des Moines, Iowa. The Commission established F-16 wing at Des Moines, Iowa, Toledo, Ohio, and Tulsa, Oklahoma. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard Laydown plan.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 2, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 192d Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 24 F-16 PAA at the 482d Fighter Wing at Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida.

Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station real property accountability will transfer to the Department of the Army. The 192d Fighter Wing's manpower will associate with the 1st Fighter Wing. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Virginia Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 192d Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth.

Realign Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 132d Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish 18 F-16 PAA at the 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, Iowa.

Establish 18 F-16 PAA at the 180th Fighter Wing, Toledo Express Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio.

Establish 21 F-16 PAA at the 138th Fighter Wing, Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station, Oklahoma.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Fairchild Air Force Base, WA

Recommendation # 116 (Air Force 51)

One-time Cost:	$6.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($6.7M)
Payback Period:	8 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA. The 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will associate with the 92d Air Refueling Wing at Fairchild Air Force Base, and the 141st Air Refueling Wing's eight KC-135R aircraft are distributed to the 185th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard Station, IA. The 256th Combat Communications Squadron and 242d Combat Communications Squadron, which are ANG geographically separated units at Four Lakes and Spokane, are relocated into available facilities at Fairchild Air Force Base.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation realigns aircraft and streamlines operations at Fairchild by associating the Air National Guard KC-135 wing with the active-duty wing. Fairchild Air Force Base (17) ranked just behind McConnell Air Force Base as the active-duty tanker base with highest military value for a tanker mission. This realignment preserves remaining capacity for the next generation tanker aircraft, while maintaining the ANG experience and recruiting potential within the region. In distributing KC-135R force structure to Sioux Gateway Air Guard Station (67), the Air Force applied military judgment in replacing aging, higher maintenance KC-135E force structure at Sioux Gateway with newer models to increase the unit's capability and retain trained, experienced aircrews and maintenance technicians. By relocating two geographically separated units onto Fairchild, the Air Force best uses its available resources while reducing the cost to the government of leased facilities.

Community Concerns

The Fairchild, WA, community did not express specific concerns about DoD's proposal, having been advised they were in line for some of the early new tanker aircraft once they are produced and deployed. The community is pleased to associate with the active unit until the new tanker aircraft are available.

Commission Findings

While the Commission found that the community had no specific concerns regarding this recommendation, the Commission noted that the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is prepared to associate with the Active Duty's 92d Air Refueling Wing at Fairchild AFB. The Commission recognized the stewardship of the 141st ARW and strongly supports the placement of the new tanker aircraft with the 141st to lead the force. The Commission further found that the Secretary of Defense's overall intent and concept of redistributing the ANG KC-135s out of Fairchild AFB was supportable.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 3, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA. Distribute the 141st Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish eight PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 185th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard Station, Iowa. The 185th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.

Establish eight PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 161st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport Air Guard Station, AZ.

If the State of Washington decides to change the organization, composition and association of the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force:

Establish the 141st Air Refueling Wing as an associate flying wing of the 92d Air Refueling Wing, Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, with the 141st Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remaining in place;

Provide opportunity for 141st Air Refueling Wing personnel to operate the future tanker replacement aircraft as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

The 256th Combat Communications Squadron and 242d Combat Communications Squadron, ANG geographically separated units at Four Lakes and Spokane, are relocated to Fairchild Air Force Base.

All other personnel allotted to the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Washington and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Washington Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI

Recommendation # 117 (Air Force 52)

One-time Cost:	(See recommendation #103, Pope AFB, North Carolina)
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	(See recommendation #103, Pope AFB, North Carolina)
20-Year Net Present Value:	(See recommendation #103, Pope AFB, North Carolina)
Payback Period:	(See recommendation #103, Pope AFB, North Carolina)

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station (ARS). Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 440th Airlift Wing to the 94th Airlift Wing (AFR), Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), GA (four aircraft) and to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR (four aircraft). Realign the 440th Airlift Wing's operations, maintenance and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) manpower to Fort Bragg, NC. Air National Guard units at Mitchell are unaffected by this recommendation.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation distributes C-130 aircraft to two bases of higher military value, Little Rock Air Force Base (17) and Dobbins Air Reserve Base (71). Adding aircraft at Little Rock and Dobbins optimizes squadron size, creating larger, more effective squadrons. Additionally, these transfers move C-130 force structure from the Air Force Reserve to the active duty, addressing a documented imbalance in the active/Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve manning mix for C-130s.

Community Concerns

The community believes that the recommendation to close General Mitchell ARS is unjustified. The community asserted that the Air Force's use of the recommendation to recapitalize its C-130 fleet was outside the scope of BRAC and would leave no strategic Air Force Reserve presence in the Milwaukee/Chicago area. The community contended that relocating the 440th Airlift Wing would have a negative impact on recruitment and retention, citing a direct correlation between proximity to the vast industrial local labor pool and the base's ability to attract and retain experienced personnel. Citizens also noted that closure of General Mitchell ARS would result in the loss of thousands of flying hours and years of technical experience, jeopardizing a level of combat readiness difficult to reproduce elsewhere. Further, the community contended that MCI formulas were inherently biased against smaller bases and that General Mitchell's MCI score was improperly computed. According to the community, General Mitchell ARS should have received an Airlift MCI score better than that of two bases that were not on DoD's list of realignments and closures. Finally, the community asserted General Mitchell ARS was more cost efficient than the three bases slated to receive Mitchell's manpower or assets and that its depot level maintenance alone saved the Air Force $1.14 million.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that though the Mission Compatibility Index (MCI) tool did not accurately capture all aspects of the base's military value and may appear to have favored larger bases, it appears to have been applied consistently. Regarding Mitchell's Airlift MCI score, the Commission verified that there was in fact a calculation error for the formula assessing the quality of an installation's pavement. Even after correcting the error, however, the base still ranked as one of two of the lowest scoring Air Force Reserve bases, according to the Air Force. The Commission found this recommendation supportable. The Commission established C-130 wings at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Georgia and Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina. This recommendation is consistent with the Commission's Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Laydown plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station (ARS). Distribute the 440th Airlift Wing's C-130H aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish the following C-130H PAA:

The 94th Airlift Wing (AFR), Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), GA (8 PAA C-130H);

The Air Force Reserve/Active Duty unit (designation to be determined) at Pope Army Airfield, NC (16 PAA C-130H).

Realign the 440th Airlift Wing's operations, maintenance and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) manpower to Pope Army Airfield, NC. Air National Guard units at Mitchell are unaffected by this recommendation.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Air Force Logistics Support Centers

Recommendation # 118 (Air Force 53)

One-time Cost:	$9.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($6.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($77.0M)
Payback Period:	1 year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Altus Air Force Base, OK; Hickam Air Force Base, HI; Hurlburt Field, FL; Langley Air Force Base, VA; Little Rock Air Force Base, AR; Luke Air Force Base, AZ; and Scott Air Force Base, IL. Establish Air Force Logistics Support Centers (LSCs) at Langley Air Force Base and Scott Air Force Base by combining five major command (MAJCOM) Regional Supply Squadrons (RSS) into two LSCs.

Combat Air Forces (CAF): Establish a CAF LSC at Langley Air Force Base by realigning RSS positions from Hickam Air Force Base and Sembach, Germany (non-BRAC programmatic), as well as base-level Logistics Readiness Squadron (LRS) positions from Luke Air Force Base.

Mobility Air Forces (MAF): Establish a MAF LSC at Scott Air Force Base by realigning RSS positions from Hurlburt Field and Sembach (non-BRAC programmatic) and LRS positions from Little Rock Air Force Base and Altus Air Force Base.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation is a transformational opportunity consistent with eLog21 initiatives that will standardize Air Force materiel management command and control. This recommendation realigns RSS manpower (from three MAJCOM locations) and base-level LRS manpower (from three installations) into two LSCs in support of Combat Air Forces and Mobility Air Forces. Consolidation will provide a seamless transition from peace to war for 3,012 aircraft and weapons systems associated with CAF/MAF forces and the airmen who use them. It also provides a single point of contact to the warfighter, whether at home station or deployed. This recommendation will also result in the disestablishment of the Air Force Special Operations Command Regional Supply Squadron, Pacific Air Forces Regional Supply Squadron, and the United States Air Forces in Europe Regional Supply Squadron.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found operational efficiencies gained by this recommendation. The Commission noted a risk to material management support to the Air Force during the transition period, but the Commission also recognized that the Air Force has, in-place, a detailed implementation plans to mitigate this risk.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

F100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities

Recommendation # 119 (Air Force 55)

One-time Cost:	$9.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($7.2M)
Payback Period:	9 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA; Tyndall Air Force Base, FL; and Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, FL. Establish a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for F100 engines at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, NC, by realigning base-level F100 engine intermediate maintenance from Langley Air Force Base. Establish a CIRF for F100 engines at New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA (Air National Guard unit), by realigning base-level F100 engine intermediate maintenance from Tyndall Air Force Base and Jacksonville Air Guard Station.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation standardizes stateside and deployed intermediate-level maintenance concepts, and compliments other CIRF recommendations made by the Air Force. These CIRFs increase maintenance productivity and support to the warfighter by consolidating dispersed and random workflows, improving reliability-centered maintenance. Realigning F100 engine maintenance from Langley and establishing an eastern region CIRF at Seymour Johnson anticipates the installation as a maintenance workload center for F-15 engines. Seymour Johnson is projected to have up to 87 F-15 aircraft as compared with only 24 F-15 aircraft at Langley. Realigning F100 engine maintenance from Tyndall and Jacksonville into a CIRF at New Orleans (ANG unit) establishes a southeast region CIRF that will service F100 engines for up to 96 F-15 aircraft of active duty and Air National Guard aircraft, complimenting other Air Force recommendations that increase New Orleans and Jacksonville to an optimum 24 aircraft squadron size. The Air Force considered both New Orleans and Jacksonville for the southeast CIRF, but analysis indicated New Orleans would require less construction than Jacksonville due to existing maintenance facilities. A CIRF at New Orleans can also potentially capitalize on capacity and recruitment of experienced maintenance technicians as a result of the recommended realignment of the New Orleans Reserve A-10 mission.

Community Concerns

Panama City, FL, expressed concerns about the loss of a jet engine facility and suggested that instead of shipping F-100 engines to a new Consolidated Intermediate Repair Facility in New Orleans, it would be more cost-effective to expand the existing engine shop at Tyndall, which already performs F-100 engine intermediate maintenance. It also questioned the accuracy and wisdom of the COBRA analysis regarding the non-medical chemical warfare research team.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that this realignment is consistent with the Air Force's goal of increased maintenance productivity and achieving economics of scale. The Commission found no substantial deviation from the military value criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Galena Forward Operating Location (FOL), AK

Recommendation # 195 (Add)

One-time Cost:	$11.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($12.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($165.5M)
Payback Period:	1 year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

None. The Secretary's proposed list submitted on May 13, 2005 did not include this facility. It was added by the Commission on July 19, 2005 for further consideration.

Secretary of Defense Justification

None.

Community Concerns

The community argued that Galena is still needed as a forward operating location (FOL) because its location offers significant operational advantages over Eielson and Elmendorf AFBs. They also cited Galena's value as an alternate landing site for aircraft based at other locations as no other suitable landing sites are within a reasonable distance.

Galena is an extremely small community, and it estimated it would lose about a third of its total jobs, as well as utilities the Air Force provides to its schools located on the airport. If the Commission's added recommendation is approved, the community seeks a gradual or phased transition process to mitigate the negative economic impact.

Commission Findings

The rationale for maintaining two forward operating locations in Alaska was derived during the Cold War. However, the Commission found the security environment has changed and the requirement for maintaining these forward operation locations is not essential. The mission currently conducted at Galena could be conducted at Eielson AFB with little operational impact and acceptable risk. Another forward operating location in King Salmon, AK would continue to be maintained. Galena has also served as an alternate landing site for aircraft based at other locations who encounter mechanical or weather related problems. However, the Commission found that closing Galena would not present significant risk, as other measures could be taken depending on the specific circumstances.

The Commission also found that other Federal Agencies operate on the Galena airport, closing the Air Force forward operating location would likely increase their costs of operation. The Commission found that these costs would be modest, and that other means might be available to help them offset those costs.

The Commission shares the concerns expressed by the community about the economic impact on the community. The Commission recommends that the Air Force not close Galena Forward Operating Location until the community has adequate time for planning and redevelopment efforts. This will help ensure that the services provided by federal and state agencies are not interrupted before these agencies have an opportunity to plan for the greater operating costs. Further, the Commission requests the Air Force to work with the state and local government to support continued winter maintenance activities at the Galena Airport runway, so that the site may serve as a viable alternative emergency airport until it closes the Galena FOL; and to expeditiously address environmental cleanup at the site. Finally, the Commission requests the Air Force to work with the local and state government to maintain the infrastructure so as to provide for an orderly transition from a military operation to a civilian operation at the Galena Airport.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close Galena Forward Operating Location, Alaska.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

2005 BRAC Commission

Air National Guard Actions by State

Base	State	Aircraft	DoD Recommendation #	BRAC Commission Final #
Birmingham IAP AGS	AL	KC-135	0	8
Dannelly Field ANGB	AL	F-16	18	18
Kulis AGS	AK	C-130H/HC-130	11	11
Ft. Smith Reg. AP AGS	AR	A-10	0	18
Ft. Smith Reg. AP AGS	AR	F-16	0	0
Little Rock AFB	AR	C-130H/J	18	9
Phoenix Sky Harbor IAP AGS	AZ	KC-135	10	8
March ARB	CA	KC-135	0	0
Channel Islands AGS	CA	C-130J	12	8
Fresno-Yosemite AGS	CA	F-16	24	18
Buckley AFB	CO	F-16	18	18
Bradley IAP AGS	CT	A-10	0	0
New Castle County AP AGS	DE	C-130H	0	8
Jacksonville IAP	FL	F-15	24	18
Savannah IAP AGS	GA	C-130H	12	8
Hickam AFB	HI	KC-135	12	12
Des Moines IAP AGS	IA	F-16	18	18
Sioux Gateway AGS	IA	KC-135	8	8
Boise Air Terminal AGS	ID	C-130H	0	0
Boise Air Terminal AGS	ID	A-10	18	18
Capital Municipal AP AGS	IL	F-16	0	0
Greater Peoria Reg. AP AGS	IL	C-130H	12	8
Scott AFB	IL	KC-135	12	8
Ft. Wayne IAP AGS	IN	F-16	24	18
Hulman Reg. AP AGS	IN	F-16	0	0
Forbes Field AGS	KS	KC-135	12	12
McConnell AFB	KS	KC-135	0	0
Louisville IAP AGS	KY	C-130H	12	8
New Orleans ARS	LA	F-15	24	18
Barnes Municipal AP AGS	MA	A-10	24	0
Barnes Municipal AP AGS	MA	F-15	0	18
Otis ANGB	MA	F-15	0	0
Andrews AFB	MD	F-16	24	18
Martin State Airport AGS	MD	A-10	18	18
Martin State Airport AGS	MD	C-130J	0	0
Bangor IAP AGS	ME	KC-135	12	10
Selfridge ANGB	MI	KC-135	12	8
Selfridge ANGB	MI	F-16	0	0
Selfridge ANGB	MI	A-10	18	24
Selfridge ANGB	MI	C-130H	0	0

2005 BRAC Commission
Air National Guard Actions by State

Base	State	Aircraft	DoD Recommendation #	BRAC Commission Final #
WK Kellogg Airport AGS	MI	A-10	0	0
Duluth IAP AGS	MN	F-16	0	15
Lambert-St Louis IAP AGS	MO	F-15	0	0
Rosecrans Memorial AP AGS	MO	C-130H	12	10
Key Field AGS	MS	KC-135	0	0
Great Falls IAP	MT	F-16	0	0
Great Falls IAP	MT	F-15	0	15
Charlotte/Douglas IAP AGS	NC	C-130H	12	10
Hector IAP IAP	ND	F-16	0	0
Atlantic City IAP AGS	NJ	F-16	0	18
Atlantic City IAP AGS	NJ	F-15	24	0
McGuire AFB	NJ	KC-135	0	8
Pease IAP AGS	NH	KC-135	12	8
Kirtland AFB	NM	F-16	18	18
Reno-Tahoe IAP AGS	NV	C-130H	0	8
Niagara Falls IAP ARS	NY	KC-135	0	0
Schenectady AP AGS	NY	(L)C-130H	6	10
Mansfield-Lahm APT AGS	OH	C-130H	0	0
Springfield-Beckley AP AGS	OH	F-16	0	0
Toledo Express AP AGS	OH	F-16	24	18
Tulsa IAP AGS	OK	F-16	24	21
Will Rogers World AP AGS	OK	C-130H	0	0
Portland IAP AGS	OR	F-15	0	15
Willow Grove ARS	PA	A-10	0	0
Quonset State AP AGS	RI	C-130J	12	8
McEntire AGS	SC	F-16	24	24
Joe Foss Field AGS	SD	F-16	18	18
McGhee-Tyson AP AGS	TN	KC-135	12	12
Nashville IAP AGS	TN	C-130H	0	0
Ellington AGS	TX	F-16	0	0
Carswell AFB (Ft. Worth)	TX	C-130H	12	8
Lackland AFB (Kelly Field)	TX	F-16	24	18
Richmond IAP AGS	VA	F-16	0	0
Burlington IAP AGS	VT	F-16	18	18
Fairchild AFB	WA	KC-135	0	0
Gen. Mitchell IAP AGS	WI	KC-135	12	12
Truax Field	WI	F-16	18	18
Cheyenne Mun. AP AGS	WY	C-130H	6	6
Yeager APT AGS	WV	C-130H	0	8

2005 BRAC Commission

Air Force Reserve Actions by State

Base	State	Aircraft	DoD Recommendation #	BRAC Commission Final #
Maxwell	AL	C-130H	12	8
Luke	AZ	F-16	0	0
Beale	CA	KC-135	0	0
March	CA	KC-135	12	12
Peterson	CO	C-130H	16	12
Homestead	FL	F-16	24	24
Dobbins	GA	C-130H	12	8
Grissom	IN	KC-135	16	16
Barksdale	LA	A-10	24	24
NAS New Orleans	LA	A-10	0	0
Andrews	MD	KC-135	8	8
Selfridge	MI	KC-135	0	0
Minneapolis	MN	C-130H	8	8
Whiteman	MO	A-10	24	24
Keesler	MS	C-130J	8	8
Pope	NC	C-130H	16	16
Seymour-Johnson	NC	KC-135	16	16
Niagara Falls	NY	C-130H	0	8
Youngstown	OH	C-130H	12	12
Tinker	OK	KC-135	12	12
Portland	OR	KC-135	0	0
Pittsburgh	PA	C-130H	0	8
Willow Grove	PA	C-130E	0	0
Carswell/Ft. Worth	TX	F-16	24	24
Hill	UT	F-16	0	0
Gen. Mitchell	WI	C-130H	0	0

JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUPS (JCSGS):

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

AVIATION LOGISTICS SCHOOL

RECOMMENDATION # 120 (E&T 5)

ONE-TIME COST:	N/A
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	N/A
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE	N/A
PAYBACK PERIOD:	N/A

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Fort Eustis, VA, by relocating the Aviation Logistics School and consolidating it with the Aviation Center and School at Fort Rucker, AL.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation consolidates Aviation training and doctrine development at a single location. Consolidating Aviation Logistics training with the Aviation Center and School fosters consistency, standardization, and training proficiency. It consolidates both Aviation skill level I-producing courses at one location, which allows the Army to reduce the total number of Military Occupational Skills training locations (reducing the TRADOC footprint). Additionally, it enhances military value, supports the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address unforeseen requirements. It improves training capabilities while eliminating excess capacity at institutional training installations. This provides the same or better level of service at a reduced cost. This recommendation supports Army Transformation by collocating institutional training, MTOE units, RDT&E organizations, and other TDA units in large numbers on single installations to support force stabilization and engage training.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

The Fort Eustis community expressed concerns that consolidation of the Aviation Logistics School and the Aviation School would not create synergies since officer flight training and maintenance enlisted personnel training call for very different skill sets. They were concerned that the move of the school would damage sophisticated training devices in transit and degrade training. They questioned the adequacy of Fort Rucker's infrastructure and off-post instructor candidate pool. Finally, they maintained that DoD understated costs and overstated savings.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

The Commission found excessive manpower savings attributed to the consolidation of the Aviation Logistics School and the Aviation School. Correcting DoD's error reduced military manpower savings from 530 spaces to 104 spaces—eliminating 426 spaces initially claimed as military savings and reducing annual dollar savings by 73 percent. In response to the Commission, the Department reviewed military construction requirements and reduced its estimated future military construction costs by nearly $200 million, to $199.5 million. While the reduced construction estimates somewhat offset the reduced annual savings, the Commission found that the adjusted payback period was still 45 years. The Commission found that the justification for consolidation rested solely on the non-cost elements of the proposal and that the marginal potential improvements in military value did not justify or support a net investment cost of $290.3 million.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary.

Combat Service Support Center

Recommendation # 121 (E&T 6)

One-time Cost:	$754.0M
Annual recurring Costs/(Savings):	($131.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value	($934.2M)
Payback Period:	6 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Eustis, VA, by relocating the Transportation Center and School to Fort Lee, VA. Realign Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, by relocating the Ordnance Center and School to Fort Lee, VA. Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL, by relocating the Missile and Munitions Center to Fort Lee, VA. Consolidate the Transportation Center and School and the Ordnance Center and School with the Quartermaster Center & School, the Army Logistic Management College, and Combined Arms Support Command to establish a Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation consolidates Combat Service Support training and doctrine development at a single installation, which promotes training effectiveness and functional efficiencies. The moves advance the Maneuver Support Center (MANSCEN) model currently in place at Fort Leonard Wood, MO, which consolidates the Military Police, Engineer, and Chemical Centers and Schools. This recommendation improves the MANSCEN concept by consolidating functionally related branch centers and schools. It enhances military value, supports the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address unforeseen requirements. It improves training capabilities while eliminating excess capacity at institutional training installations. This provides the same or better level of service at a reduced cost. This recommendation supports Army Transformation by collocating institutional training, MTOE units, RDT&E organizations, and other TDA units in large numbers on single installations to support force stabilization and engage training.

Community Concerns

The Fort Lee community expressed its support for the creation of the Center and indicated that it is well equipped to handle the proposed expansion.

The community associated with Fort Eustis pointed out issues hindering rail and maritime training at Fort Lee, specifically the lack of a deepwater port and the expense of replicating the major training assets already existing at Fort Eustis. Based on the belief that some training would have to remain at Fort Eustis, the community maintained that all training should remain, and they urged the Commission to reject the DoD proposal.

The Redstone Arsenal community requested reconsideration of the EOD Training Department move to Fort Lee, citing critical EOD training support provided to the FBI Hazardous Devices School, a national resource in the fight against terrorists and one that should not be disrupted by BRAC.

Commission Findings

The Commission found the capacity of Fort Lee sufficient to meet the new training requirements created by consolidating four schools onto the installation, except for insufficient land and space available to conduct Warrior Training involving heavy weapons and explosives. The Commission determined that the shortfall can be successfully mitigated by the use of nearby training sites at Fort Pickett, which has sufficient acreage to support all requirements.

The Commission also found that Fort Lee does not have access to a deepwater port. Since deepwater training is part of the Transportation School curriculum, some deepwater training must still be conducted at Fort Eustis, and therefore the Commission specifies that the movement of the Transportation School to Fort Lee does not prevent the conduct of training at Fort Eustis when required.

During the Commission's review of DoD's proposal, concerns were raised that the prerogative for assigning optimal training locations for combat service support courses might be legally constrained by a Commission decision to centralize all combat service support training, especially since combat service support training courses are currently conducted at several locations across the nation. The Commission notes that consolidation of the four schools at Fort Lee must not be interpreted in any way as a requirement that all combat service support training be conducted at Fort Lee. The Commission finds that the location of any course or any part of a course shall continue to be at the discretion of the Department based on both effectiveness and efficiency.

The Commission found that the Department calculated only the costs for the move of that portion of the museums associated with the schools' manning documents. DoD costing did not include new museum construction or other movement of artifacts, documents, or exhibits as part of the BRAC proposal. The Commission finds that further museum actions will be left for future decision by DoD.

Last, the Commission conducted an in-depth review of projected construction costs, the accuracy of which was challenged by locally generated estimates. The Commission found that while the DoD estimate is probably low, the correction would not be as high as the locally generated estimate. Factoring in cost reductions created by leaving deepwater training at Fort Eustis, the recommendation's payback period was extended by only a year and a half, which does not amount to a substantial deviation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training

Recommendation # 122 (E&T 7)

One-time Cost:	$1.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($18.0M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating the Transportation Management training to Fort Lee, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Eliminates redundancy. "Train as we fight: jointly." Consolidates like schools while preserving service-unique culture. Although Lackland Air Force Base, TX, has a higher military value than Fort Lee, VA, it is the military judgment of the JCSG that consolidation at the location with the largest amount of transportation training produces the greatest overall military value to the Department. Uses Inter-service Training Review Organization (ITRO) as the baseline.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission believes that locating all transportation management training at one location will provide significant joint benefits, enhance intra-service procedures, and reduce training duplication. The Commission also believes that course curriculums can be developed to provide service-unique training where necessary. In sum, the proposal was found to increase military value without posing undue risks of mission disruption.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training

Recommendation # 123 (E&T 8)

One-time Cost:	$5.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($15.7M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating Culinary Training to Fort Lee, VA, establishing it as a Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Consolidates Culinary Training at the installation with the largest Service requirement. Eliminates redundancy and costs. Provides the Services with culinary training under Inter-service Training Review Organization. It is the military judgment of the JCSG that consolidation at the location with the largest amount of culinary training produces the greatest overall military value to the Department through increased training efficiency at a lower cost.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission's review and analysis confirmed the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission's approval of this recommendation endorses the concept of centers of excellence as a means of enhancing jointness and promoting transformation.

The Commission found, however, that the ultimate cost of this recommendation is still unclear.

The Commission also found that after many years of previous consolidation with the Air Force, the Navy had begun making plans, prior to BRAC, to move its culinary training program from Lackland Air Force Base to Great Lakes Naval Base. The Navy cited differences in service-unique and cultural issues as the reason for de-consolidating culinary training. While the Commission's approval of DoD's recommendation will move the Navy's program to Fort Lee, the Commission cautions DoD to carefully implement the program to accommodate service-specific needs.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training & Education

Recommendation # 124 (E&T 9)

One-time Cost:	$1.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($11.9M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Maxwell Air Force Base, AL; Naval Air Station Meridian, MS; and Naval Station Newport, RI; by relocating religious training and education to Fort Jackson, SC, establishing a Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Consolidation at Fort Jackson, SC, creates a synergistic benefit by having each Service's officer and enlisted programs conducted in close proximity to operational forces. Realized savings result from consolidation and alignment of similar officer and enlisted educational activities and the merging of common support functions. This recommendation supports the following DoD transformational options: (1) establish center of excellence for joint education and training by combining like schools and (2) establish joint officer and enlisted specialized skills training.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission believes a Joint Center for Religious Education and Training at Fort Jackson will provide significant jointness benefits to the Chaplain Corps, and better prepare chaplains to comfortably minister to members of all service branches. The Commission also believes that during DoD implementation, course curricula can be developed to achieve both goals of consolidating training where appropriate, and providing service-unique training where necessary.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site

Recommendation # 125 (E&T 10)

One-time Cost:	$199.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$3.3M
20-Year Net Present Value:	$226.3M
Payback period:	Never

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Luke Air Force Base, AZ, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots and operations support personnel to stand up the Air Force's portion of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots and operations support personnel to stand up the Marine Corps' portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, VA, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots, operations, and maintenance support personnel to stand up the Navy's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of frontline and instructor-qualified maintenance technicians and logistics support personnel to stand up the Air Force's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of frontline and instructor-qualified maintenance technicians and logistics support personnel to stand up the Department of the Navy's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation establishes Eglin Air Force Base, FL, as an Initial Joint Training Site that teaches entry-level aviators and maintenance technicians how to safely operate and maintain the new Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) (F-35) aircraft. The Department is scheduled to take delivery of the F-35 beginning in 2008. This joint basing arrangement will allow the Interservice Training Review Organization process to establish a DoD baseline program in a consolidated/joint school with curricula that permit services latitude to preserve service-unique culture and a faculty and staff that brings a "Train as we fight: jointly" national perspective to the learning process.

Community Concerns

The Sheppard AFB, TX, community endorsed the concept of establishing a single test site for the JSF program and did not voice concerns over its being located at Eglin Air Force Base. The community did request, however, that Sheppard Air Force Base be considered as a candidate installation for JSF maintenance training after the initial JSF proof-of-concept is completed.

The Pensacola, FL, community acknowledged that locating the planned JSF test center at Eglin Air Force Base was good for the Florida Gulf region, which includes the Pensacola area.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission understands that establishing an initial training site for the Joint Strike Fighter at Eglin Air Force Base will support the learning process for this new-generation aircraft. Careful implementation should enable DoD to harness the best aspects of each service branch while still meeting service-unique requirements.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Net Fires Center

Recommendation # 126 (E&T 12)

One-time Cost:	$247.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($42.6M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($319.1M)
Payback Period:	6 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Bliss, TX, by relocating the Air Defense Artillery (ADA) Center & School to Fort Sill, OK. Consolidate the ADA Center & School with the Field Artillery Center & School to establish a Net Fires Center.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation consolidates Net Fires training and doctrine development at a single location. The moves advance the Maneuver Support Center (MANSCEN) model, currently in place at Fort Leonard Wood, which consolidated the Military Police, Engineer, and Chemical Centers and Schools. This recommendation improves the MANSCEN concept by consolidating functionally related branch centers and schools, fostering consistency, standardization, and training proficiency. It also facilitates task force stabilization by combining operational forces with institutional training. In addition, it consolidates both ADA and Field Artillery skill level I courses at one location, allowing the Army to reduce the total number of Military Occupational Skills training locations (reducing the TRADOC footprint). Additionally, it enhances military value, supports the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address unforeseen requirements. It improves training capabilities while eliminating excess capacity at institutional training installations. This provides the same or better level of service at a reduced cost. This recommendation supports Army Transformation by collocating institutional training, Modification Table of organization and Equipment (MTOE) units, research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) organizations, and other TDA units in large numbers on single installations to support force stabilization and engage training.

Community Concerns

The Fort Bliss community agreed with the concept of consolidating the ADA and Field Artillery schools to create a Net Fires Center but believed it should be located at Fort Bliss because it would be less expensive at Fort Bliss, and Fort Bliss's missile ranges and maneuver space can accommodate the schools better than Fort Sill. For example, ADA missiles can be live-fired at Fort Bliss. Community representatives maintained that moving the ADA school to Fort Sill would degrade U.S. air defense weapon systems development and allied missile training conducted at Fort Bliss. They claimed that Fort Bliss is large enough to retain all units currently stationed there as well as the 1st Armored Division and that greater opportunity for stabilization exists at Fort Bliss because it will have more units than Fort Sill.

Commission Findings

The Commission found DoD's recommendation consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The Commission carefully considered the seven major concerns raised by the Fort Bliss community. While it is true that ADA missiles cannot be live-fired at Fort Sill, the Commission found that the Army does not require live-firing of these missiles at Fort Sill. Similarly, the Commission found that sufficient training space exists at Fort Sill to accomplish the mission. Related to the concern that U.S. weapons system development and testing at Fort Bliss would be adversely impacted by relocating the ADA school and units to Fort Sill, the Commission found that development and testing are not tied to the location of these organizations and that these functions are principally the responsibility of other organizations. Moreover, the Commission found that training foreign allies at Fort Bliss is independent of the BRAC process, and allies would be free to choose to train at either Fort Bliss or Fort Sill. The Commission found compelling the Army's argument that the highest military value of both forts was obtained by relocating the ADA units from Fort Bliss to Fort Sill, including force and family stabilization. Related to the concern that cost savings would be improved substantially by retaining ADA units at Fort Bliss while assigning other units to Fort Bliss, the Commission found that the approved recommendation correctly prioritized

gains in military value relating to mission requirements, warfighting, training, and deployability, rather than generating higher potential cost savings from collocating all units of concern at Fort Bliss.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, MO

Recommendation # 127 (E&T 13)

One-time Cost:	$6.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($0.8M)
Payback Period:	16 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating Army Prime Power School training to Fort Leonard Wood, MO.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The United States Army Prime Power School courses taught at Fort Belvoir, VA, are Engineer Branch courses. The United States Army Engineer Center at Fort Leonard Wood, MO, serves as the Service engineer proponent. The common-core phases of engineer courses are already taught at Fort Leonard Wood. This realignment consolidates engineer courses at Fort Leonard Wood, MO. Consolidate like schools while preserving service-unique culture. The United States Army Engineer School trains other services under the Inter-service Training Review Organization.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that while the recommendation has a small net savings, it successfully achieves the purpose of consolidating engineering courses at one location. In addition, the new facilities would significantly improve safety and training. The Commission's review and analysis identified one issue involving a loss of the close relationship between the school and the 249th Engineer Battalion (Prime Power), the only prime power battalion in the Army. The Army is reviewing the battalion's location and has the authority and the means to move the battalion outside the BRAC process.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training

Recommendation # 128 (E&T 14)

One-time Cost:	$71.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($18.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($174.2M)
Payback Period:	4 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Moody Air Force Base, GA, as follows: Relocate the Primary Phase of Fixed-wing Pilot Training to Columbus Air Force Base, MS; Laughlin Air Force Base, TX; and Vance Air Force Base, OK. Relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots to Columbus Air Force Base, MS; Laughlin Air Force Base, TX; Randolph Air Force Base, TX; Sheppard Air Force Base, TX; and Vance Air Force Base, OK. Relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers to Columbus Air Force Base, MS; Laughlin Air Force Base, TX; Sheppard Air Force Base, TX; and Vance Air Force Base, OK. Relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Instructor Pilots to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.

Realign Randolph Air Force Base, TX, by relocating Undergraduate Navigator Training to Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation will realign and consolidate the Air Force's primary phase of undergraduate flight training functions to reduce excess/unused basing capacity, eliminate redundancy, enhance jointness for Undergraduate Navigator Training/Naval Flight Officer (NFO) training, reduce excess capacity, and improve military value.

The basing arrangement that flows from this recommendation will allow the Inter-service Training Review Organization process to establish a DoD baseline program in Undergraduate Navigator Training/NFO with curricula that permit services latitude to preserve service-unique culture and a faculty and staff that brings a "Train as we fight: jointly" national perspective to the learning process.

Community Concerns

No concerns were formally expressed by elected officials or organized civic organizations; however, individual citizens near Moody Air Force Base expressed concerns about the loss of contractor jobs.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation or justification. The Commission understands the proposal will realign training to other installations where the same mission already exists, maintenance facilities are established, and capacity to absorb the mission is adequate. As a result, the Commission finds the recommendation appropriately enhances military value at reasonable cost.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Post Graduate Education

Recommendation # 197 (Add)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

None. The Secretary's proposed list submitted on May 13, 2005, did not include this recommendation. It was added by the Commission on July 19, 2005, for further consideration.

Secretary of Defense Justification

None.

Community Concerns

Community leaders from the Dayton, OH, and Monterey, CA, areas expressed nearly identical arguments concerning the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) and the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT), pointing out the schools' service-specific focus, their successful partnerships with nearby private education institutions, the significance and scope of their non-resident postgraduate programs, and the national benefits of their research.

Specifically, Monterey advocates expressed significant concern about merging Defense Language Institute (DLI) programs with other institutions due to differences in missions, programs, and student body (primarily enlisted personnel fresh from basic training). They also argued relocation would devastate DLI because it would lose much of its faculty, comprised mainly of non-citizen native-speaking personnel. They also noted that the city of Monterey provides maintenance services worth millions of dollars.

Dayton questioned the accuracy of DoD costs and savings estimates and claimed an independent analysis showed no savings would be realized by the proposal to move AFIT to Monterey, CA. Similarly, they questioned the accuracy of the DoD's data supporting AFIT's Military Value scores. According to their independent analysis, AFIT's scores were nearly identical to NPS. They noted AFIT facilities are recently built and state-of-the-art; Ohio's financial support ($51 million since 1996) enables military students to attend state universities free of charge; and the availability of significantly more unrestricted buildable land than at NPS. They asserted consolidation of schools at Dayton would save DoD millions per year in housing allowances and locality pay due to differences in the cost of living.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that both the Naval Postgraduate School and the Air Force Institute of Technology provide unique graduate-level education programs to service members and DoD personnel. The uniqueness of these programs is characterized by (1) their focus on the service issues, challenges, and systems directly affecting the participants, (2) their successful partnerships with private education institutions, (3) the significance and scope of their non-resident postgraduate programs, and (4) the national benefits of their research.

While the Commission found that consolidation of the schools would generate cost savings, it also determined that such actions could potentially degrade the military value of both institutions and the quality of their program graduates. For example, consolidation could jeopardize the accreditation of the institutions, and force the cancellation of research projects that support operations of our Combatant Commanders.

School consolidation and privatization are not the only alternatives for reducing personnel and infrastructure costs. In December of 2002, the Secretaries of the Air Force and Navy developed a Memorandum of Understanding, commonly called the Educational Alliance, to improve coordination between the Naval Postgraduate School and the Air Force Institute of Technology. Joint boards for meteorology, space, acquisition, and aeronautical engineering were established, and some programs in these areas were consolidated. However, primarily because the Alliance has no enforcement powers, little else

has been achieved despite the fact that the group's studies identified significant duplication in curriculums between the schools, underemphasized collaboration opportunities, research that could be shared, and significant unused capacity.

The Commission finds that, under its present charter, the joint service Educational Alliance has no authority to impose change regardless of the findings of its study groups. As a result, the tough issues mentioned above that could result in significant savings and improvement remain unaddressed. The Commission believes that rather than continuing as two schools focused on individual service needs, they can and need to be transformed into a joint program with two schools working together to meet joint needs. The Commission finds that an empowered Board free from individual service branch and school institutional pressures could address issues facing the schools and provide the non-service focused direction needed to transform the Naval Postgraduate School and Air Force Institute of Technology into a truly joint system of education.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 3 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, and the Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by forming a new and permanent oversight board responsible for curriculum review and approval, and program development for the resident and non-resident degree-granting programs at both schools. This Board—consisting of an equal number of members from the governing boards of each school, civilian education authorities recommended by the U.S. Secretary of Education, and other education officials as designated by the Secretary of Defense—will be chartered by the office of the Secretary of Defense and will provide a formal report of its actions and accomplishments to that office biannually. The Board's duties will consist of those actions listed as "Goals" in the Memorandum of Agreement that formed an Educational Alliance between the Secretaries of the Air Force and Navy on December 4, 2002. This Board will be located in the National Capital Region. By this recommendation, the newly formed board will also have the authority to:

- take action to eliminate unnecessary curricula and program duplication;
- identify, approve, and implement programs of collaboration in research and instruction between the schools, and;
- expand nonresident programs and arrangements with private institutions of higher learning to meet common curriculum and non-Department of Defense focused class requirements.

The Commission finds that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUPS (JCSGS):

HEADQUARTERS AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

CO-LOCATE MISCELLANEOUS AIR FORCE LEASED LOCATIONS AND NATIONAL GUARD HEADQUARTERS LEASED LOCATIONS

RECOMMENDATION # 129 (H&SA 3)

ONE-TIME COST:	$90.5M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	($30.8M)
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	($308.2M)
PAYBACK PERIOD:	1 YEAR

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Close 1501 Wilson Blvd., a leased installation in Arlington, VA. Relocate the Air Force-Judge Advocate General to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Close 1560 Wilson Blvd., a leased installation in Arlington, VA. Relocate the Secretary of the Air Force-Acquisition to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Close Arlington Plaza, a leased installation in Arlington, VA. Relocate the Secretary of the Air Force-Auditor General to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign 1401 Wilson Blvd., the Nash Street Building, and 1919 Eads Street, leased installations in Arlington, VA, by relocating Air Force-Operations to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign 1815 N. Fort Myer Drive, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating Air Force-Operations, the Secretary of the Air Force-Administrative Assistant, and the Secretary of the Air Force-Auditor General to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign Ballston Metro Center, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Secretary of the Air Force-Public Affairs and the Secretary of the Air Force-Small Business to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign Crystal Gateway 1, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating Air Force-Personnel, Air Force-Installations and Logistics, Air Force-Operations, and Air Force-Personnel Operations to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign Crystal Gateway 2 and Jefferson Plaza 2, leased installations in Arlington, VA, by relocating Air Force-Installations and Logistics to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign Crystal Gateway North, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating Air Force-Installations and Logistics and the Secretary of the Air Force-Financial Management to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign Crystal Park 5 and Crystal Plaza 6, leased installations in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Secretary of the Air Force-Administrative Assistant to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign Crystal Plaza 5, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Air Force-Chief Information Officer and Air Force-Operations to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign Crystal Square 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating Air Force-Personnel and Air Force-Personnel Operations to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign the Webb Building, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating Air Force-Personnel and the Secretary of the Air Force/General Counsel to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign Jefferson Plaza-1, Arlington, VA, by relocating the National Guard Bureau Headquarters, the Air National Guard Headquarters, and elements of the Army National Guard Headquarters to the Army National Guard Readiness Center, Arlington, VA, and Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation meets two important Department of Defense (DoD) objectives with regard to future use of leased space and enhanced security for DoD activities. Additionally, the recommendation results in a significant improvement in military value as a result of the movement from leased space to a military installation. The average military value of the noted components of Headquarters Air Force (HAF) based on current locations ranges from 230th to 333rd of 334 entities evaluated by the MAH military value model. Andrews Air Force Base is ranked 51st out of 334. Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-010-01. The recommendation eliminates 190,000 Usable Square Feet of leased administrative space within the NCR. This, plus the immediate benefit of enhanced Force Protection afforded by a location within a military installation fence-line, will provide HAF components with immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. HAF's current leased locations are non-compliant with current Force Protection Standards.

The collocation of National Guard Headquarters elements to two sites, Army National Guard Readiness Center, Arlington, VA, and Andrews Air Force Base, MD, will enhance Joint Service interoperability. Currently, the National Guard Headquarters entities are housed in three locations in metropolitan Washington, DC, creating a disjointed hindrance to organizational and operational efficiency. By virtue of being located at two operating sites, the Guard commands would significantly increase interaction between themselves for improved force enhancement. A positive result of the co-location is a reduction in force manning levels by eliminating duplicative staff. Various common support functions; i.e., administrative support, contracting and supply functions, would be merged, resulting in a decrease in staffing size. The recommendation eliminates 237,000 Usable Square Feet of leased administrative space within the Washington, DC, area. Leased cost expenditures of $11M per year and Anti-terrorism and Force Protection costs will significantly decrease through the construction of new facilities on a military reservation.

Community Concerns

Community leaders questioned DoD's security standards, stating they were unnecessarily more stringent than those developed by the Interagency Security Committee (tasked with developing and evaluating security standards for Federal facilities.) Also, the communities questioned whether DoD had surveyed each facility to determine compliance and the level of compliance with the DoD security standards (or even those "less stringent" standards approved by OMB in September 2004.) The communities felt BRAC was not the proper instrument to effect DoD employee relocation from leased facilities.

Advocates expressed concerns about the negative impact on operational readiness and manpower implications. They argued the current "scattered" arrangement of leased office space makes more strategic sense than does concentration, that relocation will disrupt synergies with other agencies of the Federal Government and the Pentagon, and, finally, that leased space is better able to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements than its alternative, military construction. Similarly, communities claimed their quality of life could be reduced because of transportation problems such as increased traffic, lack of public transportation, and increased commuting times, with the attendant issues of air pollution and increased fuel consumption.

Commission Findings

The Commission's review and analysis validated the community concern that the Department failed to assess each leased-space location individually for compliance with DoD Force Protection standards. The Commission also acknowledged community concerns about personnel relocation, impact on military readiness, and possible advantages that leased space may have over military owned facilities. These concerns were carefully weighed and considered, but in the final analysis the Commission found they did not collectively rise to the level of a substantial deviation. The experience of prior rounds of BRAC has shown that numerous leased-space facilities have been closed and relocated successfully and without excessive disruption. Moreover, the Commission felt that the majority of the concerns raised about the proposal were more properly categorized as implementation issues that could be successfully managed over the six-year implementation period.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Co-locate Defense/Military Department Adjudication Activities

Recommendation # 130 (H&SA 5)

One-time Cost:	$67.10M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($5.72M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($11.30M)
Payback Period:	13 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close 21820 Burbank Boulevard, a leased installation in Woodland Hills, CA. Relocate all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Western Hearing Office to Fort Meade, MD.

Close 800 Elkridge Landing Road, a leased installation in Linthicum, MD. Relocate all components of the National Security Agency Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign 2780 Airport Drive, a leased installation in Columbus, OH, by relocating all components of the Defense Industrial Security Clearance Office and the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Personal Security Division to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign 1777 N. Kent Street, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating all components of the Washington Headquarters Service Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign 875 N. Randolph Street, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Headquarters to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign 10050 North 25th Avenue, a leased installation in Phoenix, AZ, by relocating all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Arizona office to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign the Washington Navy Yard Washington, DC, by relocating all components of the Navy Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign Bolling Air Force Base Washington, DC, by relocating all components of the Air Force Central Adjudication Facility and the Defense Intelligence Agency Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign the Pentagon, Washington, DC, by relocating all components of the Joint Staff Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign the US Army Soldiers Systems Center Garrison, Natick, MA, by relocating all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Boston Hearing office to Fort Meade, MD.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation collocates all Military Department (MILDEP) and Department of Defense (DoD) security clearance adjudication and appeals activities at Fort Meade, MD. It meets several important DoD objectives with regard to future use of leased space, enhanced security for DoD activities, and collocates National Capital Area intelligence community activities. It also enables the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Act of 2004, the Administration's counterintelligence strategy, and the Remodeling Defense Intelligence initiative. Additionally, this recommendation results in a significant improvement in military value due to a shift from predominately-leased space to a location on a military installation. The military value of adjudication activities current portfolio of locations ranges from 152-280 out of 334 entities evaluated by the Major Administration and Headquarters (MAH) military value model. Fort Meade, MD, ranks 94 out of 334.

Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space, which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-

010-01. The benefit of enhanced Force Protection afforded by a location within a military installation fence-line will provide immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. MILDEP and Defense adjudication activities located currently at leased locations are not compliant with current Force Protection Standards.

This recommendation eliminates 136,930 gross square feet of leased administrative space. This action provides a collocation of these activities, and reduces the number of locations from 13 to one.

Community Concerns

Community leaders questioned DoD's security standards, stating they were unnecessarily more stringent than those developed by the Interagency Security Committee (tasked with developing and evaluating security standards for Federal facilities.) Also, the communities questioned whether DoD had surveyed each facility to determine compliance and the level of compliance with the DoD security standards (or even those "less stringent" standards approved by OMB in September 2004.) The communities felt BRAC was not the proper instrument to effect DoD employee relocation from leased facilities.

Advocates expressed concerns about the negative impact on operational readiness and manpower implications. They argued the current "scattered" arrangement of leased office space makes more strategic sense than does concentration, that relocation will disrupt synergies with other agencies of the Federal Government and the Pentagon, and, finally, that leased space is better able to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements than its alternative, military construction. Similarly, communities claimed their quality of life could be reduced because of transportation problems such as increased traffic, lack of public transportation, and increased commuting times, with the attendant issues of air pollution and increased fuel consumption.

In addition to the generalized comments above, the community expressed specific concerns that Anne Arundel County would be unable to handle the influx of jobs into Fort Meade because of a lack of mass transit, inadequate roads and schools, the poor military housing at Fort Meade, and paucity of safe housing in the surrounding community. The affected communities argued that moving the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) onto a military installation would make it inordinately difficult for people to have their cases heard and that the cost in terms of reduced accessibility far outweighs the benefits of the proposed consolidation. They asserted consolidation would result in exorbitant, additional travel-related expenses for employees and hearing participants and would increase the case backlog.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. However, the Commission's review and analysis discovered that the National Security Agency's Adjudication Office is only a part of a larger NSA presence at 800 Elkridge Landing Road in Linthicum, MD, so the recommendation has been amended to realign rather than close that address.

The Commission acknowledges the community's concerns about employee commuting but understands that the local governments involved are planning surface transportation improvements near the Fort Meade area. Additionally, the Commission acknowledges that moving the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals (DOHA) onto a military installation could make it difficult for people to have their cases heard but expects the impact on individuals served by DOHA to be minimal because hearing examiners (administrative judges) travel to the hearing site on most occasions.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 7 and from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close 21820 Burbank Boulevard, a leased installation in Woodland Hills, CA. Relocate all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Western Hearing Office to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign 800 Elkridge Landing Road, a leased installation in Linthicum, MD. Relocate all components of the National Security Agency Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign 2780 Airport Drive, a leased installation in Columbus, OH, by relocating all components of the Defense Industrial Security Clearance Office and the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Personal Security Division to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign 1777 N. Kent Street, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating all components of the Washington Headquarters Service Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign 875 N. Randolph Street, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Headquarters to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign 10050 North 25th Avenue, a leased installation in Phoenix, AZ, by relocating all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Arizona office to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign the Washington Navy Yard, DC, by relocating all components of the Navy Central Adjudication Facility Fort Meade, MD.

Realign Bolling Air Force Base, DC, by relocating all components of the Air Force Central Adjudication Facility and the Defense Intelligence Agency Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign the Pentagon, Washington, DC, by relocating all components of the Joint Staff Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign the US Army Soldiers Systems Center Garrison, Natick, MA, by relocating all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Boston Hearing office to Fort Meade, MD.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency

Recommendation # 131 (H&SA 8)

One-time Cost:	$172.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($25.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($166.4M)
Payback Period:	7 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close 1919 South Eads Street, and 1801 South Bell Street, leased installations in Arlington, VA; 1340 Braddock Place, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA; and 938 Elkridge Landing, a leased installation in Linthicum, MD. Relocate all components of the Counterintelligence Field Activity (CIFA) and Defense Security Service (DSS) to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

Realign Crystal Square 2, Crystal Square 4, and 251 18th Street South, leased installations in Arlington, VA; and 6845 and 6856 Deerpath Road, leased installations in Elkridge, MD; 1 World Trade Center, a leased installation in Long Beach, California; 2300 Lake Park Drive, a leased installation in Smyrna, GA; and 2780 Airport Drive, a leased installation in Columbus, OH, by relocating all components of CIFA and DSS to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

Realign 121 Tejon, a leased installation in Colorado Springs, CO, by relocating all components of CIFA to Peterson Air Force Base, CO.

Disestablish CIFA and DSS, and consolidate their components into the newly created Department of Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency.

Realign Washington Navy Yard Washington, DC, by relocating the Naval Criminal Investigation Service (NCIS) to Marine Corp Base Quantico, VA.

Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD by relocating the Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating the Army Criminal Investigation Command (CID) to Marine Corp Base Quantico, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation produces operational synergies by locating entities with similar or related missions (CIFA, DSS, NCIS AFOSI, & CID) in one place. Proximity to nearby Federal Bureau of Investigations offices and training facilities will further enhance this effect. In addition, it collocates a CIFA component with US Northern Command headquarters, to which the component provides direct war fighting and homeland security support.

This recommendation also collapses CIFA and DSS and consolidates their activities into a new agency at Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA. It meets important DoD objectives with regard to future use of leased space, consolidation of headquarters operations at single locations, enhanced security for DoD activities, and consolidates National Capital Region (NCR) intelligence community activities. It also enables the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Act of 2004 and the Remodeling Defense Intelligence initiative.

Implementation of this recommendation will reduce the DoD's reliance on leased space, which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-010-01. The benefit of enhanced force protection afforded by a location within a military installation fence-line will provide immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. CIFA and DSS current leased locations are not compliant with current Force Protection Standards. The CIFA, DSS portion of this recommendation eliminates 427,097 Gross Square Feet (GSF) of leased administrative space, consolidates their activities, and reduces the number of locations from 13 to two.

Co-location of military department investigation activities meets a primary DoD objective to rationalize the presence of DoD activities within the NCR. The relocation to a military installation that is largely outside the boundaries of the NCR provides a dispersion of DoD activities away from a dense concentration within the NCR. This action will free up approximately 510,000 Gross Square Feet of administrative space that can be reused by other DoD activities that require a location closer to the Pentagon. It reduces the number of locations from three to one.

This recommendation results in a significant improvement in military value. As receiving locations, Peterson Air Force Base ranks 3 out of 334, and Marine Corps Base, Quantico ranks 78 out of 334, both ranked much higher than the collective portfolio of current locations. The military value of CIFA leased space is 279 out of 334 entities evaluated by the Major Administration and Headquarters (MAH) military value model. DSS military value of its locations is 334 out of 334. The military value of military department investigative activities locations evaluated by the MAH military value model is: Air Force Office of Special Investigations, 174 out of 334; Navy Criminal Investigation Agency, 180 out of 334; and the Army's Criminal Investigation Command, 220 out of 334.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found the recommendation to disestablish the Counterintelligence Field Activity (CIFA) and the Defense Security Service (DSS) and consolidate their components into the DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency via the BRAC process to be unwise and unnecessary. DoD's proposal would have directed a significant reorganization of counterintelligence and security organizations with unknown mission and manpower effects, even though there were no indications of overcapacity, and the issues in question could best be addressed through non-BRAC programmatic means.

The Commission's review and analysis found that DoD did not include Army counterintelligence (CI) components in its BRAC recommendation to co-locate investigation agencies at Marine Corps Base Quantico. As a result, the Army has developed an initiative complementary to the BRAC recommendation to consolidate Service, DSS and CIFA CI and law enforcement headquarters at Quantico.

The Commission believes that an Army counterintelligence presence at Marine Corps Base Quantico, co-located and aligned with counterpart CIFA, AFOSI and NCIS headquarters elements—will significantly enhance counterintelligence synchronization and collaboration across DoD. Co-location of Army CI will enhance DoD analytic and operational synergies and coordination—and more closely align Army CI and law enforcement units to maximize efforts in technology protection, cyber investigations and the Global War on Terrorism. Army counterintelligence at Quantico will provide a focal point for the CIFA, Navy and Air Force counterintelligence and law enforcement operational headquarters to support ever-increasing collaborative counterintelligence efforts across DoD through enhanced information sharing and economies of scale. Additionally, Army CI and law enforcement functions for national security related crimes will be enhanced with co-location.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4 and from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close 1919 South Eads Street, and 1801 South Bell Street, leased installations in Arlington, VA; 1340 Braddock Place, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA; and 938 Elkridge Landing, a leased installation in Linthicum, MD. Relocate all components of the Counterintelligence Field Activity (CIFA) and Defense Security Service (DSS) to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

Realign Crystal Square 2, Crystal Square 4, and 251 18th Street South, leased installations in Arlington, VA; and 6845 and 6856 Deerpath Road, leased installations in Elkridge, MD; 1 World Trade Center, a leased installation in Long Beach, CA; 2300 Lake Park Drive, a leased installation in Smyrna, GA; and 2780 Airport Drive, a leased installation in Columbus, OH, by relocating all components of CIFA and DSS to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

Realign 121 Tejon, a leased installation in Colorado Springs, CO, by relocating all components of CIFA to Peterson Air Force Base, CO.

Disestablish Counterintelligence Field Activity and Defense Security Service and consolidate their components into the Department of Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency if that agency is established by law or directive.

Realign Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC, by relocating the Naval Criminal Investigation Service (NCIS) to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD, by relocating the Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating the Army Criminal Investigation Command (CID) to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations

Recommendation # 132 (H&SA 10)

One-time Cost:	$44.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($27.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($322.0M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Ballston Metro Center, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the US Army Legal Agency to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Park Center Office 1, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA, by relocating the US Army Audit Agency to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Skyline VI, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA, by relocating the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army (SAAA) to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign the Zachary Taylor Building, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the US Army G6/DISC4, the G8/Force Development, the G1/Army Research Institute, the US Army Network Enterprise Technology Command, and the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army (SAAA) to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Crystal Square 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating US Army National Information Security Assessment Program, the US Army Environmental Policy Institute, and Senior Executive Public Affairs Training to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Crystal Gateway 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army - Operations Research to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign the Hoffman 1 and 2 Buildings, leased installations in Alexandria, VA, by relocating US Army G1/Civilian Personnel Office, G1/Personnel Transformation, the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army (SAAA), and the Communication and Electronics Command to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Rosslyn Metro Center, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army (SAAA) to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Jefferson Plaza 1 and 2, leased installations in Arlington, VA, by relocating the US Army Office of the Chief Army Reserve, Assistant Secretary of the Army Financial Management and Comptroller/CEAC, the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army (SAAA), and Chief of Chaplains to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Crystal Gateway North, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the US Army G3/Army Simulation to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Crystal Plaza 5, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the US Army Safety Office and OSAA to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Crystal Mall 4, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Assistant Secretary of the Army Manpower and Reserve Affairs/Amy Review Board/Equal Opportunity Office to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Crystal Gateway 1, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating US Army Office of Environmental Technology to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation meets two important Department of Defense (DoD) objectives with regard to future use of leased space and enhanced security for DoD activities. Additionally, the recommendation results in a significant improvement in military value as a result of the movement from leased space to a military installation. The average military value of the noted components of Headquarters of the Department of the Army (HQDA) based on current locations ranges from 233rd to 327th out of 334 entities evaluated by the Major Administration and Headquarters (MAH) military value model. Fort Belvoir is ranked 57th out of 334. Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space, which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-010-01. The recommendation eliminates approximately 690,300 Usable Square Feet of leased administrative space within the NCR. This, plus the immediate benefit of enhanced Force Protection afforded by a location within a military installation fence-line, will provide HQDA components with immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. HQDA's current leased locations are non-compliant with current Force Protection Standards.

Community Concerns

Community leaders questioned DoD's security standards, stating they were unnecessarily more stringent than those developed by the Interagency Security Committee (tasked with developing and evaluating security standards for Federal facilities.) Also, the communities questioned whether DoD had surveyed each facility to determine compliance and the level of compliance with the DoD security standards (or even those "less stringent" standards approved by OMB in September 2004.) The communities felt BRAC was not the proper instrument to effect DoD employee relocation from leased facilities.

Advocates expressed concerns about the negative impact on operational readiness and manpower implications. They argued the current "scattered" arrangement of leased office space makes more strategic sense than does concentration, that relocation will disrupt synergies with other agencies of the Federal Government and the Pentagon, and, finally, that leased space is better able to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements than its alternative, military construction. Similarly, communities claimed their quality of life could be reduced because of transportation problems such as increased traffic, lack of public transportation, and increased commuting times, with the attendant issues of air pollution and increased fuel consumption.

Commission Findings

The Commission's review and analysis validated the community concern that the Department failed to assess each leased-space location individually for compliance with DoD Force Protection standards. The Commission also acknowledged

community concerns about personnel relocation, impact on military readiness, and possible advantages that leased space may have over military owned facilities. These concerns were carefully weighed and considered, but in the final analysis the Commission found they did not collectively rise to the level of a substantial deviation. The experience of prior rounds of BRAC has shown that numerous leased-space facilities have been closed and relocated successfully and without excessive disruption. Moreover, the Commission felt that the majority of the concerns raised about the proposal were more properly categorized as implementation issues that could be successfully managed over the six-year implementation period.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Co-locate Miscellaneous DoD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased Locations

Recommendation # 133 (H&SA 12)

One-time Cost:	$601.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($67.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($256.4M)
Payback Period:	9 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close 1010 North Glebe Road, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, 4850 Mark Center Drive, the Crown Ridge Building at 4035 Ridgetop, and 1901 N. Beauregard, leased installations in Northern VA, by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Close North Tower at 2800 Crystal Drive, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the DoD Inspector General to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Close 1600 Wilson Boulevard, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Close 1500 Wilson Boulevard and Presidential Towers, leased installations in Arlington, VA, by relocating offices accommodating Pentagon Renovation temporary space to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Close Metro Park III and IV (6350 and 6359 Walker Lane), a leased installation in Alexandria, VA, by relocating the Defense Contract Management Agency Headquarters to Fort Lee, VA.

Realign 400 Army Navy Drive, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, and the DoD Inspector General to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign the Webb Building, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Department of Defense Education Activity and the Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Rosslyn Plaza North, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating offices accommodating Pentagon Renovation temporary space, Washington Headquarters Services and the Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Crystal Gateway North, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, and the DoD Inspector General to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign 2001 North Beauregard Street, 621 North Payne Street, Ballston Metro Center, Crystal Square 4, Crystal Square 5, Crystal Plaza 6, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Skyline 5, and Skyline 6, leased installations in Northern VA, by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Crystal Mall 3, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Defense Finance and Accounting Service at Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Hoffman 1, Crystal Gateway 1, Crystal Gateway 2, Crystal Gateway 3, and the James K. Polk Building, leased installations in Northern VA, by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Washington Headquarters Services to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign the Nash Street Building, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Alexandria Tech Center IV, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA, by relocating the Defense Technology Security Administration to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign 1400-1450 South Eads Street, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the DoD Inspector General to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign 1401 Wilson Boulevard, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, and Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign 1555 Wilson Boulevard, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating offices of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Crystal Mall 2-3-4 and Skyline 4, leased installations in Northern VA, by relocating Washington Headquarters Services to Fort Belvoir, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation meets two important Department of Defense (DoD) objectives with regard to future use of leased space and enhanced security for DoD Activities. Additionally, the recommendation results in a significant improvement in military value as a result of the movement from leased space to a military installation. The average military value of the noted Department of Defense components based on current locations ranges from 272nd to 332nd out of 334 entities evaluated by the Major Administration and Headquarters (MAH) military value model. Fort Belvoir is ranked 57th out of 334; and Fort Lee is ranked 96th. Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-010-01. The recommendation eliminates approximately 1,850,000 Usable Square Feet of leased administrative space within the NCR. This, plus the immediate benefit of enhanced Force Protection afforded by a location within a military installation fence-line, will provide immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. The leased installations affected by this recommendation are generally non-compliant with current Force Protection Standards. The relocation of the DCMA headquarters to a military installation that is farther than 100 miles from the Pentagon provides dispersion of DoD activities away from a dense concentration within the National Capital Region. This recommendation has the added benefit of allowing DCMA to combine its headquarters facilities from two adjacent leased buildings into one facility that meets its current space requirements.

Community Concerns

Community leaders questioned DoD's security standards, stating they were unnecessarily more stringent than those developed by the Interagency Security Committee (tasked with developing and evaluating security standards for Federal facilities.) Also, the communities questioned whether DoD had surveyed each facility to determine compliance and the level of compliance with the DoD security standards (or even those "less stringent" standards approved by OMB in September 2004.) The communities felt BRAC was not the proper instrument to effect DoD employee relocation from leased facilities.

Advocates expressed concerns about the negative impact on operational readiness and manpower implications. They argued the current "scattered" arrangement of leased office space makes more strategic sense than does concentration, that relocation will disrupt synergies with other agencies of the Federal Government and the Pentagon, and, finally, that leased space is better able to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements than its alternative, military construction. Similarly, communities claimed their quality of life could be reduced because of transportation problems such as increased traffic, lack of public transportation, and increased commuting times, with the attendant issues of air pollution and increased fuel consumption.

In addition to the generalized comments above, affected communities submitted comments on the following agency: DCMA. The specific concern was not about moving out of the leased facility but about moving to the gaining location, Fort Lee, because of constrained access to field operations and customers.

Commission Findings

The Commission's review and analysis validated the community concern that the Department failed to assess each leased-space location individually for compliance with DoD Force Protection standards. The Commission also acknowledged community concerns about personnel relocation, impact on military readiness, and possible advantages that leased space may have over military owned facilities. These concerns were carefully weighed and considered, but in the final analysis the Commission found they did not collectively rise to the level of a substantial deviation. The experience of prior rounds of BRAC has shown that numerous leased-space facilities have been closed and relocated successfully and without excessive disruption. Moreover, the Commission felt that the majority of the concerns raised about the proposal were more properly categorized as implementation issues that could be successfully managed over the six-year implementation period.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Co-locate Missile and Space Defense Agencies

Recommendation # 134 (H&SA 15)

One-time Cost:	$178.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($36.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($359.1M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Suffolk Building, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA. Relocate all Missile Defense Agency (MDA) functions, except the Ballistic Missile Defense System Sensors Directorate, to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Close the Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) Building, a leased installation in Huntsville, AL. Relocate all functions of the Missile Defense Agency to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Realign Federal Office Building 2, Arlington, VA, by relocating a Headquarters Command Center for the Missile Defense Agency to Fort Belvoir, VA, and by relocating all other functions of the Missile Defense Agency, except the Command and Control Battle Management and Communications Directorate, to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Realign Crystal Square 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating all functions of the Missile Defense Agency and the Headquarters component of the USA Space and Missile Defense Command to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Realign Crystal Mall 4, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Headquarters component of the USA Space and Missile Defense Command to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation meets several important Department of Defense objectives with regard to future use of leased space, rationalization of the Department's presence within 100 miles of the Pentagon, and enhanced security for DoD activities. Relocating MDA operations from the NCR and consolidating with existing MDA activities already in Huntsville will enhance jointness and establish an invaluable synergy with the principal DoD expertise in ground-based missile research and development as well as with expertise in missile-related test and evaluation. Additionally, the recommendation results in a significant improvement in military value due to the shift from primarily leased space to locations on military installations. The military value of MDA based on its current portfolio of locations is 329 out of 334 entities evaluated by the Major Administration and Headquarters (MAH) military value model, and SMDC's headquarters is 299 out of 334. Redstone Arsenal is ranked 48 out of 334, and Fort Belvoir is ranked 57 out of 334.

Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-

010-01. The recommendation will eliminate approximately 227,000 GSF of leased space. It also provides space for the consolidation of MDA contractors with the appropriate MDA elements at Redstone Arsenal. The relocation of two activities to a military installation that is farther than 100 miles from the Pentagon provides dispersion of DoD activities away from a dense concentration within the National Capital Region. This, plus the immediate benefit of enhanced Force Protection afforded by a location within a military installation fence-line, will provide immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. The vast majority of MDA's and SMDC's present leased locations are not compliant with current Force Protection Standards. This action provides a consolidation for MDA's Washington, DC, area operations and Huntsville locations and continues movement of MDA onto Redstone Arsenal that is expected to occur with the completion in FY07 of the Von Braun 2 building, which will house approximately 800 MDA personnel. Similarly, SMDC is consolidating its headquarters office with existing activities recently moved on to Redstone Arsenal.

Community Concerns

The community felt the Suffolk Building, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA, would be penalized in the future by the implication that it failed to meet Anti-terrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP) standards. Community representatives argued that no AT/FP survey was ever completed and that DoD incorrectly characterized all commercial leased space as unsatisfactory without making formal surveys.

Commission Findings

The Commission found the recommendation was incorrectly worded regarding the action at the SMDC Building in Huntsville, AL. The Commission amended DoD's recommendation to "realign," rather than close, the building because the Program Executive Office, Missile and Space (PEOMS) will remain in the building. The Commission found that PEOMS was overlooked by DoD during the data collection process and will move to Redstone Arsenal, AL, outside the BRAC proposal.

The Commission's review and analysis validated the community concern that the Department failed to assess each leased-space location individually for compliance with DoD Force Protection standards. The Commission also acknowledged community concerns about personnel relocation, impact on military readiness, and possible advantages that leased space may have over military owned facilities. These concerns were carefully weighed and considered, but in the final analysis the Commission found they did not collectively rise to the level of a substantial deviation. The experience of prior rounds of BRAC has shown that numerous leased-space facilities have been closed and relocated successfully and without excessive disruption. Moreover, the Commission felt that the majority of the concerns raised about the proposal were more properly categorized as implementation issues that could be successfully managed over the six-year implementation period.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1 and from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close the Suffolk Building, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA. Relocate all Missile Defense Agency (MDA) functions, except the Ballistic Missile Defense System Sensors Directorate, to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Realign the Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) Building, a leased installation in Huntsville, AL. Relocate all functions of the Missile Defense Agency to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Realign Federal Office Building 2, Arlington, VA, by relocating a Headquarters Command Center for the Missile Defense Agency to Fort Belvoir, VA, and by relocating all other functions of the Missile Defense Agency, except the Command and Control Battle Management and Communications Directorate, to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Realign Crystal Square 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating all functions of the Missile Defense Agency and the Headquarters component of the USA Space and Missile Defense Command to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Realign Crystal Mall 4, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Headquarters component of the USA Space and Missile Defense Command to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center

Recommendation # 135 (H&SA 17)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by relocating Navy Education and Training Command to Naval Support Activity Millington, TN.

Realign Saufley Field, FL, by relocating Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center to Naval Support Activity Millington, TN.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Realignment of Navy Education and Training Command (NETC) and Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center (NETPDTC) to Naval Support Activity Millington will collocate these activities with common functions (Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Manpower Analysis Center, and Navy Personnel Research and Development Center) and facilitate creation of a Navy Human Resources Center of Excellence. By relocating NETC and NETPDTC within the hub of naval personnel activities, this recommendation eliminates personnel redundancies and excess infrastructure capacity. NETC and NETPDTC will require 50,400 GSF of military construction (MILCON) and will utilize 102,400 GSF of existing administrative space and warehouse space at Millington; the parking lot additions will be new MILCON.

Community Concerns

The affected communities emphasized the higher military value score for, and vacant infrastructure on, NAS Pensacola. Another expressed concern was that a move from Pensacola to Millington would mean a loss of experience because the majority of employees would probably not move from Florida to Tennessee. The communities argued that the proposed NETC move to Millington is an organizational realignment that does not necessitate a costly geographic move. Pertaining to NETPDTC, the community argued that the command could remain at Saufley or move aboard NAS Pensacola to reduce overhead costs. Finally, the community argued that industry standards should be used that recognize that advances in information technology make it possible for geographically separated organizations to function. Therefore, they recommended that NETC and NETPDTC remain in Florida.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that relocating the Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center to Millington, TN, was not justifiable in light of the commands' missions, was not cost effective, and would have a negative impact on the Department's stated objective of enabling jointness.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 3, 4, and 5 and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary. The Commission found this recommendation is consistent with the Force Structure Plan and final selection criteria.

Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Headquarters

Recommendation # 136 (H&SA 18)

One-time Cost:	$7.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($8.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($125.7M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Park Center Four, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA, by relocating and consolidating Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) with its subcomponents at Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation meets several important Department of Defense (DoD) objectives with regard to future use of leased space, rationalization of the Department's presence within the National Capital Region (NCR), and enhanced security for DoD activities. Additionally, the scenario results in a significant improvement in military value. The military value of ATEC's headquarters based on its current location is ranked 319 out of 334 entities evaluated by the MAH military value model, while APG is ranked 128 out of 334. Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space, which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-010-01. The recommendation eliminates 83,000 Usable Square Feet of leased administrative space within the NCR. The relocation to a military installation outside of the NCR provides dispersion of DoD activities away from a dense concentration within the NCR. This, plus the immediate benefit of enhanced Force Protection afforded by a location within a military installation fence-line, will provide ATEC's Headquarters with immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. Its current location is non-compliant with current Force Protection Standards. APG has available, vacant administrative space that can support this space requirement without the need for new MILCON. This recommendation has the added benefit of allowing ATEC to consolidate its headquarters facilities with its subcomponents that are currently operating at APG: the Army Developmental Test Command and the Army Evaluation Center.

Community Concerns

Community leaders questioned DoD's security standards, stating they were unnecessarily more stringent than those developed by the Interagency Security Committee (tasked with developing and evaluating security standards for Federal facilities.) Also, the communities questioned whether DoD had surveyed each facility to determine compliance and the level of compliance with the DoD security standards (or even those "less stringent" standards approved by OMB in September 2004.) The communities felt BRAC was not the proper instrument to effect DoD employee relocation from leased facilities.

Advocates expressed concerns about the negative impact on operational readiness and manpower implications. They argued the current "scattered" arrangement of leased office space makes more strategic sense than does concentration, that relocation will disrupt synergies with other agencies of the Federal Government and the Pentagon, and, finally, that leased space is better able to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements than its alternative, military construction. Similarly, communities claimed their quality of life could be reduced because of transportation problems such as increased traffic, lack of public transportation, and increased commuting times, with the attendant issues of air pollution and increased fuel consumption.

Commission Findings

The Commission's review and analysis validated the community concern that the Department failed to assess each leased-space location individually for compliance with DoD Force Protection standards. The Commission also acknowledged community concerns about personnel relocation, impact on military readiness, and possible advantages that leased space may have over military owned facilities. These concerns were carefully weighed and considered, but in the final analysis the

Commission found they did not collectively rise to the level of a substantial deviation. The experience of prior rounds of BRAC has shown that numerous leased-space facilities have been closed and relocated successfully and without excessive disruption. Moreover, the Commission felt that the majority of the concerns raised about the proposal were more properly categorized as implementation issues that could be successfully managed over the six-year implementation period.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices (CPOs) within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies

Recommendation # 137 (H&SA 19)

One-time Cost:	$87.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($22.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($180.5M)
Payback Period:	4 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Richardson, AK, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Operations Center (CPOC) to Fort Huachuca, AZ, and consolidating it with the Civilian Personnel Operations Center at Fort Huachuca, AZ. Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Operations Center to Fort Riley, KS, and Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and consolidating with the Civilian Personnel Operations Center at Fort Riley, KS, and Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Human Resource Service Center-Northeast, 111 S. Independence Mall, East, Bourse Bldg., a leased installation in Philadelphia, PA, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to the Naval Support Activity Philadelphia, PA. Realign Human Resource Service Center-Southeast, 9110 Leonard Kimble Road, a leased installation at Stennis Space Center, MS, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to the Naval Support Activity Philadelphia, PA, and consolidating it with the relocated Human Resource Service Center-Northeast at the Naval Support Activity Philadelphia, PA. Realign Human Resource Service Center-Southwest, 525 B Street, Suite 600, a leased installation in San Diego, CA, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to Naval Air Station North Island or Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA. Realign Human Resource Service Center-Pacific, 178 Main Street, Bldg 499, Honolulu, HI, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to the Human Resource Service Center-Northwest, 3230 NW Randall Way, Silverdale, WA, and Naval Air Station North Island or Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA and consolidating with the Human Resource Service Centers at Silverdale, WA and Naval Air Station North Island or Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Realign Tinker Air Force Base, OK, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.

Realign Bolling Air Force Base Washington, DC, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Consolidate the relocated civilian personnel offices with the Civilian Personnel Office at Randolph Air Force Base, TX.

Realign 2521 Jefferson Davis Hwy, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the transactional functions of the Defense Commissary Agency Human Resource Division and the Washington Headquarters Services Civilian Personnel Office to the Defense Logistics Agency, 3990 East Broad Street, Columbus, OH, and consolidating them with the Customer Support Office of the Defense Logistics Agency. Realign the Department of Defense Education Activity, 4040 North Fairfax Drive, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to the Defense Logistics Agency 3990 East Broad Street, Columbus, OH, and consolidating them with the Customer Support Office of the Defense Logistics Agency. Realign the Defense Information Systems Agency, 701 S. Courthouse Road, Arlington, VA, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, 8899 E. 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN, and consolidating them with the Civilian Personnel Office of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service at Indianapolis, IN.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The consolidation of Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the transactional functions among the Defense Agencies reduces excess capacity, reduces the use of leased facilities, and achieves manpower savings through consolidation and elimination of duplicate functions. This recommendation supports the Administration's urging of federal agencies to consolidate personnel services. During the implementation of this recommendation it is important to partner with the National Security Personnel System (NSPS). NSPS provides the opportunity to improve the effectiveness of the Department through a simplified personnel management system that will improve the way it hires and assigns employees. This recommendation will be an effective tool for NSPS and provide the flexibility and responsiveness that supports the implementation of this system. Since NSPS will define a new human resource system featuring streamlined hiring, simplified job changes, and a less complex classification system, it covers all functions that would be supported by Civilian Personnel Offices.

Community Concerns

Community leaders questioned DoD's security standards, stating they were unnecessarily more stringent than those developed by the Interagency Security Committee (tasked with developing and evaluating security standards for Federal facilities.) Also, they questioned whether DoD had surveyed each facility to determine compliance and the level of compliance with the DoD security standards (or even those "less stringent" standards approved by OMB in September 2004.) Finally, affected communities felt BRAC was not the proper instrument to effect DoD employee relocation from leased facilities. More specific concerns are noted as follows:

Army:

Rock Island Arsenal - The community emphasized that DoD previously identified Rock Island Arsenal for closure, which unfairly precluded a scenario considering the North Central CPOC as a "receiving site." DoD deviated significantly from the criteria for several reasons. NC CPOC ranked first among 25 DoD personnel offices. Rock Island Arsenal is a prime location for further consolidation of human resources (HR) processing because its automation infrastructure can support further expansion, a key element in the Army's decision to site the Army Civilian Data Center (ACDC), the central site for all of Army's major HR production data systems. The servicing ratio that will result from the elimination of 44 positions will alter the current servicing ratio from 1:148 to 1:175; the Army standard is 1:144. The North Central CPOC provides HR services to Fort Belvoir, Fort Meade and Fort Sam Houston, which stand to gain thousands of civilian employees as a result of other BRAC recommendations. Finally, the community argued that the OSD BRAC Clearinghouse justification that CPOC relocation enables offices to be near their customer bases is flawed. Currently, NC CPOC supports a substantial civilian workforce in Afghanistan and Iraq and is engaged in standing up a CENTCOM organization in Iraq. The community asserts that the Army's regionalization of personnel services and centers was based on a determination that the processes performed in the personnel centers did not require geographic proximity to the customer, a concept supported by NC CPOC current customer base.

Navy:

HRSC Pacific - The community argued realignment of HRSC Pacific to CONUS West Coast would negatively affect approximately 135 Navy activities and 12,000 employees in Hawaii and those served in the Western Pacific. Also, they expressed concerns over increased travel costs and the seemingly arbitrary number of consolidated centers. As an alternative, the community offered to host a consolidated DoD Human Resource Personnel Center as a pilot program in Hawaii.

HRSC Southeast - The community submitted that DoD's recommendation to move the HRSC Southeast was based on flawed assumptions, specifically that HRSC Southeast is a typical "leased installation" and would need $2M to meet force protection standards. In reality, HRSC Southeast resides lease-free in a Level 1 security rated, federally-owned facility. Navy's fair share of installation operating costs is only $12.53/sf, a rate that is among the lowest in the nation. The community contended that jointness and synergy already exist at Stennis, that Stennis has a higher Military Value than the proposed site at Naval Support Activity Philadelphia, and that Stennis is more cost effective than Philadelphia. Currently, there are approximately 2,200 personnel employed by the various Navy tenants that include Naval Research Laboratory, Naval Small Craft Instruction and Technical Training School and Special Boat Team 22 (a Navy SEAL unit). The Navy has plans to introduce additional active-duty units permanently to the installation. The community argued that these factors gave Stennis a distinct advantage over the NSA Philadelphia site and recommended consolidation of HRSC Southeast and HRSC Northeast at the Stennis Space Center.

HRSC Northeast - The community submitted a rebuttal to the rationale and recommendation that HRSC Southeast remain at and HRSC Northeast be realigned to Stennis Space Center. The community argues that advocates for Stennis included several serious errors of fact that depart from the official COBRA report. The community supported the original DoD recommendation.

Air Force:

The community argued that "military judgment" dominated improperly over quantitative scores, and consolidating civilian personnel activities at Randolph Air Force Base would remove the customer bases farther away from the personnel who serve them.

Commission Findings

The Commission disagreed with three elements of the Secretary's recommendation.

First, the Civilian Personnel Operations Center (CPOC) at Rock Island Arsenal, IL, was recommended for relocation based on a later withdrawn proposal to close the arsenal. The Commission learned that the late timing of the decision did not allow the HSA JCSG to analyze the CPOC recommendation sufficiently.

Second, HRSC Southeast is located on Stennis Space Center, a Federally-owned, level-1 security rated facility whose tenants pay a "fair share" of the base's operating costs. Because of DoD's blanket assumptions with regard to leased space, the facility received the low military values assigned to leased space. The Commission found that, in this case, DoD's assumption of low military value was not supported by the facts.

Third, with regard to the relocation of the five Air Force CPOs, the effect of the recommendation would deprive the associated losing installations of mandatory personnel management advisory services, otherwise referred to as non-transactional functions. The Commission found this was not the Air Force's intention.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 2, 4, and 5 and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Fort Richardson, AK, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Operations Center to Fort Huachuca, AZ, and consolidating it with the Civilian Personnel Operations Center at Fort Huachuca, AZ.

Realign Human Resource Service Center-Northeast, 111 S. Independence Mall, East, Bourse Building, a leased installation in Philadelphia, PA, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to the Naval Support Activity Philadelphia, PA.

Realign Human Resource Service Center-Southwest, 525 B Street, Suite 600, a leased installation in San Diego, CA, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to Naval Air Station North Island or Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

Realign Human Resource Service Center-Pacific, 178 Main Street, Bldg 499, Honolulu, HI, by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to the Human Resource Service Center-Northwest, 3230 NW Randall Way, Silverdale, WA, and Naval Air Station North Island or Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA and consolidating with the Human Resource Service Centers at Silverdale, WA, and Naval Air Station North Island or Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, civilian workforce.

Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support the Robins Air Force Base, GA, civilian workforce.

Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support the Hill Air Force Base, UT, civilian workforce.

Realign Tinker Air Force Base, OK, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non transactional functions, necessary to support the Tinker Air Force Base, UT, civilian workforce.

Realign Bolling Air Force Base, DC, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Consolidate the relocated civilian personnel offices with the Civilian Personnel Office at Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support the Bolling Air Force Base, DC, civilian workforce.

Realign 2521 Jefferson Davis Hwy, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the transactional functions of the Defense Commissary Agency Human Resource Division and the Washington Headquarters Services Civilian Personnel Office to the Defense Logistics Agency, 3990 East Broad Street, Columbus, OH, and consolidating them with the Customer Support Office of the Defense Logistics Agency.

Realign the Department of Defense Education Activity, 4040 North Fairfax Drive, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to the Defense Logistics Agency 3990 East Broad Street, Columbus, OH, and consolidating them with the Customer Support Office of the Defense Logistics Agency.

Realign the Defense Information Systems Agency, 701 S. Courthouse Road, Arlington, VA, by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, 8899 E. 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN, and consolidating them with the Civilian Personnel Office of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service at Indianapolis, IN.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities

Recommendation # 138 (H&SA 22)

One-time Cost:	$171.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($14.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($11.2M)
Payback Period:	15 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Edwards Air Force Base, CA, Kirtland Air Force Base, NM, and Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, CA, by relocating the correctional function of each to Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, CA, and consolidating them with the correctional function already at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA, to form a single Level II Southwest Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, Fort Knox, KY, and Fort Sill, OK by relocating the correctional function of each to Fort Leavenworth, KS, and consolidating them with the correctional function already at Fort Leavenworth, KS, to form a single Level II Midwest Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

Realign Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL, and Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by relocating the correctional function of each to Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, and consolidating them with the correctional function already at Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, to form a single Level II Southeastern Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

Realign Naval Support Activity Norfolk, VA, Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA, and Camp LeJeune, NC, by relocating the correctional function of each and consolidating them at Naval Support Activity, Northwest Annex, Chesapeake, VA, to form a single Level II Mid-Atlantic Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

Realign Fort Lewis, WA, by relocating the management of correctional functions to Submarine Base Bangor, WA. The correctional facilities at Submarine Base Bangor, WA, and Fort Lewis, WA, will together form the Level II Northwestern Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The Department of Defense (DoD) Correctional program exists to enforce the military justice system, ensuring the safety, security, administration, and good order and discipline of its prisoners under guidance of the Uniform Code of Military

Justice (UCMJ). The UCMJ is legislation that is contained in Title 10 of the United States Code. It comprises a complete set of criminal military law and code. The DoD Correctional program currently consists of 17 DoD correctional facilities, which incorporate three facility classifications and four custody levels. There are eight Level I, eight Level II and one Level III correctional facilities. Level I is capable of providing pretrial and post-trial confinement up to one-year. Level II is capable of providing pretrial and post-trial confinement for prisoners/inmates with sentences to confinement of five years or less and Level III provides post-trial confinement exceeding five years, one day, to include life and death sentences.

This recommendation creates five Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facilities. The Southwest Joint Regional Correctional Facility consolidates the Naval Consolidated Brig Miramar, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar; the Edwards Confinement Facility, Edwards Air Force Base, CA; the Kirtland Confinement Facility, Kirtland Air Force Base, NM; and the Marine Corps Base Brig, Camp Pendleton, to a single Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facility at Miramar. The Midwestern Joint Regional Correctional Facility consolidates the Lackland Confinement Facility, Lackland Air Force Base, TX, the Army Regional Correctional Facility, Fort Knox, KY, the Army Regional Correctional Facility, Fort Sill, OK, and the components of the US Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, KS, into a single Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facility at Leavenworth. The Southeastern Joint Regional Correctional Facility consolidates the Naval Consolidated Brig Charleston, Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, SC; the Waterfront Brig Jacksonville, Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL; and the Waterfront Brig Pensacola, Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, to a single Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facility at Charleston. The Mid-Atlantic Joint Regional Correctional Facility consolidates the Naval Brig Norfolk, Naval Support Activity, Norfolk, VA, Marine Corps Base Brig, Quantico, VA, and Marine Corps Base Brig Camp LeJeune, NC; to a single Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facility at Chesapeake. The Northwestern Joint Regional Correctional Facility consolidates the Army Regional Correctional Facility at Fort Lewis, WA, and the Waterfront Brig Puget Sound, Silverdale, Submarine Base Bangor, WA, to a single Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facility with correctional facilities at both locations.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. Many DoD correctional facilities were built in the 1960s and 1970s; some were built in the 1950s. The Commission found that, clearly, new facilities are required to improve safety, security, and efficiency.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional, and Hopewell, VA, Offices

Recommendation # 139 (H&SA 26)

One-time Cost:	$31.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($6.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($53.3M)
Payback Period:	5 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close 300 AFCOMS Way, a leased installation in San Antonio, TX; 5258 Oaklawn Boulevard, a leased installation in Hopewell, VA; and 5151 Bonney Road, a leased installation in Virginia Beach, VA. Relocate all components of the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) to Fort Lee, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation consolidates the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) Eastern Region (Virginia Beach, VA), Midwest Region (San Antonio, TX), and headquarters element currently in leased space in Hopewell, VA, with DeCA's main headquarters at Fort Lee, VA. It meets several important Department of Defense objectives with regard to future use of leased space, consolidation of Headquarters operations at single locations, and enhanced security for DoD activities. Additionally, the recommendation significantly improves military value due to the shift from leased space to a location on a military installation. The military value of DeCA leased space based on its current portfolio of locations is 216 out of 334 entities evaluated by the Major Administration and Headquarters (MAH) military value model. Fort Lee ranks 96 out of 334.

Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space, which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-010-01. The benefit of enhanced Force Protection afforded by a location within a military installation fence-line will provide immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. DeCA's current leased locations are not compliant with current Force Protection Standards. The recommendation eliminates 99,915 Gross Square Feet (GSF) of leased administrative space. This action provides a consolidation of these DeCA regional and headquarters activities from three to two, and reduces the number of buildings from four to one.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. However, the Commission questioned the number of contractors required and found the planned construction would be a wing on an already existing structure rather than a new stand-alone building. As a result, DoD revised its cost and savings estimates for this proposal. The one-time costs were reduced from $47.2 to $31.7 million; net costs were reduced from $35.4 to $2.5 million; annual recurring savings increased from $3.9 to $6.7 million; the payback period was reduced from 14 to 5 years, and finally net present value increased from $4.9 to $53.3 million.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR D&A Capability

Recommendation # 140 (H&SA 27)

One-time Cost:	$220.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($59.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($491.2M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close 5600 Columbia Pike and Skyline Place (Skyline VII), leased installations in Falls Church, VA, and 1010 Gause Boulevard, a leased installation in Slidell, LA.

Relocate all components of the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) to Fort Meade, MD.

Close the Logicon Building, a leased installation in Arlington, Virginia. Relocate the Joint Task Force-Global Network Operation (JTF-GNO) to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign Skyline IV and Skyline V, leased installations in Falls Church, VA, and GSA Franconia Warehouse Depot, a leased installation in Springfield, VA, by relocating all components of DISA to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign Arlington Service Center, VA, by relocating all components of DISA and the JTF-GNO to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign Naval Support Activity Panama City, Florida by relocating the Deployable Joint Command and Control (DJC2) Program Office of the Naval Surface Warfare Center to Fort Meade, MD.

Realign Rosslyn Plaza North, a leased location in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) Program Office to Fort Meade, MD.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation consolidates headquarters components of DISA and the JTF-GNO, a related organization with a dual-hatted command and shared facilities, at Fort Meade. This recommendation also realigns the scattered Combatant Commander Development and Acquisition activities, of which certain DISA components are a part, into a single activity at Fort Meade. These DISA components include Global Information Grid-Bandwidth Expansion (GIG-BE), Global Command and Control System (GCCS), Network Centric Enterprise Services (NCES), and Teleport Program Offices. This realignment will provide for the delivery of integrated, interoperable C4ISR systems to the warfighters with increased efficiency at less cost.

The Army's recommendation to close Fort Monmouth relocates the Joint Network Management System (JNMS) Program Office from Fort Monmouth, New Jersey to Fort Meade in a complementary action to those described herein.

This recommendation meets several important Department of Defense objectives with regard to future use of leased space, rationalizing the presence of DoD activities within the National Capital Region (NCR), consolidation of Headquarters operations at single locations, and enhanced security for DoD activities.

Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space, which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-010-01. The recommendation eliminates over 720,000 Usable Square Feet (USF) of leased administrative space. The relocation of a DoD Agency headquarters to a military installation that is outside of the NCR provides dispersion of DoD activities away from a dense concentration within the NCR. This, plus the immediate benefit of enhanced Force Protection afforded by a location within a military installation fence-line, will provide immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards.

DISA's current leased locations are not compliant with current Force Protection Standards. This action provides a consolidation for DISA's headquarters, reducing the number of buildings from eight to two.

Community Concerns

The Slidell, LA, community argued that closure of 1010 Gause Boulevard, a leased installation, would decrease military value for the Defense Information Systems Agency. They claimed functions performed by DISA at Slidell are not headquarters functions appropriate for consolidation into headquarters operations. The Slidell facility meets DoD force protection requirements and has low operating costs. The community proposed relocating functions within the National Capital Region to Slidell, LA, as a way to meet DoD's goal of dispersion of defense activities away from a dense concentration within the National Capital Region and asserted construction costs at Fort Meade, MD, are underestimated. The community stated DoD's scenario underestimated the number of employees needed to be recruited at Fort Meade to offset the loss of personnel from Slidell and therefore overestimated personnel savings. Further, the community suggested that COBRA data underestimate the cost of closing the Slidell facility and relocating associated equipment to Fort Meade, MD.

The Falls Church, VA, community argued that current leased installations occupied by DISA at Skyline Drive could meet DoD force protection requirements for less cost than relocating to Fort Meade, MD. The community suggested that cost estimates for leased space overestimated the projected cost avoidance for vacating leased space. Although spread across several buildings in Northern Virginia, DISA installations already operate in close proximity to each other and to the customer base in the NCR.

The Annapolis, MD, community argues that the Joint Spectrum Center (JSC), Annapolis, MD, should be included in DoD's recommendation. The Department certified that the JSC has ongoing relationships with another Fort Meade tenant

that could be strengthened by collocation. DISA sees several advantages to collocating the JSC with DISA headquarters at Fort Meade, MD and no substantive disadvantages.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The Commission notes, however, that the recommendation erroneously failed to include the Joint Spectrum Center in Annapolis, MD, and the Defense Cyber Crime Center in Linthicum, MD, both of which would realize an increased military value from consolidation to Fort Meade, MD. These moves should occur outside the BRAC process.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications

Recommendation # 141 (H&SA 30)

One-time Cost:	$42.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($9.6M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($89.0M)
Payback Period:	4 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating Soldier Magazine to Fort Meade, MD. Realign Anacostia Annex, District of Columbia, by relocating the Naval Media Center to Fort Meade, MD. Realign 2320 Mill Road, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA, by relocating Army Broadcasting-Soldier Radio/TV to Fort Meade, MD. Realign 103 Norton Street, a leased installation in San Antonio, TX, by relocating Air Force News Agency-Army/Air Force Hometown News Service (a combined entity) to Fort Meade, MD. Close 601 North Fairfax Street, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA, by relocating the American Forces Information Service and the Army Broadcasting-Soldier Radio/TV to Fort Meade, MD. Consolidate Soldier Magazine, Naval Media Center, Army Broadcasting-Soldier Radio/TV, and the Air Force News Agency-Army/Air Force Hometown News Service into a single DoD Media Activity at Fort Meade, MD.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation creates a new DoD Media Activity by consolidating a number of military department media organizations with similar missions into a new organization. It also collocates the American Forces Information Service (AFIS) with the new DoD Media Activity and the existing Defense Information School.

This recommendation meets several important Department of Defense objectives with regard to future use of leased space, rationalizing the presence of DoD activities within the NCR, and enhanced security for DoD activities. The creation of a new DoD Media Activity as the result of consolidating a number of entities with similar missions promotes "jointness" and creates opportunities for cost savings and operational synergy. The co-location of AFIS with the new Activity will facilitate further consolidation of common support functions.

Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space, which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet antiterrorism force protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-010-01. The recommendation eliminates approximately 75,000 Usable Square Feet (USF) of leased administrative space. The relocation to a military installation that is outside the boundaries of the NCR provides a dispersion of DoD activities away from a dense concentration with the NCR. This, plus the immediate benefit of enhanced force protection afforded by a location within a military installation fence-line for those activities currently in leased space, will provide immediate compliance with force protection standards.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Consolidate Transportation Command Components

Recommendation # 142 (H&SA 31)

One-time Cost:	$101.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($101.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($1,309.3M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Fort Eustis, VA, by relocating the Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command to Scott Air Force Base, IL, and consolidating it with the Air Force Air Mobility Command Headquarters and Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) Headquarters at Scott Air Force Base, IL.

Realign Hoffman 2, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA, by relocating the US Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command to Scott Air Force Base, IL, and consolidating it with the Air Force Air Mobility Command Headquarters and Transportation Command Headquarters at Scott Air Force Base, IL.

Realign US Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command -Transportation Engineering Agency facility in Newport News, VA, by relocating US Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command - Transportation Engineering Agency to Scott Air Force Base, IL, and consolidating it with the Air Force Air Mobility Command Headquarters and Transportation Command Headquarters at Scott Air Force Base, IL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Collocation of TRANSCOM and Service components will (1) collocate activities with common functions and facilitate large-scale transformation proposed by the TRANSCOM Commander, and (2) reduce personnel to realize long-term savings. The realignment will also terminate leased space operations in the National Capital Region (143,540 GSF in Alexandria, VA) and near Norfolk, VA (40,013 GSF in Newport News, VA). The scenario will terminate a total of 183,553 GSF in both locations.

Community Concerns

The city of Newport News, VA, offered to participate in the construction of secure office facilities to retain the US Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC) at Fort Eustis, VA, and the SDDC - Transportation Engineering Agency (TEA), Newport News, in the Newport News area.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force

Recommendation # 143 (H&SA 33)

One-time Cost:	$128.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($151.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($1,884.5M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Army Human Resources Command leased facilities in Alexandria, VA, Indianapolis, IN, and St. Louis, MO. Relocate and consolidate all functions at Fort Knox, KY.

Realign the Air Reserve Personnel Center (Buckley Annex), CO, by relocating the Air Reserve Personnel Center processing functions to Randolph Air Force Base, TX, and consolidating them with the Air Force Personnel Center at Randolph Air Force Base, TX, and by relocating the Individual Mobilization Augmentee operational management functions to Robins Air Force Base, GA, and consolidating them with the Air Force Reserve Command at Robins Air Force Base, GA.

Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA, by relocating Air Force Reserve Recruiting Service to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The collocation of military personnel and recruiting functions for Army and Air Force creates Service Human Resources Centers for Excellence and improves personnel lifecycle management. This recommendation enables Business Process Reengineering transformation to support several significant Department of Defense initiatives such as increasing Active and Reserve Component Total Force integration and effectiveness and supporting the Department's goals for the Continuum of Service concept which permits a range of participation to assist in force management and relieve stress on military skills that have been in high demand during recent operations and also supporting the ongoing development and implementation of the Defense Integrated Military Human Resource System (DIMHRS).

For the Army, this recommendation eliminates over 1,100,000 square feet of leased space with annual lease savings of over $31.0M and a one-time cost avoidance of over $30.0M. In addition, it eliminates over 248,000 gross square feet of current excess capacity and moves a large support organization of over 2,000 personnel out of the National Capital Region. For the Air Force, this recommendation eliminates over 100,000 gross square feet of current excess capacity. The Air Force reserve Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA) operational command and management functions will be relocated and consolidated with the Air Force Reserve Command at Robins Air Force Base, GA for improved command management of Reserve forces assigned to the Command. The HSA JCSG agrees with the Air Force that the operational alignment of personnel would benefit the Department and this action creates a similar organizational construct with the Marine Corps. The Air Force Recruiting Service is currently located at Randolph Air Force Base; this scenario will collocate Active and Reserve Component headquarters functions in a single location and assist with overall Total Air Force Recruiting management. Randolph Air Force Base is also the current location of the Air Education and Training Command, further improving opportunities to coordinate personnel life-cycle planning. The overarching strategy for these consolidated human resources and recruiting centers extends to other organizations within the Army and Navy. The relocation of Army Accessions Command and Cadet Command from Fort Monroe, VA, and their co-location with the US Army Recruiting Command Headquarters at Fort Knox, KY, is captured in the installation closure recommendation for Fort Monroe. The relocation of the Navy Reserve Personnel Center, the Enlisted Placement and Management Center and the Navy Recruiting Command Headquarters from Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA, and their consolidation with the Navy Personnel Command and Navy Recruiting Command Headquarters at Naval Support Activity Millington, TN, is captured in the installation closure recommendation for Naval Support Activity New Orleans.

Community Concerns

The Army portion of this recommendation generated expressions of concern from the communities of Alexandria, VA, St. Louis, MO, and Indianapolis, IN, due to the negative economic impact of projected job losses associated with the DoD recommendation. In particular, community representatives from St. Louis vigorously opposed the DoD proposal, and claimed they have the space to host the Command there.

Concerns related to the Air Force portion of the recommendation came from the Denver community regarding the economic impact of jobs slated to be realigned to Randolph AFB, TX. The Denver community did not become aware of the projected job losses when the DoD BRAC report was released in May because the numbers related to the Air Reserve Personnel Center were incorrectly reported and related to another unit that shares the same facility. When the accurate numbers were finally revealed, Denver advocates opposed the plan and urged the Commission to reject it, arguing the benefits of consolidation were overstated and the costs understated.

The receiving community of Fort Knox, KY, strongly supported DoD's recommendation and looked forward to becoming the new host for the Army's Human Resources Command, especially given the significant job losses created by other DoD 2005 BRAC recommendations.

Commission Findings

The Commission's findings supported DoD's recommendation to consolidate the Army Human Resources Command at Fort Knox, KY, rather than in St. Louis as proposed by the Missouri community.

The Commission's review and analysis of the Air Force portion of this recommendation found that certain elements did not promote the same kind of synergy created by the other service departments. For instance, unlike the Army plan to consolidate all personnel functions into one place, the Air Force recommended moving Reserve Component recruiting and personnel functions away from their parent command. The Commission found DoD's plan created the potential for mission degradation and overstated the benefits of consolidation. Finally, the Commission found the Air Force portion of this recommendation was not cost-effective, with a net cost of more than $6 million in 20-year net present value rather than savings. The Commission amended the recommendation by disapproving the two Air Force realignments of the Air Reserve Personnel Center at Buckley Annex in Denver and the Air Force Reserve Recruiting Service at Robins AFB, GA, to Randolph AFB, TX. The Commission found that because the DFAS unit located at Buckley Annex was closed by another recommendation (see discussion on DFAS), moving the Air Reserve Personnel Center out of the Buckley Annex facility to nearby Buckley Air Force Base in Denver will allow the Air Force to close the facility, reducing its infrastructure and thus enabling significant savings in annual operation costs while averting the potential for mission degradation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 4, and 5 and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Army Human Resources Command leased facilities in Alexandria, VA, Indianapolis, IN, and St. Louis, MO. Relocate and consolidate all functions at Fort Knox, KY.

Realign the Air Reserve Personnel Center (Buckley Annex), CO, by relocating the Air Reserve Personnel Center to Buckley Air Force Base, Denver, CO, and by relocating the Individual Mobilization Augmentee operational management functions to Robins Air Force Base, GA, and consolidating them with the Air Force Reserve Command at Robins Air Force Base, GA.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Create Joint Mobilization Sites

Recommendation # 144 (H&SA 35)

One-time Cost:	$0.10M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($37.9M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC, and Naval Submarine Base New London, CT, by relocating all mobilization functions to Fort Dix, NJ, designating it as Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Site Dix/McGuire/Lakehurst. Realign Submarine Base Bangor, WA, by relocating all mobilization processing functions to Fort Lewis, WA, designating it as Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Site Lewis/McChord. Realign Fort Huachuca, AZ, by relocating all mobilization processing functions to Fort Bliss, TX, designating it as Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Site Bliss/Holloman. Realign Fort Eustis, VA, Ft Jackson, SC, and Fort Lee, VA, by relocating all mobilization processing functions to Fort Bragg, NC, designating it as Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Site Bragg/Pope.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation realigns eight lower threshold mobilization sites to four existing large capacity sites and transforms them into Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Platforms. This action is expected to have the long-term effect of creating pre-deployment/mobilization centers of excellence, leverage economies of scale, reduce costs, and improve service to mobilized servicemembers. This recommendation specifically targets four of the larger capacity mobilization centers located in higher density Reserve Component (RC) personnel areas. These platforms have the added military value of strategic location, Power Projection Platform (PPP) and deployment capabilities. The gaining bases all have an adjoining installation from another service(s), thereby gaining the opportunity to increase partnership and enhance existing joint service facilities and capabilities. The eight realigned, lower thresholds/mobilization sites have significantly less capacity and many less mobilizations. The realignment of these pre-deployment/mobilization missions to the other joint pre-deployment/mobilization sites will not overload the gaining joint mobilization installations. These new joint regional predeployment/redeployment mobilization processing sites, Fort Dix, Fort Lewis, Fort Bliss and Fort Bragg, have the capability to adequately prepare, train and deploy members from all services while reducing overall mobilization processing site manpower and facilities requirements. Numerous other intangible savings are expected to result from transformation opportunities by consolidating all services' mobilization operations and optimizing existing and future personnel requirements. Additional opportunities for savings are also expected from the establishment of a single space mobilization site capable of supporting pre-deployment/mobilization operations from centralized facilities and infrastructure. The establishment of these Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Sites will not preclude the services from using any/all of their other existing mobilization sites, nor will they affect any service rapid mobilization units/wings. These joint platforms will not affect any of the services units that have specific unit personnel/equipment requirements necessitating their mobilization from a specified installation.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Defense Finance and Accounting Service

Recommendation # 145/196 (H&SA 37/Add)

One-time Cost:	$254.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($102.6M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($1,030.4M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) sites at Rock Island IL; Pensacola Saufley Field, FL; Norfolk Naval Station, VA; Lawton, OK; Pensacola Naval Air Station, FL; Omaha, NE; Dayton, OH; St. Louis, MO; San Antonio, TX; San Diego, CA; Pacific Ford Island, HI; Patuxent River, MD; Limestone, ME; Charleston, SC; Orlando, FL; Rome, NY; Lexington, KY; Kansas City, MO; Seaside, CA; San Bernardino, CA; and Oakland, CA. Relocate and consolidate business, corporate and administrative functions to the Defense Supply Center-Columbus, OH, the Buckley Air Force Base Annex, Denver, CO, or the MG Emmett J. Bean Federal Center, Indianapolis, IN.

Realign DFAS Arlington, VA, by relocating and consolidating business, corporate, and administrative functions to the Defense Supply Center-Columbus, OH, the Buckley Air Force Base Annex, Denver, CO, or the MG Emmett J. Bean Federal Center, Indianapolis, IN. Retain a minimum essential DFAS liaison staff to support the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, Military Service Chief Financial Officers, and Congressional requirements.

Realign DFAS Cleveland, OH, by relocating and consolidating business, corporate, and administrative functions to the Defense Supply Center-Columbus, OH, the Buckley Air Force Base Annex, Denver, CO, or the MG Emmett J. Bean Federal Center, Indianapolis, IN. Retain an enclave for the Military Retired and Annuitant Pay Services contract function and government oversight.

Realign DFAS Columbus, OH, by relocating up to 55 percent of the Accounting Operation functions and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Denver, CO, or DFAS Indianapolis, IN, and up to 30 percent of the Commercial Pay function and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Indianapolis, IN, for strategic redundancy.

Realign DFAS Denver, CO, by relocating up to 25 percent of the Accounting Operation functions and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Columbus, OH, or DFAS Indianapolis, IN, and up to 35 percent of the Military Pay function and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Indianapolis, IN, for strategic redundancy.

Realign DFAS Indianapolis, IN, by relocating up to 10 percent of the Accounting Operation functions and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Columbus, OH or DFAS Denver, CO, and up to 20 percent of the Commercial Pay function and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Columbus, OH, for strategic redundancy.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This action accomplishes a major facilities reduction and business line mission realignment, transforming the current DFAS organization into an optimum facilities configuration, which includes strategic redundancy to minimize risks associated with man-made or natural disasters/challenges. All three of the gaining sites meet DoD Antiterrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP) Standards. The current number of business line operating locations (26) inhibits the ability of DFAS to reduce unnecessary redundancy and leverage benefits from economies of scale and synergistic efficiencies. Overall excess facility capacity includes approximately 43 percent or 1,776,000 Gross Square Feet (GSF) in administrative space and 69 percent or 526,000 GSF in warehouse space with many locations lacking adequate threat protection as defined in DoD AT/FP Standards. Finally, the three locations have potential to evolve into separate Business Line Centers of Excellence and further enhance "unit cost" reductions beyond the BRAC facilities/personnel savings aspect.

The three gaining locations were identified through a process that used Capacity Analysis, Military Value, Optimization Modeling, and knowledge of the DFAS organization and business line mission functions. The Military Value analysis, of 26 business operating locations, ranked the Buckley AF Base Annex, CO, the Defense Supply Center-Columbus, OH, and the

MG Emmett J. Bean Federal Center, Indianapolis, IN, as 3, 7, and 9 respectively. The Optimization analysis not only included the factors of available capacity and expansion capability, but also included business line process and business operational considerations in identifying the three-location combination as providing the optimal facilities approach to hosting DFAS business line missions/functions.

Subject matter knowledge of DFAS' three business line missions and its operational components, along with business process review considerations and scenario basing strategy, was used to focus reduction of the 26 locations and identification of the three gaining locations. The scenario basing strategy included reducing the number of locations to the maximum extent possible, while balancing the requirements for an environment meeting DoD Antiterrorist and Force Protection standards, strategic business line redundancy, area workforce availability, and to include an anchor entity for each business line and thus retain necessary organizational integrity to support DoD customer needs while the DFAS organization relocation is executed.

Community Concerns

The communities' concerns about DoD's proposed closure of numerous Defense Finance and Accounting Service sites focused on criticism of military value scores. Most stated that the Headquarters & Support Activities-Joint Cross Services Group focused its analysis almost exclusively on physical facility issues and not on work quality or customer input. Some contended that DoD overweighed the value of locations on DoD installations within a controlled perimeter; a consideration they contended was irrelevant to DFAS' mission. Others pointed out facilities proposed for closure despite meeting DoD force protection standards.

In addition, many claimed that the three sites selected by DoD for retention had higher operating costs than many DFAS sites proposed for closure, despite the heavy weight assigned to operating costs in computing military value scores. They also noted that operating costs, and therefore military value scores, were heavily influenced by differing costs for General Service Administration space that are irrelevant to a DFAS site's effectiveness or efficiency and something a DFAS site cannot control. Some sites claimed they provide unique services not properly factored into military value scores. Some communities raised concerns about the choice of sites with high locality pay. Many claimed that only about 10 percent to 15 percent of personnel would move, creating workforce and experience losses that would negatively affect customer service.

Some DFAS facilities had been sited to mitigate the effect of previous BRAC rounds, and their closure would be a heavy blow to communities that may not have fully recovered from previous BRAC actions. Some argued that DFAS consolidation to the Denver site on Buckley Annex makes no sense as a BRAC recommendation, because another BRAC recommendation would realign the Air Reserve Personnel Center, the site's current major tenant, to another location. Realigning DFAS personnel away from, rather than to, Denver would allow for a full closure of the property.

Commission Findings

The Commission identified discrepancies in the DFAS sites' military value scores, but the scores were not DoD's primary site selection driver. Instead, DoD used an optimization model to develop a best-value solution to get to the minimum number of sites. The model's primary focus was potential receiver sites with a large capacity and, in turn, personnel. The Commission acknowledges that the work of DFAS does not have to be done on military installations. The Commission found that in the out-years, DFAS' workforce will continue to decrease due to technology and efficiency improvements, and retaining DoD-owned property could be a liability to the organization. Therefore, as workload and personnel decrease, GSA property or similar types of properties will provide more flexibility for DFAS to reduce its facility footprint.

Further, the Commission found that closing the DFAS located in Denver, CO, at Buckley Annex, combined with other BRAC actions, would enable a full closure of property owned by the Air Force. The DFAS in Columbus and the DFAS in Indianapolis do not afford such an opportunity. Buckley Annex is approximately 38 acres, and DFAS occupies 78 percent of the building on the property. The Commission found that closing the Denver site would require keeping open another major DFAS site in order to retain desired anchor sites for business operations and strategic redundancy. According to DoD, the next major site in their selection process would be the DFAS in Cleveland, OH.

Last, the Commission found that DoD did not adequately consider economic impact in its decision process. The two sites that could have experienced severe impacts are Limestone, ME, and Rome, NY. Retaining these two sites will provide DFAS with needed capacity for business operations and strategic redundancy while also mitigating economic impacts.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 3, 4, and 6 and from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) sites at Denver, CO; Rock Island, IL; Pensacola Saufley Field, FL; Naval Station, Norfolk, VA; Lawton, OK; Naval Air Station, Pensacola, FL; Omaha, NE; Dayton, OH; St. Louis, MO; San Antonio, TX; San Diego, CA; Pacific Ford Island, HI; NAS Patuxent River, MD; Charleston, SC; Orlando, FL; Lexington, KY; Kansas City, MO; Seaside, CA; San Bernardino, CA; and Oakland, CA. Relocate the functions performed at these locations to the DFAS sites at Cleveland, OH; Columbus, OH; Indianapolis, IN; Limestone, ME; and Rome, NY; grow the DFAS site at Cleveland, OH, to not less than 1500 Full Time Equivalents (FTE); grow the DFAS site at Limestone, ME, to not less than 600 FTE, and grow the DFAS site at Rome, NY, to not less than 1000 FTE; maintain not less than the current FTEs at the DFAS sites at Columbus, OH, and Indianapolis, IN. Assign functions among the DFAS sites retained to provide for strategic redundancy in all critical tasks. Realign the Arlington, VA, site by relocating all functions to the remaining DFAS sites except the minimum essential DFAS liaison staff to support the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, Military Service Chief Financial Officers, and Congressional requirements, which will be retained in the National Capital Region.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Joint Basing

Recommendation # 146 (H&SA 41)

One-time Cost:	$50.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($183.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($2,342.5M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign McChord Air Force Base (AFB), WA, by relocating the installation management functions to Fort Lewis, WA, establishing Joint Base Lewis-McChord.

Realign Fort Dix, NJ, and Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst, NJ, by relocating the installation management functions to McGuire AFB, NJ, establishing Joint Base McGuire-Dix- Lakehurst.

Realign Naval Air Facility Washington, MD, by relocating the installation management functions to Andrews AFB, MD, establishing Joint Base Andrews-Naval Air Facility Washington, MD.

Realign Bolling AFB, Washington, DC, by relocating the installation management functions to Naval District Washington at the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC, establishing Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling-Naval Research Laboratory (NRL), Washington, DC.

Realign Henderson Hall, VA, by relocating the installation management functions to Fort Myer, VA, establishing Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall, VA.

Realign Fort Richardson, AK, by relocating the installation management functions to Elmendorf AFB, AK, establishing Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, AK.

Realign Hickam AFB, HI, by relocating the installation management functions to Naval Station Pearl Harbor, HI, establishing Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI.

Realign Fort Sam Houston, TX, and Randolph AFB, TX, by relocating the installation management functions to Lackland AFB, TX.

Realign Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, by relocating the installation management functions to Charleston AFB, SC.

Realign Fort Eustis, VA, by relocating the installation management functions to Langley AFB, VA.

Realign Fort Story, VA, by relocating the installation management functions to Commander Naval Mid-Atlantic Region at Naval Station Norfolk, VA.

Realign Andersen AFB, Guam, by relocating the installation management functions to Commander, US Naval Forces, Marianas Islands, Guam.

Secretary of Defense Justification

All installations employ military, civilian, and contractor personnel to perform common functions in support of installation facilities and personnel. All installations execute these functions using similar or near similar processes. Because these installations share a common boundary with minimal distance between the major facilities or are in near proximity, there is significant opportunity to reduce duplication of efforts with resulting reduction of overall manpower and facilities requirements capable of generating savings, which will be realized by paring unnecessary management personnel and achieving greater efficiencies through economies of scale. Intangible savings are expected to result from opportunities to consolidate and optimize existing and future service contract requirements. Additional opportunities for savings are also expected to result from establishment of a single space management authority capable of generating greater overall utilization of facilities and infrastructure. Further savings are expected to result from opportunities to reduce and correctly size both owned and contracted commercial fleets of base support vehicles and equipment consistent with the size of the combined facilities and supported populations. Regional efficiencies achieved as a result of Service regionalization of installation management will provide additional opportunities for overall savings as the designated installations are consolidated under regional management structures.

Specific exceptions not included in the functions to relocate are Health and Military Personnel Services. In general, the Department anticipates transferring responsibility for all other Base Operating Support (BOS) functions and the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) portion of Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization (SRM), to the designated receiving location.

However, because of the variety of circumstances at each location, the Department requires flexibility to tailor implementation to the unique requirements at each location.

In all but three realignments, discussed below, the quantitative military value score validated by military judgment was the primary basis for determining which installation was designated as the receiving location.

McGuire's quantitative military value compared to the Fort Dix quantitative military value score was too close to be the sole factor for determining the receiving installation for installation management functions. Military judgment favored McGuire AFB as the receiving installation for the installation management functions because its mission supports operational forces, in contrast to Fort Dix, which has a primary mission of support for Reserve Component training.

As an installation accustomed to supporting operational forces, it was the military judgment of the JCSG that McGuire was better able to perform those functions for both locations.

Similarly, the quantitative military value score of Charleston AFB compared to that of Naval Weapons Station Charleston was too close to be the sole factor for determining the receiving installation for installation management functions. Military judgment favored Charleston AFB as the receiving installation for the installation management functions because of its mission in support of operational forces compared to Naval Weapons Station Charleston, which has a primary mission to support training and industrial activities. It was the military judgment of the JCSG that Charleston AFB, as an installation accustomed to supporting operational forces , was better able to perform those functions for both locations.

Langley AFB's quantitative military value score compared to the Fort Eustis quantitative military value score was a clear margin for Fort Eustis. However, pending changes to Fort Eustis resulting from other BRAC recommendations causes military judgment to favor Langley AFB as the receiving installation for the installation management functions. Relocations of organizations currently based at Fort Eustis will cause a significant population decline and overall reduction in the scope of the installation's supporting mission. Based on these changes, it was the military judgment of the JCSG that Langley AFB was better able to perform these functions for both locations.

Community Concerns

Although affected communities supported the concept of Joint Basing, several communities expressed concerns about the effect of personnel cuts on the mission, questioned DoD's process used to determine the proposed number of personnel

cuts, and expressed concern over the overall health and welfare of the bases involved. Additionally, communities argued that the "clash of cultures" and service-specific interests would impair installation management by a different service. To avoid this likely problem, some community advocates argued DoD would need to develop a common installation management approach by establishing a joint basing office in DoD to implement the new Joint Bases so that individual military services did not issue conflicting guidance and procedures. Finally, there was concern expressed that non-appropriated fund employees were not addressed specifically in the DoD recommendation.

Commission Findings

While the Commission supports the concept of Joint Basing strongly, it is concerned, as is GAO, that DoD must assess and remedy several issues before implementation will be successful. For instance, common terminology is lacking to define Base Operating Support (BOS) functions among the military services and OSD. The Commission concurs with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) that DoD needs an analytic process for developing BOS requirements. Also, while each military service has standards, there are no DoD-wide standards for common support functions.

Additionally, the Commission learned that DoD determined the manpower reductions through application of a formula and not deliberations among commanders of the affected installations. In other words, the manpower savings were directed rather than derived from functional analyses and manpower studies.

Finally, the Commission found that currently Naval District Washington provides non-mission related services to the Naval Research Laboratory because the Navy has centralized its installation management functions. Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) is a Secretary of the Navy Working Capital Fund Activity, so it must maintain control of laboratory buildings, structures, and other physical assets that are essential to the NRL research mission.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4 and from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign McChord Air Force Base (AFB), WA, by relocating the installation management functions to Fort Lewis, WA, establishing Joint Base Lewis-McChord, WA.

Realign Fort Dix, NJ, and Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst, NJ, by relocating the installation management functions to McGuire AFB, NJ, establishing Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst, NJ.

Realign Naval Air Facility Washington, MD, by relocating the installation management functions to Andrews AFB, MD, establishing Joint Base Andrews-Naval Air Facility Washington, MD.

Realign Bolling AFB, DC, by relocating the installation management functions to Naval District Washington at the Washington Navy Yard, DC, establishing Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling, DC.

Realign Henderson Hall, VA, by relocating the installation management functions to Fort Myer, VA, establishing Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall, VA.

Realign Fort Richardson, AK, by relocating the installation management functions to Elmendorf AFB, AK, establishing Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, AK.

Realign Hickam AFB, HI, by relocating the installation management functions to Naval Station Pearl Harbor, HI, establishing Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI.

Realign Fort Sam Houston, TX, and Randolph AFB, TX, by relocating the installation management functions to Lackland AFB, TX.

Realign Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, by relocating the installation management functions to Charleston AFB, SC.

Realign Fort Eustis, VA, by relocating the installation management functions to Langley AFB, VA.

Realign Fort Story, VA, by relocating the installation management functions to Commander Naval Mid-Atlantic Region at Naval Station Norfolk, VA.

Realign Andersen AFB, Guam, by relocating the installation management functions to Commander, US Naval Forces, Marianas Islands, Guam.

The Commission found this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA)

Recommendation # 147 (H&SA 44)

One-Time Cost:	$4.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($7.9M)
Payback Period:	5 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Rosslyn Center and the Nash Street Building, leased installations in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Air Force Real Property Agency to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, TX.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation meets two important Department of Defense (DoD) objectives with regard to rationalization of the Department's presence within 100 miles of the Pentagon and enhanced security for DoD activities. Additionally, the recommendation results in a significant improvement in military value. The military value of the Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA) is 302nd of 334 entities evaluated by the Major Administration and Headquarters (MAH) military value model. Lackland Air Force Base is ranked 25th out of 334.

The recommendation eliminates over 16,000 Usable Square Feet of leased administrative space within the National Capital Region and relocates the involved offices to a military installation that will provide immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. AFRPA's current leased location is non-compliant with current Force Protection Standards. The relocation of a headquarters activity to an installation that is farther than 100 miles from the Pentagon provides dispersion of DoD activities away from a dense concentration within the National Capital Region. This recommendation provides for operational efficiency and enhanced synergy by collocating AFRPA with a related Activity, the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, which is also relocating to Lackland Air Force Base.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies

Recommendation # 148 (H&SA 46)

One-time Cost:	$199.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($23.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($122.9M)
Payback Period:	10 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign the Zachary Taylor Building, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Army Installation Management Agency headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, as follows: relocate the Army Installation Management Agency Northwest Region headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX, and consolidate it with the Army Installation Management Agency Southwest Region headquarters to form the Army Installation Management Agency Western Region; and relocate the Army Network Enterprise Technology Command Northwest Region headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX, and consolidate it with the Army Network Enterprise Technology Command Southwest Region headquarters to form the Army Network Enterprise Technology Command Western Region.

Realign Crystal Square 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Army HR XXI office to Fort Knox, KY.

Realign the Park Center IV Building, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA, by relocating the Army Center for Substance Abuse to Fort Knox, KY.

Realign Seven Corners Corporate Center, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA, and 4700 King Street, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA, by relocating the Army Community and Family Support Center to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign Rosslyn Metro Center, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Army Family Liaison Office to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign Skyline Six, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA, by relocating the Army Contracting Agency headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign the Hoffman 1 Building, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA, by relocating the Army Contracting Agency E-Commerce Region headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, by relocating the Army Contracting Agency Southern Hemisphere Region headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, by relocating the Army Environmental Center to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA by relocating Army Materiel Command (AMC) and the Security Assistance Command (USASAC, an AMC major subordinate command) to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation relocates several Army Service Provider headquarters and regional offices in order to create operating efficiencies via co-location and/or consolidation. A new Installation Management Agency (IMA) Western Region office is created at Fort Sam Houston by relocating the IMA Northwest Region headquarters from Rock Island Arsenal; it collocates the IMA Headquarters with the IMA Western Region. Separate Army recommendations relocate other IMA regional offices to create the IMA Eastern Region at Fort Eustis.

This recommendation creates a new Network Enterprise Technology Command (NETCOM) Western Region at Fort Sam Houston by relocating the NETCOM Northwest Region headquarters from Rock Island Arsenal. Separate Army recommendations relocate other NETCOM Region headquarters to create the NETCOM Eastern Region at Fort Eustis.

The Army Contracting Agency (ACA) is relocating the ACA Southern Region office to Fort Sam Houston where it will consolidate with the ACA Southern Hemisphere Region office that is relocating from Fort Buchanan. The ACA

Headquarters and ACA E-Commerce Region will collocate with the ACA Southern Region at Fort Sam Houston. By a separate Army recommendation, the ACA Northern Region headquarters will relocate from Fort Monroe to Fort Eustis in order to collocate with the ACA Northern Contracting Center.

Several other Army entities will relocate in order to collocate with the aforementioned organizations at Fort Sam Houston: the Army Community and Family Support Center, the Army Family Liaison Office, and the Army Environmental Center. The Army Center for Substance Abuse and the Army HR XXI office are relocating to Fort Knox. Finally, the Army Materiel Command (AMC) and the Security Assistance Command will relocate to Redstone Arsenal in order to collocate with one of AMC's major subordinate commands, the USA Aviation and Missile Command.

This recommendation meets several important Department of Defense objectives with regard to future use of leased space, rationalization of the Department's presence within 100 miles of the Pentagon, consolidation of Headquarters operations at single locations, and enhanced security for DoD activities. It collocates the Headquarters of the Army's regional service providers that typically interact daily. It results in improvement in military value due to the shift from leased space to locations on military installations and from re-location of organizations from installations lying outside of the Army's portfolio of installations they intend to keep to installations with higher military value. The military value of the affected Army activities range from 219th to 303rd of 334 entities evaluated by the Major Administration and Headquarters (MAH) military value model. Fort Sam Houston is ranked 19th out of 334; Fort Knox is ranked 32nd, and Redstone Arsenal is ranked 48th.

Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-010-01. The recommendation eliminates approximately 234,000 Usable Square Feet (USF) of leased administrative space within the National Capital Region (NCR) by relocating 8 organizations to military installations that are farther than 100 miles from the Pentagon, thereby providing dispersion of DoD activities away from a dense concentration within the NCR. This, plus the immediate benefit of enhanced Force Protection afforded by locating service providers within a military installation fence-line, will provide immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. Operational synergies and efficiencies gained by co-locating Headquarters and newly consolidated Regional offices will likely result in additional operational efficiency and/or personnel reductions in the future.

The relocation of AMC and USASAC to Redstone Arsenal will result in the avoidance of future military construction costs; this future cost avoidance is not reflected in the payback calculation because it is planned for post-FY05. This military construction would provide for a new headquarters building for AMC and USASAC on Fort Belvoir; the majority of AMC's current space on Fort Belvoir is currently in temporary structures.

Community Concerns

No community concerns were voiced during the review and analysis process regarding this specific recommendation. All organizations visited or contacted by the analyst stated that they could perform their mission from the new location. While there were some individual issues that would require adjudication during implementation, none were of such a nature as to conflict with the move or mission performance.

Community concerns over leased space in general received by the Commission questioned DoD's security standards, stating they were unnecessarily more stringent than those developed by the Interagency Security Committee (tasked with developing and evaluating security standards for Federal facilities.) Also, they questioned whether DoD had surveyed each facility to determine compliance and the level of compliance with the DoD security standards (or even those "less stringent" standards approved by OMB in September 2004).

Commission Findings

The Commission found that all organizations had indicated that they could perform their mission from the new location. Individual issues requiring careful adjudication during implementation would not conflict with the move or mission performance, and none rose to the level of a substantial deviation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations

Recommendation # 149 (H&SA 49)

One-time Cost:	$61.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($18.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($164.7M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Crystal Park 3 and Crystal Square 3, leased installations in Arlington, VA, and 214191 Great Mills Road and 21535 Pacific Drive, leased installations in Lexington Park, MD. Relocate all Department of the Navy organizations to DoD owned space in the National Capital Region. Realign Crystal Gateway 3, Crystal Gateway 4, Crystal Mall 2, Crystal Mall 3, Crystal Park 1, Crystal Park 5, Crystal Square 2, 1400-1450 S. Eads Street, and 2300 Clarendon Blvd., all leased installations in Arlington, VA, and any other Department of the Navy occupied leased space in the National Capital Region, by relocating all Department of the Navy organizations to DoD owned space in the National Capital Region. Realign Federal Office Building 2, Arlington, VA, by relocating all Department of the Navy organizations to DoD owned space in the National Capital Region.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation meets two important Department of Defense (DoD) objectives with regard to future use of leased space and enhanced security for DoD activities. Implementation will reduce the Department's reliance on leased space which has historically higher overall costs than government-owned space and generally does not meet Anti-terrorism Force Protection standards as prescribed in UFC 04-010-01. This, plus the immediate benefit of enhanced Force Protection afforded by locations within a military installation fence-line, will provide the Department of the Navy (DON) activities with immediate compliance with Force Protection Standards. DON's current leased locations are non-compliant with current Force Protection Standards. Additionally, the recommendation results in a significant improvement in military value as a result of the movement from leased space to military installations. The average military value of DON activities based on current locations ranges from 192nd to 326th out of 334 entities evaluated by the MAH military value model. All military installations to which the DON activities would relocate have higher military values.

The payback calculation in this recommendation reflects the relocation of approximately 228,000 GSF of leased space in the NCR, along with 284,000 GSF of administrative space in FOB-2, which is scheduled for closure, to locations identified by DON as the most likely relocation sites: Arlington Service Center, Anacostia Annex, and the Washington Navy Yard. This recommendation also reflects Naval Air Systems Command consolidating its headquarters operation at NAS Patuxent River by moving two locations from leased space to be contiguous with its main office. However, the recommendation is written broadly enough to relocate Navy organizations currently in leased space to any other DoD leased space in the NCR. Our analysis indicates that such alternative relocation sites will not have a significant or material impact on any of the BRAC selection criteria.

Community Concerns

Community leaders questioned DoD's security standards, stating they were unnecessarily more stringent than those developed by the Interagency Security Committee (tasked with developing and evaluating security standards for Federal facilities). Also, the communities questioned whether DoD had surveyed each facility to determine compliance and the level of compliance with the DoD security standards (or even those "less stringent" standards approved by OMB in September 2004). The communities felt BRAC was not the proper instrument to effect DoD employee relocation from leased facilities.

Advocates expressed concerns about the negative impact on operational readiness and manpower implications. They argued the current "scattered" arrangement of leased office space makes more strategic sense than does concentration, that relocation will disrupt synergies with other agencies of the Federal Government and the Pentagon, and, finally, that leased space is better able to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements than its alternative, military construction. Similarly, communities claimed their quality of life could be reduced because of transportation

problems such as increased traffic, lack of public transportation, and increased commuting times, with the attendant issues of air pollution and increased fuel consumption.

However, there were no formal expressions relating directly to Navy leased locations from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. While the Department did not assess individual buildings for force protection compliance or review individual leases, enough empirical data support moving DoD personnel from leased locations to force-protected locations. While the Commission approved the Secretary's recommendation, it also included a technical change to conform to DoD's stated intent to close 214191 Great Mills Road and 21535 Pacific Drive, leased installations in Lexington Park, MD, and relocate Naval Air Systems Command offices to Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Joint Medical Command Headquarters

Recommendation # 198 (Add)

One-time Cost:	$106.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($32.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($316.3M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

None. The Secretary's proposed list submitted on May 13, 2005, did not include these facilities. They were added by the Commission on July 19, 2005, for further consideration.

Secretary of Defense Justification

None.

Community Concerns

Northern Virginia argued closure of leased space is outside the purview of the Commission and that the TRICARE Management Activity and Office of the Army Surgeon General should remain in place. They asserted current employees would leave rather than move or commute excessive distances.

The District of Columbia argued medical commands should consolidate at Bolling AFB, the site of the Air Force Surgeon General's Office, which is close to the Pentagon and Capitol Hill, and meets force protection standards.

Commission Findings

The Commission recognizes the importance of promoting jointness in Medical Command Headquarters, and found substantial military value and cost savings in the proposed collocation of stand-alone military headquarters, such as the Potomac Annex, DC, and multi-location headquarters such as the Office of the Air Force Surgeon General at Bolling AFB, DC, and Skyline Lease Space, VA. The Commission decided to realign the Potomac Annex, DC, to enable the flag officer housing to remain intact. The Commission acknowledges the community concern that existing leased space meeting force-protection requirements or Bolling Air Force Base could be viable locations for the new Medical Command Headquarters. The Commission believes that the National Naval Medical Center Bethesda, MD, is also a potential site that should not be

overlooked during implementation. As a result, the Commission recommendation would collocate a Medical Command Headquarters in the National Capital Region to a single force-protected installation determined by the Secretary. Moreover, DoD is directed to consolidate common support functions in order to maximize efficiencies and enhance jointness.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 2 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign the Potomac Annex, DC. Realign Bolling Air Force Base, DC. Realign Skyline, leased space in Falls Church, VA. Collocate the Navy Bureau of Medicine, Office of the Surgeon General of the Air Force, the Air Force Medical Operating Activity, and the Air Force Medical Support Activity, Office of the Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs), Tricare Management Activity, Office of the Army Surgeon General and US Army Medical Command to a single, contiguous site that meets the current Department of Defense Anti-Terrorism Force Protection standards for new construction at either the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD, Bolling Air Force Base, DC, or federally owned or leased space in the National Capital Region and consolidate common support activity.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUPS (JCSGs):

INDUSTRIAL

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION SEAL BEACH, CA

RECOMMENDATION # 150 (IND 4)

ONE-TIME COST:	$4.0M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	($1.8M)
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	($19.9M)
PAYBACK PERIOD:	1 YEAR

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA, as follows: relocate the depot maintenance of Electronic Components (Non-Airborne), Fire Control Systems and Components, Radar, and Radio to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA; relocate the depot maintenance of Material Handling to Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA; relocate the depot maintenance of Other Components to Anniston Army Depot, AL; and relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation supports depot maintenance function elimination at Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach and follows the strategy of minimizing sites using maximum capacity at 1.5 shifts. This recommendation eliminates over 243,000 square feet of depot maintenance production space with annual facility sustainment and recapitalization savings of $1.1M. Required capacity to support workloads and Core requirements for the Department of Defense (DoD) is relocated to other DoD Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence, thereby increasing the military value of depot maintenance performed at these sites. This recommendation decreases the cost of depot maintenance operations across DoD by consolidation and elimination of 30 percent of duplicate overhead structures required to operate multiple depot maintenance activities. Additionally, this recommendation supports transformation of the Department's depot maintenance operations by increasing the utilization of existing capacity by up to 150 percent while maintaining capability to support future force structure. Another benefit of this recommendation includes utilization of DoD capacity to facilitate performance of interservice workload.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

The Seal Beach community noted the base would lose positions and work to four different locations. In particular, they said the recommendation to "relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA," made absolutely no sense. They claimed the Navy mischaracterized this work as depot maintenance, when in reality it consists of about $500 worth of work polishing, removing dents, tightening screws, etc. on missile containers which are returned to Seal Beach and reunited with missiles sent to the Fleet. They indicated these tasks are more efficiently performed at Seal Beach, rather than spending $960 per missile container shipping it from Seal Beach to the East Coast and back again. The community also noted that San Diego-based ships would benefit from having West Coast-based support to adjust, install, and trouble-shoot fire-control and aircraft landing radar, rather than shipping it back to the depot at Tobyhanna, PA, and overhauling it there.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense regarding the first elements of the recommendation. The Commission carefully considered the community concerns relating to the sub-recommendation dealing with West Coast support for Fire Control Systems and Components, Radar, and Radio equipment. However, the Commission determined that this issue did not rise to the level of requiring a revision to the DoD recommendation.

The Commission found that the segment of DoD's recommendation to direct work and personnel to Letterkenny Army Depot to correct work more efficiently performed at Seal Beach, where related work is already performed, deviated substantially from criteria #1 and #4. Rejection of the proposal also avoids holding missiles in inventory awaiting only delivery of their shipping containers from the East Coast. Therefore, the Commission deleted the section of the recommendation referring to the relocation of missile container work to Letterkenny.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA, as follows: relocate the depot maintenance of Electronic Components (Non-Airborne), Fire Control Systems and Components, Radar, and Radio to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA; relocate the depot maintenance of Material Handling to Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA; and relocate the depot maintenance of Other Components to Anniston Army Depot, AL.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA

Recommendation # 151 (Ind 5)

One-time Cost:	$25.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($6.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($53.3M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA. Relocate the artillery cartridge case metal parts functions to Rock Island Arsenal, IL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

There are 4 sites within the Industrial Base producing Metal Parts. To remove excess from the Industrial Base, the closure allows DoD to generate efficiencies and nurture partnership with multiple sources in the private sector.

Community Concerns

The community believes the recommendation to close the Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant (RBAAP) defied logic and common sense. They pointed out that NI Industries, Inc. has successfully operated the installation since 1951. They noted RBAAP hosts thirteen tenants with more than 200 employees. The community and NI Industries Inc. asserted that RBAAP is the only plant producing the deep-drawn steel cartridge cases needed for the Navy's next generation fleet and the Army's Future Combat System. The City of Riverbank challenged the rationale for, and pointed out risks associated with, closing this high-military-value production plant and asserted that production interruptions could hinder current and future military missions. The City adamantly opposed the closure, saying the closure recommendation was based on invalid criteria and faulty information, and questioned DoD's estimated costs for dismantling, moving, and reassembling the plant's complex

equipment. They contended an unsuccessful relocation of equipment and a lack of highly skilled (artisan level) transferees would have significant repercussions on military access to needed ordnance. The community concluded that the RBAAP should remain a vital entity in the military arsenal.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The commission acknowledges the community's concerns with the challenges of moving the deep-drawn steel cartridge case production line. However, the commission does not find that the uniqueness of this production line reaches the level of substantial deviation from the final selection criteria. The low utilization of this ammunition plant, coupled with the significant excess capacity for munitions manufacturing in the US industrial base, created a very compelling case to rationalize manufacturing capacity.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Sierra Army Depot, CA

Recommendation # 152 (Ind 6)

One-time Cost:	$33.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($7.5M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($66.7M)
Payback Period:	7 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Sierra Army Depot, CA. Relocate Storage to Tooele Army Depot, UT and Demilitarization to Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN and, McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Capacity and capability for storage exists at numerous munitions sites. To reduce redundancy and remove excess from the Industrial Base, the realignment allows DoD to create centers of excellence and remove inefficiencies.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Rock Island Arsenal, IL

Recommendation # 153 (Ind 7)

One-time Cost:	$27.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($3.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($13.8M)
Payback Period:	9 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL, by relocating the depot maintenance of Combat Vehicles and Other to Anniston Army Depot, AL, and the depot maintenance of Other Equipment and Tactical Vehicles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation supports minimizing the number of depot maintenance sites through the consolidation of Rock Island's remaining Combat Vehicle workload and capacity at Anniston Army Depot, the Army's Center for Industrial and Technical Excellence for Combat Vehicles. The recommendation also increases overall depot capability utilization by consolidating Rock Island's remaining Tactical Vehicle workload and capability at Letterkenny, the depot with the highest Military Value for Tactical Vehicle maintenance. This recommendation eliminates over 160,000 square feet of depot maintenance production space with annual facility sustainment and recapitalization savings of $0.6M. This recommendation also decreases the cost of depot maintenance operations across DoD by consolidation and elimination of 30 percent of duplicate overhead structures required to operate multiple depot maintenance activities. Finally, this recommendation facilitates future interservice utilization of DoD depot maintenance capacity.

Community Concerns

The Illinois/Rock Island Arsenal community argued DoD greatly deviated from the selection criteria by not basing its decisions regarding the Rock Island Arsenal on military value and cost savings. Rock Island Arsenal Tank Automotive and Armaments Command (TACOM) had a higher military value score than Detroit Arsenal TACOM, yet the lower-ranked facility would gain the management of the Depot Level Reparable mission. The community claimed facilities at Detroit Arsenal had insufficient space to accommodate Rock Island's TACOM mission. The community expressed concerns about discrepancies in the number of positions identified (740 versus 1,129) with the moves and efficiencies at TACOM Rock Island, which in their view underestimated true costs. Similarly, they asserted military construction costs identified in the COBRA data for Detroit Arsenal were grossly understated by either $42 million or $85 million, depending on the source of data. They claimed a move to Michigan raised Force Protection and Antiterrorism issues, since Rock Island Arsenal meets and exceeds force protection requirements, while Detroit does not. Moving Rock Island TACOM away from the Engineering support and PEO combat system could also result in the loss of synergy. The community voiced concerns about the recommendation for the Joint Manufacturing & Technology Center (JMTC-RI), questioning the categorization of the JMTC-RI in comparing Depot Maintenance hours. The bulk of JMTC-RI workload is not Depot Maintenance, and therefore this may have been misreported. The Civilian Personnel Operations Center (CPOC) and Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) center, both located on Rock Island, were rated number one in military value compared to similar facilities. CPOC was recently assigned the highest-priority missions for human resources. The community recommended that the Commission overturn the Pentagon's BRAC recommendation to realign TACOM, CPOC and other activities at Rock Island Arsenal.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that DoD's proposed realignment of Rock Island Arsenal, IL, will decrease the cost of depot maintenance operations while increasing the military value to the warfighter. In response to community concerns, the Commission examined the appropriateness of transferring TACOM from a higher quantitatively ranked installation to a lower ranked installation but found that military value is measured by military judgment as well as by numerical calculation and that military judgment was reasonably exercised in this recommendation. The Commission also found that while cost

projections might vary, they did not vary sufficiently to call into question the logic and financial soundness of the proposal, nor did potential cost variances rise to the level of a substantial deviation from the final selection criteria.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Newport Chemical Depot, IN

Recommendation # 154 (Ind 8)

One-time Cost:	$2.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($10.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($132.6M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Newport Chemical Depot, IN.

Secretary of Defense Justification

There is no additional chemical demilitarization workload slated to go to Newport Chemical Depot. The projected date for completion of existing workload is 2nd quarter of 2008. There is no further use for Newport Chemical Depot.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the International Chemical Weapons Convention Treaty requires completion of the chemical demilitarization mission prior to closure of this depot. An examination of status information for this depot's mission completion and subsequent closure revealed that dates may slip beyond the six-year statutory period for completion of BRAC actions. Furthermore, mission completion and closure dates beyond 2011 exceed the BRAC implementation period.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

On completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with Treaty obligations, close Newport Chemical Depot, IN.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS

Recommendation # 155 (Ind 9)

One-time Cost:	$25.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($10.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($101.4M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Kansas Army Ammunition Plant (AAP), KS. Relocate Sensor Fuzed Weapon/Cluster Bomb function and Missile warhead production to McAlester AAP, OK; 155MM ICM Artillery and 60MM, 81MM, and 120MM Mortar functions to Milan AAP, TN; 105MM HE, 155MM HE, and Missile Warhead functions to Iowa AAP, IA; and Detonators/relays/delays to Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Capacity and capability for Artillery, Mortars, Missiles, and Pyro/Demo exists at numerous munitions sites. There are 8 sites producing Artillery, 5 producing Mortars, 9 producing Pyro/Demo, and 13 performing Demilitarization. To reduce redundancy and remove excess from the Industrial Base, the closure allows DoD to create centers of excellence, avoid single point failure, and generate efficiencies.

Community Concerns

Labette County and the city of Parsons supported the closure of the Kansas Army Ammunition Plant (KSAAP) but had concerns about their ability to redevelop the site's facilities and property. They explained that the plant is located in a rural area with limited transportation access and that the loss of 267 jobs would exacerbate the county's economic hardships. The Community wanted to accelerate the development of uncontaminated portions of the site through the use of leases prior to conveyance of the property. During the transition phase, the community proposed a $1 per annum lease between the US Government and the Local Reuse Authority (LRA). At the conclusion of the clean-up and transition phase, the community proposed the Government transfer all equipment, facilities and, property to the LRA at no cost. The Community expressed an interest in keeping the existing operating contractor in place as a tenant to compete for future DoD work, thereby retaining jobs in the community. The operating contractor noted potential issues with proprietary processes and recommended privatization in place for the KSAAP.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The Commission examined the community's proposals regarding conveyance, and decided to refer them to the Department for consideration during implementation of the recommendation. The Commission carefully considered the operating contractor's recommendation of privatization-in-place, but rejected it due to the low utilization of the plant and the need to rationalize munitions production capacity in the US industrial base.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Lima Tank Plant, OH

Recommendation # 156 (Ind 10)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Lima Tank Plant, OH. Retain the portion required to support the manufacturing of armored combat vehicles to include Army Future Combat System (FCS) program, Marine Corps Expeditionary Force Vehicle (EFV) chassis, and M1 Tank recapitalization program.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Capacity and capability for armored combat vehicles exists at three sites with little redundancy among the sites. The acquisition strategy for the Army Future Combat System (FCS) and Marine Corps Expeditionary Force Vehicle includes the manufacturing of manned vehicle chassis at Lima Army Tank Plant. The impact of establishing this capability elsewhere would hinder the Department's ability to meet the USA and USMC future production schedule. This recommendation to retain only the portion of Lima Army Tank Plant required to support the FCS, EFV, and M1 tank recap, reduces the footprint. This allows the Department of Defense to remove excess from the Industrial Base, create centers of excellence, avoid single point failure, and generate efficiencies within the manufacture and maintenance of combat vehicles.

Community Concerns

The community contended that DoD's claims of excess capacity were no longer valid due to program changes since the BRAC data calls. They noted there had been a significant change in capacity requirements and utilization at the plant, citing M1A1 Reset, M1A1 sales to Australia, M1A1 work for Egypt, the USMC Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle, six Stryker-related programs, and the Mobile Gun System. The community cited plant expansion from 450 to 759 employees to meet these requirements and 100 percent utilization of plant facilities as evidence to support their arguments. The community argued that a 27 percent reduction in the manufacturing footprint would require termination or relocation of either all Abrams related workload or Stryker and Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle work.

Commission Findings

The Commission found minimal excess manufacturing space at the Lima Tank Plant. Current utilization of the manufacturing space at the plant is at 95 percent, and expected future workloads are sufficient to maintain this high utilization rate. The Commission concurs with the community's assessment that under existing conditions, implementing this recommendation would require termination or relocation of all Abrams tank-related workload or all Stryker and Expeditionary Force Vehicle workload. Finally, the Commission found that implementing this recommendation and relocating existing production lines would be disruptive to production schedules and would incur significant costs.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 3 and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary. The Commission found this recommendation is consistent with the Force Structure Plan and final selection criteria.

Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS

Recommendation # 157 (Ind 11)

One-time Cost:	$32.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($5.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($38.6M)
Payback Period:	7 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS. Relocate the 155MM ICM artillery metal parts functions to Rock Island Arsenal, IL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

There are 4 sites within the Industrial Base producing Metal Parts. To remove excess from the Industrial Base, the closure allows DoD to generate efficiencies and nurture partnership with multiple sources in the private sector.

Community Concerns

The state of Mississippi supported the closure of the Army Ammunition Plant at Stennis Space Center, but also requested review and comment on the projected costs for mitigation of the existing environmental and safety concerns. The state contended that these facilities can be more effectively utilized through more aggressive and responsive local control, and that closure would ameliorate the need for the Army to continue to spend millions of dollars annually to hold on to an abandoned facility in growing disrepair.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The low utilization of this ammunition plant, coupled with significant excess capacity for munitions manufacturing in the US industrial base created a compelling argument for rationalizing munitions manufacturing capacity.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Hawthorne Army Depot, NV

Recommendation # 158 (Ind 12)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Hawthorne Army Depot, NV. Relocate Storage and Demilitarization functions to Tooele Army Depot, UT.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Capacity and capability for Storage and Demilitarization exists at numerous munitions sites. To reduce redundancy and remove excess from the Industrial Base, the closure allows DoD to create centers of excellence and establish deployment networks that support readiness. Hawthorne Army Depot has infrastructure problems that severely limit the ability to offload.

Community Concerns

Community advocates pointed out the slowed rates of munitions demilitarization makes storage capacity a more valuable commodity in the next few years as DoD faces the return of large quantities of ammunition from overseas. Estimates of 600,000 tons to return in 2007, would fill the existing depot system to 98 percent of capacity. Elimination of Hawthorne's storage capacity will require building an additional 1,000 magazines at a cost of $500 million. Hawthorne's demilitarization facilities are the most environmentally friendly in the Army, and re-creating them at Tooele would cost between $157 million and $340 million, and take seven years to complete. On-going joint activities at Hawthorne include Navy Special Forces High Desert Training, Navy Undersea Warfare Center, Marine Corps Sniper Team Training and weapons testing, Army Ranger High Desert Training and processing of Air Force and Navy bombing ranges scrap. The depot's training facilities are particularly well suited to simulating conditions in the Middle East. The community disagreed with DoD's estimates for closure costs and believed that the costs could exceed $840 million and reach as high as $1.2 billion. Funds would be needed to retire outdated munitions, create duplicate capability elsewhere, and for environmental remediation. Additionally, the community argued that insufficient weight was given to the fact that the depot faces no encroachment problems, as it is surrounded by Bureau of Land Management and US Forest Services controlled lands. In direct response to DoD's contention of offload problems at Hawthorne due to washouts at its facilities, the community countered that, with an average yearly rainfall of no more than 5 inches no offload problems exist. The community strenuously questioned the application of military judgment in the Hawthorne closure decision.

The community contended that DoD used erroneous data for employment and economic consideration. Based on community input, DoD corrected the Region of Influence to Mineral County, NV. The community contended that closure of Hawthorne Army Depot would result in direct job losses of 30 percent in the town of Hawthorne with indirect effects driving total job losses as high as 50 percent. Community leaders and elected representatives claimed the economic impacts would be so devastating that the local area would never recover and become a ghost town, noting that Mineral County is 98 percent federally managed. They believed detrimental effects included reduced property values and property tax revenue. Effects could include default on a $6 million school bond and loss of revenues for education, including Community College programs, potential loss of a hospital in Western Central Nevada, loss of a paid fire department, loss of quality of life programs (parks, libraries, museums, youth programs), loss of dental and medical service providers, increased fees for other services (water, sewer and, garbage collection) and downsizing or closure of the only food and pharmacy store in town. The community argued that closure of the depot will result in the loss of about 10 million square feet of storage capacity now filled to almost 70 percent of capacity. In sum, the community contends the DoD recommendation is a massive deviation from Selection Criteria 6.

Commission Findings

The Commission found sufficient discrepancies in the data to reject DoD's recommendation to close Hawthorne Army Depot. Currently unused munitions demilitarization capabilities of about 30,000 tons per year and unused storage capabilities of about 44 percent at Hawthorne Army Depot would be available as significant quantities of munitions return in the near future from Korea, Europe and Southwest Asia. Added to current stockpiles, these munitions will also require demilitarization and /or storage. Past diversions from the conventional munitions demilitarization account have resulted in increasing stockpiles of obsolete munitions that have increasingly filled available storage space. The Commission received information that the Department of Defense plans to increase spending on conventional demilitarization to approximately $541 million for fiscal years 2006 through 2011 to reduce its current backlog of approximately 390,000 short tons. The degree of success or failure of this planned effort in the face of higher priority wartime needs will consequently have a major effect on conventional munitions demilitarization and storage.

The Commission found none of the problems noted by the Department of Defense that limit loading and offloading of munitions at Hawthorne. DoD undervalued additional services provided by the depot, including range scrap processing for the Navy and Corps of Engineers, testing and loading of explosive charges, ammunition testing, ammunition restoration, and testing for the next generation of robotic security systems. Further, the depot offers training opportunities in 71,287

acres of high altitude desert terrain similar to that found in Iraq and Afghanistan, including high-angle sniper and other firing ranges, high altitude patrol, and desert convoy operations. The depot has also signed an agreement with the Defense Logistics Agency to store the military's entire stockpile of elemental mercury.

The Commission also found that DoD significantly underestimated the economic impact of closing Hawthorne by erroneously using the Reno-Sparks Metropolitan Statistical Area as its baseline location. The depot in fact draws its personnel from the Mineral County, NV, Region of Influence (ROI). Recalculation of economic impact in the appropriate ROI with correct personnel figures yielded a 37 percent negative impact to the county.

Last, the Commission determined that environmental clean-up costs of closure may reach as high as $708 M. Current estimated restoration costs are $383.24 M. Additionally, between $29.2 M and $324.8 M would be required to clean up 16 operational ranges.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary. The Commission found this recommendation is consistent with the Force Structure Plan and final selection criteria.

Watervliet Arsenal, NY

Recommendation # 159 (Ind 13)

One-time Cost:	$63.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($5.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($5.2M)
Payback Period:	18 years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Watervliet Arsenal, NY, by disestablishing all capabilities for Other Field Artillery Components.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The Department no longer requires the capability for Other Field Artillery Components at Watervliet Arsenal. The Department will require and will retain at Watervliet Arsenal the capability to support core cannon tube, rotary forge, and swage. Disestablishing the Other Field Artillery Components capability will allow the Department to reduce its overall footprint at Watervliet Arsenal. It will also allow the Department to explore partnering with the local community, perhaps through a leaseback arrangement. This type of partnering could allow the government to reduce its footprint while maintaining that portion of Watervliet Arsenal needed to fulfill core capabilities.

Community Concerns

The community did not oppose the realignment of the Watervliet Arsenal. The workforce at the arsenal has experienced a steady and significant decline over the last ten years, creating economic hardship in the city of Watervliet. While supporting the recommendation, the community desired a clarification of the Secretary's recommendation on the issue of leaseback arrangements. The DoD recommendation addressed the option of partnering with the local community and exploring leaseback options, but did not directly address the issue of conveyance. The community proposed that the entire arsenal site be conveyed to a Local Reuse Authority that will in turn lease it back to the Army for $1 dollar per year, for as long as DoD needs facilities to continue the core functions detailed in the recommendation. Conveyance to, and leaseback from, a Local Reuse Authority would provide a greater opportunity to establish a high-technology business park that would support the Arsenal's core functions and the technology research and development functions of tenant Benet Laboratory.

Commission Findings

The Commission agrees with the Department's goal of reducing its footprint while maintaining the portion of the arsenal needed to fulfill core capabilities. The Commission encourages continued interaction between the Department and the Local Reuse Authority to develop an industrial development plan.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR

Recommendation # 160 (Ind 14)

One-Time Cost:	$13.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($34.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($347.9M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR.

Secretary of Defense Justification

No additional chemical demilitarization workload is slated to go to Umatilla Chemical Depot. The projected date for completion of its existing workload is 2nd quarter of 2011. There is no further use for Umatilla Chemical Depot.

Community Concerns

The Umatilla Chemical Depot had been planning for closure since the initial 1988 BRAC realignment of the site. The installation wanted to be closed through the BRAC process to obtain funds to assist site personnel and the community with the post closure transition of the depot. The disposal of some existing facilities and land generated by the 1988 BRAC realignment stopped after the 9/11 attacks in response to increased security requirements for chemical weapons storage and disposal. Facilities and land that could have been disposed of became part of the protective buffer around the storage and chemical disposal facilities. The community wanted a final decision and determination on the future of the Umatilla Chemical Depot.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the International Chemical Weapons Convention Treaty requires completion of the chemical demilitarization mission prior to closure of this depot. An examination of status information for this depot's mission completion and subsequent closure revealed that dates may slip beyond the six-year statutory period for completion of BRAC actions. Furthermore, mission completion and closure dates beyond 2011 exceed the BRAC implementation period.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

On completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with Treaty obligations, close Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Lackland Air Force Base, TX

Recommendation # 161 (Ind 15)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating the depot maintenance of Computers, Crypto, Electronic Components (Non-Airborne), and Radio to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA; and disestablishing all depot maintenance capabilities.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation supports depot maintenance function elimination at Lackland Air Force Base, TX and follows the strategy of minimizing sites using maximum capacity at 1.5 shifts. This recommendation eliminates over 36,200 square feet of depot maintenance production space with annual facility sustainment and recapitalization savings of $0.1M. Required capacity to support workloads and Core requirements for the Department of Defense (DoD) is relocated to other DoD Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence, thereby increasing the military value of depot maintenance performed at these sites. This recommendation decreases the cost of depot maintenance operations across DoD by consolidation and elimination of 30 percent of duplicate overhead structures required to operate multiple depot maintenance activities. Additionally, this recommendation supports transformation of the Department's depot maintenance operations by increasing the utilization of existing capacity by 150 percent while maintaining capability to support future force structure. Another benefit of this recommendation includes utilization of DoD capacity to facilitate performance of interservice workload.

Community Concerns

The community argued the closure of Cryptologic Systems Group at Lackland Air Force Base would negate the efficiencies that resulted from the consolidation and co-location of complimentary intelligence functions. They claimed DoD evaluated the military value of individual functions within the Cryptologic Systems Group rather than conducting a combined value assessment of the missions of the group. The community also pointed out that collectively the three DoD proposals to split up the Cryptologic Systems Group are not cost effective, and several costs to relocate were either not considered or understated. Additionally, the community claimed the DoD mission analysis was flawed because the intelligence community was not sufficiently involved in the decision. For example, the National Security Agency has formally expressed concern about the realignment recommendation. Finally, the community believed the proposed split of the collective functions of the Cryptologic Systems Group at Lackland "has a very real potential to severely damage our national security."

Commission Findings

The Commission found that DoD did not evaluate the collective military value of the Cryptologic Systems Group, but rather evaluated individual elements of the group. Consequently, the collective military value of the Group was not appropriately assessed, creating concerns not only by the community, but also among a number of the national security customers of the Group's work products. The Commission found that DoD substantially deviated from the military value criteria by failing to account for the full scope and classified nature of the Cryptologic Systems Group work or the support it currently provides to a host of military and non-military government agencies. The Commission also found the cost estimates used in this recommendation did not represent fairly the costs associated with the breakup of the Cryptologic Systems Group at Lackland AFB. Additionally, the Commission found potential costs outweighed savings, with no payback of investment, and after taking into consideration recurring transportation costs and other adjustments, the DoD proposed annual recurring

savings of $2.9 million would change to a recurring cost of $5.7 million. The payback period changed from three years to "never" and the 20-year net present value savings of $28 million became a $53.1 million increased cost.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 4 and 5, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary. The Commission found this recommendation is consistent with the Force Structure Plan and final selection criteria.

Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX

Recommendation # 162 (Ind 16)

One-time Cost:	$29.0M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($17.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($164.2M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant (AAP), TX. Relocate the Storage and Demilitarization functions to McAlester AAP, OK. Relocate the 105MM and 155MM ICM Artillery, MLRS Artillery, Hand Grenades, 60MM and 81MM Mortars functions to Milan AAP, TN. Relocate Mines and Detonators/Relays/Delays functions to Iowa AAP, IA. Relocate Demolition Charges functions to Crane Army Ammunition Activity (AAA), IN.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Capacity and capability for Artillery, Mortars, Missiles, Pyro/Demo, and Storage exists at numerous munitions sites. There are 8 sites producing Artillery, 5 producing Mortars, 9 producing Pyro-Demo, 15 performing storage, and 13 performing Demilitarization. To reduce redundancy and remove excess from the Industrial Base, the closure allows DoD to create centers of excellence, avoid single point failure, and generate efficiencies. Goal is to establish multi-functional sites performing Demilitarization, Production, Maintenance, and Storage. Lone Star primarily performs only one of the 4 functions.

Community Concerns

The community noted that DoD gave the Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant (LSAAP) credit for only one of the functional areas making up a center of excellence and countered that the plant is a multifunctional site performing the full scope of functions—demilitarization, production, maintenance and, storage. The community asserted that DoD understated the number of personnel by 242, misreported current and maximum capacity as equal, and improperly excluded one-time relocation costs of $14 million from savings calculations. In addition, the community noted that some production lines were not accounted for in the data call, and that no credit was given for the complexity of producing ammunition. LSAAP also performs open burn and open detonation demilitarization and has 1.23M square feet of storage. The community asserted that directing LSAAP work to other Army ammunition activities would be contrary to DoD's strategy to increase competitive contracting for ammunition production. They suggested that, if LSAAP is closed, its work could migrate to non-US producers. The operating contractor noted potential issues with proprietary processes and recommended privatization in place for the LSAAP.

The Texarkana community proposed a public-private partnership as an alternative reuse of the installation and proposed the transfer of workload, equipment and, facilities to the private sector or local jurisdiction as appropriate since the private sector can accommodate the workload onsite.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The Commission examined the community's proposals regarding conveyance and decided to refer them to the Department for consideration during implementation of the recommendation. The Commission carefully considered the operating contractor's recommendation of privatization-in-place but rejected it due to the low utilization of the plant and the need to rationalize munitions production capacity in the US industrial base.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Deseret Chemical Depot, UT

Recommendation # 163 (Ind 17)

One-time Cost:	$18.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($38.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($407.5M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Deseret Chemical Depot, UT. Transfer the storage igloos and magazines to Tooele Army Depot, UT.

Secretary of Defense Justification

There is no additional chemical demilitarization workload slated to go to Deseret Chemical Depot. The projected date for completion of its existing workload is 2nd quarter of 2008. Because of the close proximity of Deseret Chemical Depot to Tooele Army Depot, the sophistication of the security system, the number and conditions of igloos and magazines, this recommendation increases the storage and distribution deployment network capability at Tooele Army Depot at a minimal cost.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the International Chemical Weapons Convention Treaty requires completion of the chemical demilitarization mission prior to closure of this depot. An examination of status information for this depot's mission completion and subsequent closure revealed that dates may slip beyond the six-year statutory period for completion of BRAC actions. Mission completion and closure dates beyond 2011 exceed the BRAC implementation period. The Commission notes that the community would like the opportunity to convert the chemical demilitarization plant into a conventional munitions demilitarization plant within the BRAC implementation timeframe.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

On completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with Treaty obligations and if, after completion of a comprehensive study to evaluate Deseret Chemical Depot, UT, as a site for conventional weapons demilitarization it is

shown that such a use is not feasible, close Deseret Chemical Depot, UT. Transfer the storage igloos and magazines to Tooele Army Depot, UT.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA

Recommendation # 164 (Ind 18)

One-time Cost:	$10.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($8.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($104.3M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity (SIMA) Norfolk, VA, by relocating intermediate ship maintenance function to Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation supports capacity reduction at the SIMA Norfolk, VA, and reduces excess ship repair capacity. This consolidation matches the ship maintenance infrastructure at the other major Fleet concentrations where depot and intermediate level activities are collocated. This consolidation will lead to synergy and efficiency in ship maintenance. This recommendation assumes that Norfolk Naval Shipyard becomes a Direct or Mission Funded activity.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Fleet Readiness Centers

Recommendation # 165 (Ind 19)

One-time Cost:	$33.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($248.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($3,715.0M)
Payback Period:	IMMEDIATE

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, VA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Oceana, the Naval Air Depot Cherry Point Detachment, and the Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment; establishing Fleet Readiness

Center Mid-Atlantic, Naval Air Station Oceana, VA; and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic, Naval Air Station Oceana, VA.

Realign Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department at Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division; establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Patuxent River, Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD; and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Patuxent River, Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD.

Realign Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Norfolk VA, the Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment, and Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division Lakehurst Detachment; establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Norfolk, Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA; and transferring all intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Norfolk, Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA.

Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA; and transfer all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC, as follows: disestablish Naval Air Depot Cherry Point; establish Fleet Readiness Center East, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 39K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 69K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 8K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 23K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 126K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic, Naval Air Station Oceana, VA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 11K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 19K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 35K DLHs), and Aircraft Other Components (approximately 6K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Norfolk, Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 10K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 1K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 3K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 18K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Patuxent River, Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 0.4K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 1K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 6K DLHs) to FRC Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans, Naval Air Station JRB New Orleans, LA.; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 9K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 16K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 6K DLHs) and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 30K DLHs) to the Fleet Readiness Center East Site Beaufort, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, SC; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 11K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 20K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 36K DLHs), Aircraft Rotary (approximately 1K DLHs), Aircraft VSTOL (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Cargo/Tanker (approximately 0.02K DLHs,), Aircraft Other (approximately 18K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 0.001K DLHs), Calibration (approximately 0.15K DLHs) and "Other" Commodity (approximately 0.3K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center East Site New River, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station New River, Camp Lejeune, NC; and transfer all remaining depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center East, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, SC, by disestablishing Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment Beaufort and transferring all depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center East Site Beaufort, Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, SC.

Realign Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL, as follows: disestablish Naval Air Depot Jacksonville, Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment Jacksonville, and Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Jacksonville; establish Fleet Readiness Center Southeast, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, FL; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 8K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 27K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 9K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Site Mayport, hereby

established at Naval Air Station, Mayport, FL; transfer all remaining intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southeast, Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL.

Realign Naval Air Station Mayport, FL, by disestablishing Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment Mayport, and Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division Lakehurst Voyage Repair Team Detachment Mayport and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Site Mayport, Naval Air Station Mayport, FL.

Realign Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA, by disestablishing Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Lemoore and Naval Air Depot North Island Detachment; establishing Fleet Readiness Center West, Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA; and transferring all intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center West, Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA.

Realign Naval Air Station Fallon, NV, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Fallon and the Naval Air Depot North Island Detachment Fallon; establishing Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fallon, Naval Air Station Fallon, NV; and transferring all intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fallon, Naval Air Station Fallon, NV.

Realign Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division China Lake, CA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department and relocating its maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Components (approximately 45K DLHs), Fabrication & Manufacturing (approximately 6K DLHs) and Support Equipment (approximately 16K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center West, Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA.

Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, establishing Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth, Naval Air Station Fort Worth, TX, and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.

Realign Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, establishing Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA, and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA.

Realign Naval Support Activity Crane, IN, by relocating the depot maintenance workload and capacity for ALQ-99 Electronic Warfare to Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA.

Realign Naval Air Station North Island, Naval Base Coronado, CA, as follows: disestablish Naval Air Depot North Island, COMSEACONWINGPAC (AIMD), and NADEP North Island Detachment North Island; establish Fleet Readiness Center Southwest, Naval Air Station North Island, Naval Base Coronado, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 13K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 4K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Point Mugu, hereby established at Naval Air Station Point Mugu, Naval Base Ventura, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 26K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Component (approximately 8K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 13K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 55K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 16K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Miramar, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 8K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 4K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 17K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 5K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Pendleton, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 12K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 3K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Southwest Site Yuma, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, AZ; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 12K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 3K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth, Fort Worth TX; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 25K DLHs), Aircraft

Hydraulic Components (approximately 8K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 13K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 53K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 15K DLHs), from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA; and transfer all remaining intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest, Naval Air Station North Island, Naval Base Coronado, CA.

Realign Naval Air Station Point Mugu, Naval Base Ventura, CA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Point Mugu, Naval Base Ventura, CA.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA, by transferring depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Other (approximately 28K DLHs) and Aircraft Fighter/Attack (approximately 39K DLHs) and intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication & Manufacturing and Support Equipment from Marine Aviation Logistics Squadrons (MALS) 11 and 16 to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Miramar, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, CA, by transferring depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Other (approximately 22K DLHs) and Aircraft Rotary (approximately 102K DLHs) and intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication & Manufacturing and Support Equipment from MALS-39 to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Camp Pendleton, Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, CA.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, AZ, by transferring depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Fighter/Attack, Aircraft Other and Aircraft Rotary and intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Communication/Electronics Equipment, Ordnance Weapons & Missiles, Software and Support Equipment from MALS-13 to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Yuma, Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, AZ.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation realigns and merges depot and intermediate maintenance activities. It creates 6 Fleet Readiness Centers (FRCs), with 13 affiliated FRC Sites at satellite locations. FRC Mid-Atlantic will be located on NAS Oceana, VA, with affiliated FRC Sites at NAS Patuxent River, MD, NAS Norfolk, VA, and JRB New Orleans, LA. FRC East is located at Cherry Point, NC, with affiliated FRC Sites at MCAS Beaufort, SC, and MCAS New River, NC. The existing intermediate level activity associated with HMX-1 at MCB Quantico, VA, will also be affiliated with FRC East. FRC Southeast will be located on NAS Jacksonville, FL, and will have an affiliated FRC Site at NAS Mayport, FL. FRC West will be located on NAS Lemoore, CA, and will have FRC affiliated sites at NAS JRB Fort Worth, TX, and NAS Fallon, NV. FRC Southwest will be located on Naval Station Coronado, CA, and will have affiliated sites at MCAS Miramar, CA, MCAS Pendleton, CA, MCAS Yuma, AZ, and NAS Point Mugu, CA. FRC Northwest will be located on NAS Whidbey, WA, with no affiliated FRC Sites.

This recommendation supports both DoD and Navy transformation goals by reducing the number of maintenance levels and streamlining the way maintenance is accomplished with associated significant cost reductions. It supports the Naval Aviation Enterprise's (NAE's) goal of transforming to fewer maintenance levels, i.e., from 3 to 2 levels; and it supports the NAE's strategy of positioning maintenance activities closer to fleet concentrations when doing so will result in enhanced effectiveness and efficiency, greater agility, and allows Naval Aviation to achieve the right readiness at the least cost. This transformation to FRCs produces significant reductions in the total cost of maintenance, repair and overhaul plus the associated Supply system PHS&T (Packaging, Handling, Storage and Transportation) as well as repairables inventory stocking levels as a result of reduced total repair turn-around times, reduced transportation, lower spares inventories, less manpower, and more highly utilized infrastructure. It requires integration and collaboration between Depot-level Civil Service personnel and Military Intermediate-level Sailors and Marines. At those FRCs involving Marine Corps MALS (Marine Aviation Logistics Squadrons), because the MALS remain deployable commands, they will affiliate with their FRC organizations, but will remain operationally distinct and severable in all respects. The FRC D-level functions within the MALS fall under the Commanding Officer of each MALS. The FRC Commander is the provider of embedded depot personnel, as well as D-level technical and logistics support within the MALS. For all FRCs, there is a combined annual facility sustainment savings of $1.1M; elimination of a total of 529,000 square feet of depot/intermediate maintenance production space and military construction cost avoidances of $0.2M. This recommendation also includes a military construction cost of $85.7M.

In addition to the actions described in this recommendation, there are four additional actions involved in the comprehensive merger of depot and intermediate maintenance: Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX, Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME, and Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA. The actions at these installations are described in separate installation closure recommendations in the Department of the Navy section of the BRAC Report.

Community Concerns

The majority of the communities affected by this recommendation had no formal expressions of concern. A number of community leaders expressed general support for the bases within their community and their support for Navy and Marine Corps missions. Specific comments from community leaders representing the Lakehurst Naval Air Engineering Station suggested that the maintenance of unique Aircraft Launch and Recovery Equipment, and Aviation Support Equipment at Lakehurst should be considered and included with the proposed reorganization of the depot and intermediate maintenance activities into Fleet Readiness Centers.

The community from Naval Support Activity, Crane, Indiana questioned the proposed movement of the ALQ-99 airborne Electronic Warfare Center (EWC) because it fractures a truly joint EWC that supports all services, and moves one system's depot operation from Crane's total depot capability and destroys the synergy of operations at Crane to a single platform within a single service at Whidbey Island. The community was also critical of the proposal because they claimed it was neither cost effective nor logical given that the system being moved will be out of the inventory in 10 - 12 years.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the vast majority of this recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The Commission found that pre-BRAC reorganizations considered the unique maintenance at Lakehurst and planned to address reorganization of Lakehurst during the implementation of this recommendation.

The Commission's assessment of the proposed realignment of Naval Support Activity Crane, IN, portion of this very complex DoD recommendation would require substantial construction at Whidbey Island for a system to support EA-6B aircraft to be phased out of the inventory in 10 to 15 years regardless of BRAC. Additionally, the proposed realignment is not cost effective, with implementation costs of $143.6 million and a 20-year Net Present Value cost of $163.9 million. As a result, the Commission amended the recommendation by deleting this portion.

The Commission found construction costs and savings projections were overstated. The Commission found that savings should not be attributed to elimination of unencumbered positions unlikely to be filled. Costs and savings for the final, amended recommendation approved by the Commission have been adjusted to reflect newly estimated military construction costs, the elimination of the Crane realignment to Whidbey Island, and savings that were incorrectly attributed to the elimination of positions already empty as a result of previous efficiency measures. The Commission found that the approved recommendation still enhances military value and generates substantial cost savings.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, VA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Oceana, the Naval Air Depot Cherry Point Detachment, and the Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment; establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic, Naval Air Station Oceana, VA; and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic, Naval Air Station Oceana, VA.

Realign Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department at Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division; establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Patuxent River, Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD; and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Patuxent River, Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD.

Realign Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Norfolk VA, the Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment, and Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division Lakehurst Detachment; establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Norfolk, Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA; and transferring all

intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Norfolk, Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA.

Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA; and transfer all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC, as follows: disestablish Naval Air Depot Cherry Point; establish Fleet Readiness Center East, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 39K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 69K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 8K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 23K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 126K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic, Naval Air Station Oceana, VA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 11K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 19K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 35K DLHs), and Aircraft Other Components (approximately 6K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Norfolk, Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 10K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 1K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 3K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 18K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Patuxent River, Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 0.4K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 1K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 6K DLHs) to FRC Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans, Naval Air Station JRB New Orleans, LA.; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 9K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 16K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 6K DLHs) and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 30K DLHs) to the Fleet Readiness Center East Site Beaufort, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, SC; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 11K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 20K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 36K DLHs), Aircraft Rotary (approximately 1K DLHs), Aircraft VSTOL (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Cargo/Tanker (approximately 0.02K DLHs,), Aircraft Other (approximately 18K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 0.001K DLHs), Calibration (approximately 0.15K DLHs) and "Other" Commodity (approximately 0.3K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center East Site New River, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station New River, Camp Lejeune, NC; and transfer all remaining depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center East, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, SC, by disestablishing Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment Beaufort and transferring all depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center East Site Beaufort, Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, SC.

Realign Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL, as follows: disestablish Naval Air Depot Jacksonville, Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment Jacksonville, and Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Jacksonville; establish Fleet Readiness Center Southeast, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, FL; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 8K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 27K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 9K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Site Mayport, hereby established at Naval Air Station, Mayport, FL; transfer all remaining intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southeast, Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL.

Realign Naval Air Station Mayport, FL, by disestablishing Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment Mayport, and Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division Lakehurst Voyage Repair Team Detachment Mayport and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Site Mayport, Naval Air Station Mayport, FL.

Realign Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA, by disestablishing Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Lemoore and Naval Air Depot North Island Detachment; establishing Fleet Readiness Center West, Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA; and

transferring all intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center West, Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA.

Realign Naval Air Station Fallon, NV, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Fallon and the Naval Air Depot North Island Detachment Fallon; establishing Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fallon, Naval Air Station Fallon, NV; and transferring all intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fallon, Naval Air Station Fallon, NV.

Realign Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division China Lake, CA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department and relocating its maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Components (approximately 45K DLHs), Fabrication & Manufacturing (approximately 6K DLHs) and Support Equipment (approximately 16K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center West, Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA.

Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, establishing Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth, Naval Air Station Fort Worth, TX, and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.

Realign Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, establishing Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA, and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA.

Realign Naval Air Station North Island, Naval Base Coronado, CA, as follows: disestablish Naval Air Depot North Island, COMSEACONWINGPAC (AIMD), and NADEP North Island Detachment North Island; establish Fleet Readiness Center Southwest, Naval Air Station North Island, Naval Base Coronado, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3K DLHs), aircraft Other Components (approximately 13K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 4K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Point Mugu, hereby established at Naval Air Station Point Mugu, Naval Base Ventura, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 26K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Component (approximately 8K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 13K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 55K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 16K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Miramar, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 8K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 4K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 17K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 5K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Pendleton, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 12K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 3K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Southwest Site Yuma, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, AZ; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 12K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 3K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth, Fort Worth, TX; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 25K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 8K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 13K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 53K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 15K DLHs), from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA; and transfer all remaining intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest, Naval Air Station North Island, Naval Base Coronado, CA.

Realign Naval Air Station Point Mugu, Naval Base Ventura, CA, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Point Mugu, Naval Base Ventura, CA.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA, by transferring depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Other (approximately 28K DLHs) and Aircraft Fighter/Attack (approximately 39K DLHs) and intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication & Manufacturing and Support Equipment

from Marine Aviation Logistics Squadrons (MALS) 11 and 16 to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Miramar, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, CA, by transferring depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Other (approximately 22K DLHs) and Aircraft Rotary (approximately 102K DLHs) and intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication & Manufacturing and Support Equipment from MALS-39 to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Camp Pendleton, Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, CA.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, AZ, by transferring depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Fighter/Attack, Aircraft Other and Aircraft Rotary and intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Communication/Electronics Equipment, Ordnance Weapons & Missiles, Software and Support Equipment from MALS-13 to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Yuma, Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, AZ.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Naval Shipyard Detachments

Recommendation # 166 (Ind 26)

One-time Cost:	$12.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($20.7M)
Payback Period:	4 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Detachment Boston, MA, by relocating the ship repair function to Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, WA.

Realign Naval Station Annapolis, MD, by relocating the Norfolk Naval Shipyard Detachment, Naval Sea Systems Command Plant Equipment Support Office ship repair function to Norfolk Naval Shipyard, VA.

Realign the Navy Philadelphia Business Center, PA, by relocating the Norfolk Naval Shipyard Detachment, Naval Sea Systems Command Shipbuilding Support Office ship repair function to Norfolk Naval Shipyard, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation supports mission elimination at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Detachment Boston, MA, Norfolk Naval Shipyard Detachment, Naval Sea Systems Command Plant Equipment Support Office, Annapolis, MD, and Norfolk Naval Shipyard Detachment, Naval Sea Systems Command Shipbuilding Support Office, Philadelphia, PA, and reduces excess ship repair capacity. This relocation will create synergy among like functions at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and Norfolk Naval Shipyard. Although this expected synergy is not captured in the payback calculations, experience has shown that it will produce additional long-term savings.

Community Concerns

Community representatives and employees of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard (PSNSY) Detachment Boston noted the detachment performs engineering and planning and is not a shipyard or repair facility. Inapplicable ship repair and overhaul facility metrics improperly reduced the detachment's military value score. DoD also improperly projects savings due to elimination of building lease payments. The detachment makes no lease payments and its housing costs are already included in the Detachment's Base Operating Support account, hence the recommendation's projected savings are improperly inflated by double-counted savings for the cost of space.

The NAVSHIPSO union and Congressional representatives believe the proposed realignment would result in the loss of intellectual capital, since most NAVSHIPSO personnel would not relocate to Norfolk. The community recommended

moving the facility to Government-owned spaces at the Naval Foundry & Propeller Center, Philadelphia, rather than Norfolk. It was noted the recommendation would move the facility back onto a shipyard, even though BRAC 1993 moved them out of one.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense. The issues raised by the community were more properly categorized as implementation issues that could be managed during the six-year implementation period, and did not individually or collectively rise to the level of a substantial deviation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUPS (JCSGs):

INTELLIGENCE

DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

(A CLASSIFIED VERSION OF THIS RECOMMENDATION IDENTIFIES SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS TO BE MOVED.)

RECOMMENDATION # 167 (INT 3)

ONE-TIME COST:	$96.7M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	($10.1M)
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	($52.8M)
PAYBACK PERIOD:	4 YEARS

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Defense Intelligence Analysis Center, Bolling Air Force Base, DC, by relocating select Defense Intelligence Agency intelligence analysis functions to a new facility at Rivanna Station, VA. Realign Crystal Park 5, a leased facility in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Defense Intelligence Agency analysis function to the Defense Intelligence Analysis Center, Bolling Air Force Base, DC.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation is a realignment of select personnel, equipment and intelligence analysis functions of the Defense Intelligence Agency. It co-locates select intelligence analysis functions and personnel with the National Ground Intelligence Center into a new facility at Rivanna Station. This recommendation improves information flow/mission synergy; addresses capacity shortage at the Defense Intelligence Analysis Center; meets the spirit of the Secretary of Defense's guidelines for relocation outside the National Capital Region, and improves Continuity of Operations (COOP)/Mission Assurance by locating functions on a secure Department of Defense-owned location. The realignment of personnel from Crystal Park 5 to the Defense Intelligence Analysis Center, Bolling Air Force Base, DC, reduces vulnerable leased space while addressing Anti-terrorism/Force Protection deficiencies by locating functions onto a secure Department of Defense-owned location. This recommendation accommodates current and surge requirements and is consistent with the 20-year Force Structure Plan.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

There were no formal expressions from the community.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency Activities

Recommendation # 168 (Int 4)

One-time Cost:	$1,117.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	$127.7M
20-Year Net Present Value:	($535.1M)
Payback Period:	8 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) Dalecarlia and Sumner sites, Bethesda, MD; Reston 1, 2 and 3, leased installations in Reston, VA; Newington buildings 8510, 8520, and 8530, Newington, VA; and Building 213 a leased installation at the South East Federal Center, Washington, DC. Relocate all functions to a new facility at Fort Belvoir, VA. Realign the National Reconnaissance Office facility, Westfields, VA, by relocating all NGA functions to a new facility at the Fort Belvoir, VA. Consolidate all NGA National Geospatial-Intelligence College functions on Fort Belvoir into the new facility at Fort Belvoir, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation is a strategic consolidation of the personnel, equipment and functions of NGA's 22 legacy organizations into a new geospatial intelligence consolidated campus. It consolidates multiple NGA National Capital Region-based intelligence community activities now occupying small, government facilities and privately-owned leased space, to a secure Department of Defense-owned location, reducing excess capacity and increasing overall military value. It optimizes mission efficiencies, improves readiness, and enhances mission partner coordination, while addressing Antiterrorism/Force Protection deficiencies. This recommendation accommodates current and surge requirements and is consistent with the 20-year Force Structure Plan.

Community Concerns

The Maryland community maintains the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency is a good neighbor. They are concerned by the potential reduction in quality of life that would result from transportation problems, such as increased traffic over poor roads, lack of public transportation around the Fort Belvoir area, and increased commuting times with the attendant issues of air pollution and increased fuel consumption. Inadequate road infrastructure and lack of mass transit will lead to large increases in auto commuting and extreme traffic congestion on already overburdened highways and local roads.

Maryland argued the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) is a unique and vital piece of the U.S. intelligence community, and that a new, larger site to accommodate a consolidated NGA is needed. The community expressed concerns that the logistical challenges associated with the realignment of Fort Belvoir will interfere with NGA's ability to carry out its mission if moved to Fort Belvoir as proposed by DoD. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) expressed a similar concern in its July 1, 2005 report. According to GAO, DoD's proposal to add nearly 8,500 new employees to Fort Belvoir should be considered by the Commission in light of "the impact [of this move] on the local community structure, such as roads and public transportation." Community advocates urged the Commission to accept their counter-proposal in which NGA would establish itself faster, more securely and with less disruption to its mission at Fort Meade than at Fort Belvoir. They claimed Fort Meade is unquestionably one of the most secure military facilities in the National Capital Region, and has the space to accommodate the roughly 2,000 NGA employees who must be relocated from the Washington Navy Yard. They assert this counter-proposal could be accomplished within the six-year implementation period because Fort Meade has completed or is completing substantial infrastructure upgrades, which would allow NGA to "plug in" quickly at Fort Meade, including: privatizing the power supply and the water and waste facilities; and laying fiber for enhanced communications. Lastly, the community argued that Fort Meade's secure, superior facilities make it better suited than Fort Belvoir to accommodate the special needs of a high-tech intelligence facility. Consolidating NGA at Fort Meade would also facilitate closer interaction between NGA and the National Security Agency (NSA), Fort Meade's largest tenant. The Maryland Delegation asserts the United States Government needs to consider ways to streamline and improve cooperation between NGA, NSA, and the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), whose missions are closely intertwined.

Commission Findings

The Commission carefully considered the community input, but found no evidence that it would cost less money to move the NGA to Fort Meade than to Fort Belvoir. The Commission also noted that the bulk of NGA staff resides in Northern Virginia, which would better facilitate a commute to Fort Belvoir. The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUPS (JCSGs):

MEDICAL

WALTER REED NATIONAL MILITARY MEDICAL CENTER, BETHESDA, MD

RECOMMENDATION # 169 (MED 4)

ONE-TIME COST:	$988.8M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	($145.3M)
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	($830.6M)
PAYBACK PERIOD:	6 YEARS

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, DC, as follows: relocate all tertiary (sub-specialty and complex care) medical services to National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD, establishing it as the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center Bethesda, MD; relocate Legal Medicine to the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center Bethesda, MD; relocate sufficient personnel to the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center Bethesda, MD, to establish a Program Management Office that will coordinate pathology results, contract administration, and quality assurance and control of DoD second opinion consults worldwide; relocate all non-tertiary (primary and specialty) patient care functions to a new community hospital at Fort Belvoir, VA; relocate the Office of the Secretary of Defense supporting unit to Fort Belvoir, VA; disestablish all elements of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology except the National Medical Museum and the Tissue Repository; relocate the Armed Forces Medical Examiner, DNA Registry, and Accident Investigation to Dover Air Force Base, DE; relocate enlisted histology technician training to Fort Sam Houston, TX; relocate the Combat Casualty Care Research sub-function (with the exception of those organizational elements performing neuroprotection research) of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (Forest Glen Annex) and the Combat Casualty Care Research sub-function of the Naval Medical Research Center (Forest Glen Annex) to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX; relocate Medical Biological Defense Research of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (Forest Glen Annex) and Naval Medical Research Center (Forest Glen Annex) to Fort Detrick, MD, and consolidate it with US Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases; relocate Medical Chemical Defense Research of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (Forest Glen Annex) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and consolidate it with the US Army Medical Research Institute of Chemical Defense; and close the main post.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation will transform legacy medical infrastructure into a premier, modernized joint operational medicine platform. This recommendation reduces excess capacity within the National Capital Region (NCR) Multi-Service Market (MSM: two or more facilities collocated geographically with "shared" beneficiary population) while maintaining the same level of care for the beneficiaries. Walter Reed Army Medical Center (AMC) has a military value of 54.46 in contrast to the higher military values of National Naval Medical Center (NNMC) Bethesda (63.19) and DeWitt Hospital (58). This action relocates medical care into facilities of higher military value and capacity. By making use of the design capacity inherent in NNMC Bethesda (18K RWPs) and an expansion of the inpatient care at DeWitt Hospital (13K RWPs), the entire inpatient care produced at Walter Reed AMC (17K RWPs) can be relocated into these facilities along with their current workload (11K RWPs and 1.9K RWPs, respectively). This strategically relocates healthcare in better proximity to the beneficiary base, which census data indicates is concentrating in the southern area of the region. As a part of this action, approximately 2,069 authorizations (military and civilian) will be realigned to DeWitt Hospital and 797 authorizations will be realigned to NNMC Bethesda in order to maintain the current level of effort in providing care to the NCR beneficiary population. DeWitt Hospital will assume all patient care missions with the exception of the specific tertiary care missions that will go to the newly established Walter Reed National Military Medical Center at Bethesda. Specialty units, such as the Amputee

Center at WRAMC, will be relocated within the National Capitol Region. Casualty care is not impacted. Development of a premier National Military Medical Center will provide enhanced visibility, as well as recruiting and retention advantages to the Military Health System. The remaining civilian authorizations and contractors at Walter Reed AMC that represent unnecessary overhead will be eliminated. Military personnel filling similar "overhead positions" are available to be redistributed by the Service to replace civilian and contract medical personnel elsewhere in Military Healthcare System activities of higher military value.

Co-location of combat casualty care research activities with related military clinical activities of the trauma center currently located at Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, TX, promotes translational research that fosters rapid application of research findings to health care delivery, and provides synergistic opportunities to bring clinical insight into bench research through sharing of staff across the research and health care delivery functions.

This action will co-locate Army, Navy, Air Force and Defense Agency program management expertise for non-medical chemical and biological defense research, development and acquisition (each at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD) and two separate aspects of medical chemical and biological research: medical biological defense research (at Ft. Detrick, MD) and medical chemical defense research (at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD). It will promote beneficial technical interaction in planning and headquarters-level oversight of all defense biomedical R&D, fostering a joint perspective and sharing of expertise and work in areas of joint interest; create opportunities for synergies and efficiencies by facilitating integrated program planning to build joint economies and eliminate undesired redundancy, and by optimizing use of a limited pool of critical professional personnel with expertise in medical product development and acquisition; foster the development of common practices for DoD regulatory interactions with the US Food and Drug Administration; and facilitate coordinated medical systems lifecycle management with the medical logistics organizations of the Military Departments, already co-located at Fort Detrick.

The Armed Forces Institute of Pathology (AFIP) was originally established as the Army Medical Museum in 1862 as a public and professional repository for injuries and disease specimens of Civil War soldiers. In 1888, educational facilities of the Museum were made available to civilian medical professions on a cooperative basis. In 1976, Congress established AFIP as a joint entity of the Military Departments subject to the authority, control, and direction of the Secretary of Defense. As a result of this recommendation, in the future the Department will rely on the civilian market for second opinion pathology consults and initial diagnosis when the local pathology labs capabilities are exceeded.

Community Concerns

The Washington, DC community argued that moving Walter Reed Army Medical Center to the National Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, MD would disrupt the mission of the premier military medical facility, and have a negative effect on the economy of the District of Columbia and homeland security in the nation's capital. Concerns were also expressed about whether there would be sufficient housing for family members visiting service members recovering from serious conditions or injuries. They claimed DoD substantially deviated from the BRAC criteria by incorrectly calculating Walter Reed's military value, underestimating the costs for closure and realignment, and ignoring environmental cleanup costs. They suggested Walter Reed remain open, and the mission of the National Naval Medical Center be aligned with Walter Reed to ensure there are no disruptions during a time of war. They also expressed concerns about the disestablishment of the Armed Force Institute of Pathology (AFIP), which is a part of the larger Walter Reed Recommendation. The community argued that AFIP is an irreplaceable resource for disease research and education, and disestablishing elements like the tissue repository would have far-reaching implications for military and civilian medicine.

Commission Findings

The Commission acknowledged Walter Reed Army Medical Center's rich heritage and earned reputation as a world-class medical center. However, the Commission found that service members deserve a state-of-the-art 21st century medical center and that the Secretary's proposal would increase military value. The Commission considered the community's concerns that realigning medical services will disrupt Walter Reed's mission, but the Commission found that the Walter Reed legacy will be preserved in the plan for the new facility and that service members would continue to receive needed medical services during the implementation period. The Commission concurred with the Department's objective to transform medical infrastructure within the National Capital Region. However, the Commission agrees with the communities' concern about whether sufficient housing will be available for family members at the Bethesda Campus and urges the DoD to address this issue.

The professional community regards AFIP and its services as integral to the military and civilian medical and research community, and relies on AFIP for pathology consultations and the training of radiology residents. The Commission found that DoD failed to sufficiently address several AFIP functions, such as the Radiologic Pathology program, with the associated tissue repository, veterinary pathology and continuing medical education.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, DC, as follows: relocate all tertiary (sub-specialty and complex care) medical services to National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD, establishing it as the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center Bethesda, MD; relocate Legal Medicine to the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center Bethesda, MD; relocate sufficient personnel to the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center Bethesda, MD, to establish a Program Management Office that will coordinate pathology results, contract administration, and quality assurance and control of DoD second opinion consults worldwide; relocate all non-tertiary (primary and specialty) patient care functions to a new community hospital at Fort Belvoir, VA; relocate the Office of the Secretary of Defense supporting unit to Fort Belvoir, VA; disestablish all elements of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology except the National Medical Museum and the Tissue Repository; relocate the Armed Forces Medical Examiner, DNA Registry, and Accident Investigation to Dover Air Force Base, DE; AFIP capabilities not specified in this recommendation will be absorbed into other DoD, Federal, or civilian facilities, as necessary; relocate enlisted histology technician training to Fort Sam Houston, TX; relocate the Combat Casualty Care Research sub-function (with the exception of those organizational elements performing neuroprotection research) of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (Forest Glen Annex) and the Combat Casualty Care Research sub-function of the Naval Medical Research Center (Forest Glen Annex) to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX; relocate Medical Biological Defense Research of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (Forest Glen Annex) and Naval Medical Research Center (Forest Glen Annex) to Fort Detrick, MD, and consolidate it with US Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases; relocate Medical Chemical Defense Research of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (Forest Glen Annex) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and consolidate it with the US Army Medical Research Institute of Chemical Defense; and close the main post.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Brooks City Base, TX

Recommendation # 170 (Med 6)

One-time Cost:	$325.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($102.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($940.7M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Brooks City Base, San Antonio, TX. Relocate the Air Force Audit Agency and 341st Recruiting Squadron to Randolph AFB. Relocate the United States Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine, the Air Force Institute of Occupational Health, the Naval Health Research Center Electro-Magnetic Energy Detachment, the Human Systems Development and Acquisition function, and the Human Effectiveness Directorate of the Air Force Research Laboratory to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. Consolidate the Human Effectiveness Directorate with the Air Force Research Laboratory, Human Effectiveness Directorate at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. Relocate the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, the Air Force Medical Support Agency, Air Force Medical Operations Agency, Air Force Element Medical Defense Agency, Air Force Element Medical-DoD, Air Force-Wide Support Element, 710th Information Operations Flight and the 68th Information Operations Squadron to Lackland Air Force Base, TX. Relocate the Army Medical Research Detachment to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX. Relocate the Non-Medical Chemical Biological Defense

Development and Acquisition to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Disestablish any remaining organizations.

Realign Holloman AFB by disestablishing the high-onset gravitational force centrifuge and relocating the physiological training unit (49 ADOS/SGGT) to Wright-Patterson AFB.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation enables technical synergy, and positions the Department of the Air Force to exploit a center-of-mass of scientific, technical, and acquisition expertise required by the 20-year Force Structure Plan. Greater synergy across technical capabilities and functions will be achieved by consolidating geographically separate units of the Air Force Research Laboratory.

The end state will co-locate the Human Systems Development & Acquisition function and the Human Systems Research function with Air Force Aerospace Medicine and Occupational Health education and training. This action will co-locate the Development & Acquisition for Human Systems with the Research function and will concentrate acquisition expertise for Human Systems at one site. Additionally, the relocation of the physiological training unit from Holloman AFB with the relocation of the high-onset gravitational-force centrifuge, enables the continued use of a critical piece of equipment required for both Human Systems Research and Aerospace Medicine Education and Training. This end state will also increase synergy with the Air Platform Research and Development & Acquisition functions and continue the efficient use of equipment and facilities implemented under Biomedical Reliance and BRAC 91 at Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

Co-location of combat casualty care research activities with related military clinical activities of the trauma center currently located at Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston TX, promotes translational research that fosters rapid application of research findings to health care delivery, and provides synergistic opportunities to bring clinical insight into bench research through sharing of staff across the research and health care delivery functions. The availability of a co-located military trauma center also provides incentives for recruitment and retention of military physicians as researchers, and is a model that has proven highly successful in civilian academic research centers.

Edgewood Chemical and Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, is home to the military's most robust infrastructure supporting research utilizing hazardous chemical agents. Relocation of the Non-medical Chemical Biological Defense Development and Acquisition to Aberdeen Proving Ground will increase synergy, focus on joint needs, and efficient use of equipment and facilities by co-locating Tri-Service and Defense activities performing functions in chemical-biological defense and medical RDA.

This recommendation also moves the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE) to Lackland AFB, where it will be co-located with the Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA) that is being relocated to Lackland in a separate recommendation. The military value of AFCEE is 265th out of 336 entities evaluated by the Major Administrative and Headquarters (MAH) military value model. Lackland Air Force Base is ranked 25th out of 336.

Community Concerns

Community representatives argued DoD's proposed closure of Brooks City Base, Texas would be too costly and eliminated already existing synergies. Specifically, they questioned why the US Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine (USAFSAM) would be moved to the Human Effectiveness Directorate at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base when the mission of USAFSAM involves training and has nothing to do with human system research or development. Alternatively, they suggested realigning USAFSAM with Fort Sam Houston where a co-located medical training organization is proposed. The community also recommended that the Air Force Institute of Operational Health remain in San Antonio and be realigned with USAFSAM because such an alignment would create greater military value than moving to Wright-Patterson. Finally, they argued that the Tri-Service Directed Energy Bioeffects Laboratory, created as a result of a prior BRAC process, remain intact so that such tri-service research can continue.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that several elements of this recommendation were not supportable as originally proposed. For instance, moving the Naval Health Research Center Electro-Magnetic Energy Detachment and the directed energy aspects of the Human Effectiveness Directorate of the Air Force Research Laboratory to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and the Army Medical Research Detachment to the Army Institute of Surgical Research at Fort Sam Houston, TX, would break apart valuable research synergies established over a 10-year period at the Tri-Service Directed Energy Laboratories. In fact, the

Tri-Service Directed Energy Laboratory was brought together at Brooks City Base in 1993 under a special project to collocate similar research and development activities of the military services. Therefore, the Commission found that the work conducted on the effect of directed energy on humans could be placed at risk under the DoD proposal.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close Brooks City Base, San Antonio, TX. Relocate the Air Force Audit Agency and 341st Recruiting Squadron to Randolph AFB. Relocate the United States Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine, the Air Force Institute of Operational Health, and the Human Systems Development and Acquisition function to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. Relocate the Naval Health Research Center Electro-Magnetic Energy Detachment and the Directed Energy portion of the Human Effectiveness Directorate of the Air Force Research Laboratory to Fort Sam Houston, TX. Consolidate the Human Effectiveness Directorate with the Air Force Research Laboratory, Human Effectiveness Directorate at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. Relocate the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, the Air Force Medical Support Agency, Air Force Medical Operations Agency, Air Force Element Medical Defense Agency, Air Force Element Medical-DoD, Air Force-Wide Support Element, 710th Information Operations Flight and the 68th Information Operations Squadron to Lackland Air Force Base, TX. Relocate the Army Medical Research Detachment to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX. Relocate the Non-Medical Chemical Biological Defense Development and Acquisition to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Disestablish any remaining organizations.

Realign Holloman AFB by disestablishing the high-onset gravitational force centrifuge and relocating the physiological training unit (49 ADOS/SGGT) to Wright-Patterson AFB.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

McChord Air Force Base, WA

Recommendation # 171 (Med 9)

One-time Cost:	$1.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($11.6M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($164.4M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign McChord Air Force Base, WA, by relocating all medical functions to Fort Lewis, WA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The primary rationale for this recommendation is to promote jointness and reduce excess capacity. This recommendation supports strategies of reducing excess capacity and locating military medical personnel in areas with enhanced opportunities for medical practice. McChord AFB's medical facility produced 44,283 Relative Value Units (RVUs) in FY02, which is well below the Military Health System average of 166,692 RVUs. Its Healthcare Services Functional Military Value of 51.45, is much lower than that of Fort Lewis (73.30). Military personnel stationed at McChord AFB's Medical Facility can be placed in activities of higher military value with a more diverse workload, providing them with enhanced opportunities to maintain their medical currency and making them better able to support Army medical readiness requirements. Approximately 169 military and civilian authorizations will be realigned to Fort Lewis in order to maintain the current level of effort in providing care to the McChord AFB beneficiary population. The remaining civilian authorizations and contractors at McChord AFB that represent unnecessary overhead will be eliminated. Military personnel that are filling similar "overhead positions" will be redistributed by the Service to replace civilian and contract medical personnel elsewhere in the Military Health System activities of higher military value. The large savings along with the reduction of inefficiencies and workload

available supports this action. While the jobs are lost in the military system the same type of job is available in the community.

Community Concerns

The community expressed concerns about access to medical services if the McChord AFB, WA Clinic is closed and all medical functions are relocated at Madigan Army Medical Center at Fort Lewis. Specifically, they questioned whether Madigan Army Medical Center has the capacity to take on the patient population from the McChord Clinic, how long patients would have to wait for an appointment, if there will be enough staff to treat all patients, and whether the TRICARE civilian network in the area was adequate.

Commission Findings

The Commission found merit in the community's concern that Madigan Army Medical Center at Fort Lewis may not have sufficient capacity to accept McChord Medical Clinic's patient population. Built in 2000, the McChord Clinic provides care to about 14,500 active duty members and their families, as well as retirees and their families. Madigan Army Medical Center, located approximately eight miles from the McChord clinic, has a 172-bed capacity and serves a six-state area. Additionally, the Commission found that, while the medical functions would be realigned to Madigan, the McChord Clinic would be an optimal "satellite" facility to provide health care services. The Commission believes its recommendation will reduce duplication of services while maintaining sufficient future medical capacity.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 2, 3 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign McChord Air Force Base, WA, by reorganizing medical functions under Madigan Army Medical Center, Fort Lewis, WA. McChord Air Force Base medical functions will be reorganized and relocated as directed by the Commander, Madigan Army Medical Center.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX

Recommendation # 172 (Med 10)

One-time Cost:	$1,040.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($129.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($476.2M)
Payback Period:	10 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating the inpatient medical function of the 59th Medical Wing (Wilford Hall Medical Center) to the Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, TX, establishing it as the San Antonio Regional Military Medical Center, and converting Wilford Hall Medical Center into an ambulatory care center.

Realign Naval Air Station Great Lakes, IL, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, Naval Medical Center Portsmouth, Naval Medical Center San Diego, CA, by relocating basic and specialty enlisted medical training to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The primary rationale for this recommendation is to transform legacy medical infrastructure into a modernized joint operational medicine platform. This recommendation reduces excess capacity within the San Antonio Multi-Service Market (MSM: two or more facilities collocated geographically with "shared" beneficiary population) while maintaining the level of

care for the beneficiaries, enhancing opportunities for provider currency, and maintaining surge capacity. By making use of the design capacity inherent in Brooke Army Medical Center (BAMC), the entire inpatient care produced at WHMC can be relocated into this facility. In terms of military value, while BAMC had a slightly lower quantitative military value score than WHMC, the difference was so small as to not be a meaningful discriminator. Additionally, the small difference is primarily attributable to the efficiency of the Dental Clinic at WHMC, a facility that is excluded from this recommendation. It was the military judgment of the MJCSG that in the context of this recommendation, the condition of the facilities and their average weighted age were the most important elements of the military value of the two locations. In this area, BAMC received a significantly higher score than WHMC. Additionally, it is more cost effective and timely to return BAMC to its inherent design capacity and convert WHMC to an ambulatory care center, than to do the reverse. BAMC is located in a more centralized location, enabling it to better support the broader population area. WHMC and BAMC support Level 1 Trauma Centers, this capability is maintained in this recommendation by expanding the BAMC Level 1 Trauma Center to the capacity of both trauma centers. It was therefore the military judgment of the MJCSG that regionalization at BAMC provided the highest overall military value to the Department. Development of a premier Regional Military Medical Center will provide enhanced visibility, as well as, recruiting and retention advantages to the Military Health System. The remaining civilian authorizations and contractors at Wilford Hall Medical Center that represent unnecessary overhead will be eliminated. Military personnel filling similar "overhead positions" are available to be redistributed by the Service to replace civilian and contract medical personnel elsewhere in Military Healthcare System activities of higher military value. While the jobs are lost in the military system the same type of job is available in the community.

This recommendation also co-locates all (except Aerospace Medicine) medical basic and specialty enlisted training at Fort Sam Houston, TX, with the potential of transitioning to a joint training effort. This will result in reduced infrastructure and excess system capacity, while capitalizing on the synergy of the co-location similar training conducted by each of the three Services. In addition, the development of a joint training center will result in standardized training for medical enlisted specialties enhancing interoperability and joint deployability.

Co-location of medical enlisted training with related military clinical activities of the San Antonio Regional Medical Center at Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, TX, provides synergistic opportunities to bring clinical insight into the training environment, realtime. As a result, both the healthcare delivery and training experiences are exponentially enhanced.

Community Concerns

The Lackland Air Force Base community questioned DoD's decision to convert Wilford Hall Medical Center into an outpatient clinic and ambulatory surgery center, and move inpatient services and the Level 1 Trauma Center to Brooke Army Medical Center at Fort Sam Houston. They argued that the south side of the city would no longer have a trauma center, and it would take longer to get to the trauma center located on the north side of the city.

The Sheppard Air Force Base community questioned DoD's decision to move basic medical training from Sheppard to Fort Sam Houston, TX. They felt Sheppard ranked better in excess capacity, buildable acreage, and nearby field training, which were three of the four reasons given by DoD for moving the training to Fort Sam Houston. Advocates claimed the fourth area, clinical capacity, is irrelevant because basic medical training does not require nearby clinical activities. They proposed adjusting the weighted value given to clinical capacity, which would give Sheppard a higher military value score than Fort Sam Houston or Great Lakes. Additionally, they estimated moving basic medical training to Sheppard saves 45.9 percent and 61.8 percent in military construction costs over Fort Sam Houston or Great Lakes respectively. Community leaders noted that Sheppard has a unique one-of-a kind medical training facility for non-prior service students where joint medical training already exists. They explained Sheppard also offers better infrastructure utilization because it has the largest footprint for classrooms reported by all installations, with an excess capacity of 24,482 students, on average.

Community representatives for Naval Station Great Lakes argued that DoD's proposal goes too far in centralizing basic enlisted medical training at Fort Sam Houston, and asserted it would be better to provide training at two locations: Fort Sam Houston and Great Lakes. They believed two locations would better balance the goals of savings and operational flexibility. Additionally, centralizing at Fort Sam Houston would be risky due to the 10 year pay-back period for associated costs. DoD's proposal would also have an adverse impact on the local economy with the loss of 2,000 military positions and a smaller cut in civilian jobs.

Commission Findings

The Commission found merit in DoD's rationale for transforming its medical infrastructure by bringing together two locations in a multi-service market (Wilford Hall Medical Center and Brooke Army Medical Center) and creating a modernized operational medicine installation in San Antonio, TX. The Commission recognizes that both medical institutions have an enviable history of providing quality health care services for active duty service members and their families, and retirees and their dependents. However, it believes implementation of this recommendation will improve service delivery and efficiency.

The Commission also found that collocating all medical basic and specialty enlisted training would create an opportunity for the service branches to develop a joint training center that could result in standardized and enhanced training opportunities, as well as improved interoperability and joint deployability.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics

Recommendation # 173 (Med 12)

One-time Cost:	$141.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($94.0M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($1,146.5M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC by disestablishing the inpatient mission at Naval Hospital Cherry Point; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign Fort Eustis, VA, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the Fort Eustis Medical Facility; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign the United States Air Force Academy, CO, by relocating the inpatient mission of the 10th Medical Group to Fort Carson Medical Facility, CO; convert the 10th Medical Group into a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 89th Medical Group; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign MacDill Air Force Base, FL, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 6th Medical Group; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign Keesler Air Force Base, MS, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 81st Medical Group; convert the medical center to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign Scott Air Force Base, IL, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 375th Medical Group; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign Naval Station Great Lakes, IL, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at Naval Hospital Great Lakes; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign Fort Knox, KY, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at Fort Knox's Medical Facility; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The Department will rely on the civilian medical network for inpatient services at these installations. This recommendation supports strategies of reducing excess capacity and locating military personnel in activities with higher military value with a more diverse workload, providing them with enhanced opportunities to maintain their medical currency to meet COCOM requirements. Additionally, a robust network with available inpatient capacity of Joint Accreditation of Hospital Organizations (JCAHO) and/or Medicare accredited civilian/Veterans Affairs hospitals is located within 40 miles of the referenced facilities.

Community Concerns

The Keesler Air Force Base, MS community questioned DoD's decision asserting a flawed military value analysis, an ineffective analysis of the effects of shutting down Keesler's Graduate Medical Education program on the community, and disputing the costing data used in estimating savings. If the recommendation is not reversed the community fears healthcare services for active duty personnel, dependents, veterans, and retirees will be drastically reduced in the 4-state area served by Keesler. Additionally, the readiness of medical training for deployment teams, and the medical support provided to the education and training mission of the base, would be adversely affected. Other community effects would be the loss of the current support provided for emergency services, medical support to retirees, and the loss of synergies and personnel support with VA and local hospitals.

Community leaders representing Kentucky questioned DoD's decision to convert Ireland Army Hospital at Fort Knox to an outpatient clinic and ambulatory surgery center when the Army planned to locate a brigade combat team (BCT) at Fort Knox. Standing up a BCT at Fort Knox will result in an increase in permanent party and families, thereby changing the overall demand for soldier and family medical support. Additionally, the community was concerned that if the Ireland Hospital were converted into an outpatient clinic, the local civilian hospitals could not absorb the projected increase in obstetrical care that will be required by the Ft. Knox population.

Community representatives from Cherry Point, NC and North Chicago, IL expressed concerns about converting their hospitals, Halyburton Naval Hospital, NC and Great Lakes Naval Station, IL to clinics with ambulatory surgery centers because active duty service members and their families would no longer have nearby access to inpatient medical services.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that DoD did not make a sufficiently detailed assessment of the available health care services within the referenced communities and failed to determine whether the civilian medical network would be able to provide needed medical services. Additionally, the Commission noted that GAO's analysis showed DoD did not coordinate with the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to determine whether military beneficiaries in the referenced communities could have adequate access to care at VA hospitals.

More specifically, the Commission found that the civilian medical network around Ireland Hospital at Fort Knox would have difficulty providing medical services, particularly obstetrical care, to the service members and their dependents who would use Ireland Hospital. Moreover, the demand for health care services would measurably grow when Fort Knox gained an overseas brigade. Finally, the Commission acknowledged community concerns about available health care in the area surrounding Keesler Air Force Base and found DoD's proposal created a risk of insufficient health care services available to Keesler beneficiaries if the medical center was downsized to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center. It was noted that several hospitals in the area of Keesler AFB are not part of the TRICARE network.

Additionally, in that this recommendation realigns several facilities to clinics with ambulatory surgery centers, increasing demand on outpatient services, the Commission urges DoD to provide the appropriate mix of healthcare providers and the proper level of staff to meet the demand.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 3 and 7, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at Naval Hospital Cherry Point; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign Fort Eustis, VA, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the Fort Eustis Medical Facility; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign the United States Air Force Academy, CO, by relocating the inpatient mission of the 10th Medical Group to Fort Carson Medical Facility, CO; convert the 10th Medical Group into a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 89th Medical Group; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign MacDill Air Force Base, FL, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 6th Medical Group; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign Keesler Air Force Base, MS, by convert the medical center to a community hospital.

Realign Scott Air Force Base, IL, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 375th Medical Group; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

Realign Naval Station Great Lakes, IL, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at Naval Hospital Great Lakes; convert the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biological, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisition

Recommendation # 174 (Med 15)

One-time Cost:	$55.2M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($7.3M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($39.5M)
Payback Period:	6 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Building 42, 8901 Wisconsin Ave, Bethesda, MD, by relocating the Combat Casualty Care Research sub-function of the Naval Medical Research Center to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign Naval Station Great Lakes, IL, by relocating the Army Dental Research Detachment, the Air Force Dental Investigative Service, and the Naval Institute for Dental and Biomedical Research to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign 13 Taft Court and 1600 E. Gude Drive, Rockville, MD, by relocating the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Division of Retrovirology to the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Walter Reed Army Medical Center – Forest Glen Annex, MD, establishing it as a Center of Excellence for Infectious Disease.

Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by relocating the Naval Aeromedical Research Laboratory to Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

Realign 12300 Washington Ave, Rockville, MD, by relocating the Medical Biological Defense Research sub-function to the U. S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases, Ft. Detrick, MD.

Realign Potomac Annex-Washington, DC, by relocating Naval Bureau of Medicine, Code M2, headquarters-level planning, investment portfolio management and program and regulatory oversight of DoD Biomedical Science and Technology programs and FDA-regulated medical product development within the biomedical RDA function to a new Joint Biomedical Research, Development and Acquisition Management Center at Fort Detrick, MD.

Realign 64 Thomas Jefferson Drive, Frederick, MD, by relocating the Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical Biological Defense, Joint Project Manager for Chemical Biological Medical Systems headquarters-level planning, investment portfolio management and program and regulatory oversight of DoD Biomedical Science and Technology programs and FDA-regulated medical product development within the RDA function to a new Joint Biomedical Research, Development and Acquisition Management Center at Fort Detrick, MD.

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating the Chemical Biological Defense Research component of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Tyndall AFB, FL, by relocating Non-medical Chemical Biological Defense Research to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and consolidating it with Air Force Research Laboratory.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division, VA, by relocating Non-medical Chemical Biological Defense Research and Development & Acquisition to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division, IN, by relocating the Non-medical Chemical Biological Defense Development and Acquisition to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Skyline 2 and 6, Falls Church, VA, by relocating the Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical Biological Defense to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation creates Joint Centers of Excellence for Battlefield Health and Trauma research at Fort Sam Houston, TX; Infectious Disease research at Walter Reed–Forest Glen Annex, MD; Aerospace Medicine research at Wright-Patterson AFB, OH; Regulated Medical Project development & acquisition at Fort Detrick, MD; Medical Biological Defense research at Fort Detrick, MD; and Chemical Biological Defense research, development & acquisition at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. These actions will increase synergy, focus on joint needs, and efficient use of equipment and facilities by co-locating Tri-Service and Defense activities performing functions in chemical-biological defense and medical RDA. Fort Sam Houston is the best location for the Center for Battlefield Health and Trauma because it is the only current biomedical S&T location that also includes a military trauma center, providing enhanced translational research opportunities and ability to recruit and retain physician/scientists. Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Forest Glen Annex, is the CONUS hub of the worldwide Army and Navy activities in infectious diseases of military significance. Fort Detrick, MD, is the site of an Interagency Biodefense Campus and the military's only Bio-Safety Level 4 containment facilities for medical research. The realignment of Air Force Aerospace medical and non-medical R&D to Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, with co-location of associated education and training activities relocated in another recommendation, makes this location most suitable for a joint center for Aerospace Medical Research. Fort Detrick, MD is home of Tri-Service medical logistics as well the Department's largest Medical RDA management activity. Edgewood Chemical and Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, is home to the military's most robust infrastructure supporting research utilizing hazardous chemical agents. These actions will also reduce the use of leased space within the National Capital Region, and increase the force protection posture of the realigning activities. Specific benefits occurring as a result of this recommendation include:

Promote beneficial technical and management interaction in the functional research areas of combat casualty care including combat dentistry and maxillofacial care, infectious disease, aerospace medicine, medical and non-medical chemical and biological defense research, as well as in the functional area of medical development and acquisition, fostering a joint perspective and sharing of expertise and work in areas of joint interest.

Build joint economies and optimize use of limited pools of critical professional personnel with expertise in unique mission areas.

Co-location of combat casualty care research activities with related military clinical activities of the trauma center currently located at Brooke Army Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, TX, promotes translational research that fosters rapid application of research findings to health care delivery, and provides synergistic opportunities to bring clinical insight into bench research through sharing of staff across the research and health care delivery functions. The availability of a co-located military trauma center also provides incentives for recruitment and retention of military physicians as researchers, and is a model that has proven highly successful in civilian academic research centers.

Reduce the number of DoD animal facilities.

Provide increased opportunities to share management and scientific support functions across Services and reduce costs.

Foster the development of common practices for DoD regulatory interactions with the US Food and Drug Administration.

Facilitate coordinated medical systems lifecycle management with the medical logistics organizations of the Military Departments, already co-located at Fort Detrick.

Promote jointness, enable technical synergy, and position the Department of Defense to exploit a center-of-mass of scientific, technical, and acquisition expertise with the personnel necessary to provide defense against current and emerging chemical and biological warfare threats.

Complete earlier consolidations of military Service Chemical Biological Defense programs into a joint, consolidated Chemical Biological Defense program.

Directly support the Department's Strategy for homeland defense and Civil Support.

Community Concerns

The Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren (Fredericksburg, Virginia) community expressed concern about DoD's recommended transfer of the US Navy's non-medical chemical and biological defense research and development to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland. The community maintained that the transfer would remove the research and development effort from an organization focused on the Navy's unique concerns, to a facility with no prior experience in this area. In addition, community advocates claimed that only about 20 percent of the staff would move from the Fredericksburg, Virginia, area to Harford County, Maryland, where Aberdeen Proving Ground is located. This would cause a significant loss of intellectual and human capital, thereby jeopardizing the Navy mission.

The Tyndall Air Force Base (Bay County, Florida) community expressed concern that the DoD recommendation overstated number of people to be moved to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland. Specifically, they felt the DoD recommendation improperly cited all the staff at the Air Force Research Lab, not just the people working in chemical and biological defense research.

The Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane (Southern Indiana) community expressed concern about the recommended realignment of 57 positions, including 16 engineering and 15 technicians, in Crane's development, acquisition and support of Chemical and Biological detection devices to Edgewood Arsenal at Aberdeen, Maryland. The community feels this action separates the Chemical and Biological detection technical capability which moves, from the industrial depot repair which stays. This causes duplication of knowledge and facilities.

Commission Findings

The Commission found DoD's recommendation to realign chemical-biological defense activities at (1) Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane, IN, (2) Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren, VA, and (3) Tyndall Air Force Base, FL, to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, would not enhance DoD's chemical-biological defense research, development and acquisition activities at Aberdeen Proving Ground, but would instead degrade engineering and logistics support to chemical-biological defense equipment at operational units.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criterion 1, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Building 42, 8901 Wisconsin Ave, Bethesda, MD, by relocating the Combat Casualty Care Research sub-function of the Naval Medical Research Center to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign Naval Station Great Lakes, IL, by relocating the Army Dental Research Detachment, the Air Force Dental Investigative Service, and the Naval Institute for Dental and Biomedical Research to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX.

Realign 13 Taft Court and 1600 E. Gude Drive, Rockville, MD, by relocating the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Division of Retrovirology to the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Walter Reed Army Medical Center – Forest Glen Annex, MD, establishing it as a Center of Excellence for Infectious Disease.

Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by relocating the Naval Aeromedical Research Laboratory to Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

Realign 12300 Washington Ave, Rockville, MD, by relocating the Medical Biological Defense Research sub-function to the U. S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases, Ft. Detrick, MD.

Realign Potomac Annex-Washington, DC, by relocating Naval Bureau of Medicine, Code M2, headquarters-level planning, investment portfolio management and program and regulatory oversight of DoD Biomedical Science and Technology programs and FDA-regulated medical product development within the biomedical RDA function to a new Joint Biomedical Research, Development and Acquisition Management Center at Fort Detrick, MD.

Realign 64 Thomas Jefferson Drive, Frederick, MD, by relocating the Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical Biological Defense, Joint Project Manager for Chemical Biological Medical Systems headquarters-level planning, investment portfolio management and program and regulatory oversight of DoD Biomedical Science and Technology programs and FDA-regulated medical product development within the RDA function to a new Joint Biomedical Research, Development and Acquisition Management Center at Fort Detrick, MD.

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating the Chemical Biological Defense Research component of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Skyline 2 and 6, Falls Church, VA, by relocating the Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical Biological Defense to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUPS (JCSGs):

SUPPLY AND STORAGE

COMMODITY MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION

RECOMMENDATION # 175 (S&S 5)

ONE-TIME COST:	$6.4M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	($43.8M)
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	($735.9M)
PAYBACK PERIOD:	IMMEDIATE

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Detroit Arsenal, MI, by relocating the supply contracting function for tires to the Inventory Control Point at Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and disestablishing all other supply functions for tires.

Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT, as follows: relocate the supply contracting function for tires to the Inventory Control Point at Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH; disestablish all other supply functions for tires; and disestablish the storage, and distribution functions for tires, packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants, and compressed gases.

Realign Naval Support Activity, Mechanicsburg, PA, by relocating the supply contracting function for packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants to the Inventory Control Point at Defense Supply Center, Richmond, VA, and disestablishing all other supply functions for packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants.

Realign Defense Supply Center, Richmond, VA, by disestablishing storage and distribution functions for tires, and the supply, storage, and distribution functions for packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants, and compressed gases. Retain the supply contracting function for packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants, and compressed gases.

Realign Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA, Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna, PA, Naval Station Norfolk, VA, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC, Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, GA, Robins Air Force Base, GA, Anniston Army Depot, AL, Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX, Naval Station Bremerton, WA, Naval Station San Diego, CA, Defense Distribution Depot Barstow, CA, Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin, CA, and Naval Station Pearl Harbor, HI, by disestablishing storage and distribution functions for tires, packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants, and compressed gases at each location.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation achieves economies and efficiencies that enhance the effectiveness of logistics support to forces as they transition to more joint and expeditionary operations. This recommendation disestablishes the wholesale supply, storage, and distribution functions for all tires; packaged petroleum, oils and lubricants; and compressed gases used by the Department of Defense, retaining only the supply contracting function for each commodity. The Department will privatize these functions and will rely on private industry for the performance of supply, storage, and distribution of these commodities. By doing so, the Department can divest itself of inventories and can eliminate infrastructure and personnel associated with these functions. This recommendation results in more responsive supply support to user organizations and thus adds to capabilities of the future force. The recommendation provides improved support during mobilization and deployment, and the sustainment of forces when deployed worldwide. Privatization enables the Department to take advantage of the latest technologies, expertise, and business practices, which translates to improved support to customers at less cost.

It centralizes management of tires; packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants; and compressed gases; and eliminates unnecessary duplication of functions within the Department. Finally, this recommendation supports transformation by privatizing the wholesale storage and distribution processes from DoD activities.

In addition to the actions described in this recommendation, the Department is also disestablishing storage and distribution functions for tires, packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants, and compressed gases at Red River Army Depot, TX. The storage and distribution functions at this additional location are now being disestablished as part of a recommendation for the full closure of the Red River Army Depot installation. The recommendation to close the installation fully supports all objectives intended by this recommendation.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation

Recommendation # 176 (S&S 7)

One-time Cost:	$124.9M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($156.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($1,857.8M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to Robins Air Force Base, GA, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Robins Air Force Base, GA.

Realign Soldier Systems Center, Natick, MA, by relocating the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Philadelphia, PA, and reestablishing them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions and by disestablishing the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables and designating them as Defense Supply Center Philadelphia, PA, Inventory Control Point functions.

Realign Detroit Arsenal, MI, by relocating the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablishing them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions, and by disestablishing the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables and designating them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions.

Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to Detroit Arsenal, MI, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Detroit Arsenal, MI.

Realign Ft. Huachuca, AZ, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and designate them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Naval Support Activity Mechanicsburg, PA, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items, except those Navy items associated with Nuclear Propulsion Support, Level 1/Subsafe and Deep Submergence System Program (DSSP) Management, Strategic Weapon Systems Management, Design Unstable/Preproduction Test, Special Waivers, Major End Items and Fabricated or Reclaimed items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Marine Corps Base, Albany, GA, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for any residual Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Naval Support Activity Philadelphia, PA, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Hill Air Force Base, UT, and Robins Air Force Base, GA, by relocating the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items, except those Navy items associated with Design Unstable/Preproduction Test, Special Waivers and Major End Items to Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, and reestablishing them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions, and by disestablishing the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables and designating them as Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, Inventory Control Point functions.

Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Aviation Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Aviation Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for Aviation depot-level repairables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, Aviation Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated

Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Missile Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH; reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Missile Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for missile depot-level repairables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Missile Inventory Control Point functions; and realign a portion of the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions necessary to oversee the Inventory Control Point activities at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, Detroit Arsenal, MI, Soldier System Center, Natick, MA, and Redstone Arsenal, AL, to Headquarters Army Materiel Command (AMC).

Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by relocating the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by assigning the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

The Supply & Storage Joint Cross Service Group looked at the responsibility for consumable and depot-level repairable item management across the Department of Defense. This recommendation, together with elements of a base closure recommendation, supports the migration of the remaining Service Consumable Items to the oversight and management of a single DoD agency/activity. This proposal moves select Inventory Control Point functions (Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support) to DLA. A number of Inventory Control Point functions (Allowance/Initial Supply Support List Development, Configuration Management, User Engineering Support, Provisioning, and User Technical Support) will be retained by the Services to maintain the appropriate critical mass to perform requirements and engineering. In addition, this recommendation realigns or relocates the procurement management and related support functions for the procurement of DLRs to DLA.

For both consumable items and the procurement management of DLRs, this recommendation provides the opportunity to further consolidate Service and DLA Inventory Control Points by supply chain type. Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH (DSCC), manages the Maritime and Land supply chain, the Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA (DSCR), manages the Aviation supply chain, and Defense Supply Center Philadelphia, PA (DSCP), manages the Troop Support supply chain. The realignment should provide labor savings through transfer in place (application of standard labor rates across Inventory Control Points, headquarters staff reductions, and consolidation of support functions), reduce labor and support costs (from site consolidation) and business process improvements, such as consolidation of procurement under a single inventory materiel manager, reduction of disposal costs, and improved stock positioning. Savings related to overhead/support functions, especially at those locations where physical realignments occur at a lead center, can be anticipated. Finally, this recommendation supports transformation by transferring procurement management of all Service DLRs to a single DoD agency/activity.

This recommendation also allows for the relocation of the remaining Army ICP functions at Fort Huachuca (integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions) to be collocated with its respective Life Cycle Management Command.

This recommendation relocates Air Force ICP functions from Lackland AFB to Robins AFB to provide for the continuation of secure facilities required by the Lackland ICP.

In addition, while this recommendation incorporates most of the actions required to complete the transfer of management to DLA, one element is captured in the closure recommendation associated Fort Monmouth, NJ, as noted below:

The realignment of Fort Monmouth, NJ, which relocates the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablishes them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocates the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to

Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designates them as Defense Supply Center, Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocates the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, has been incorporated into the closure of Fort Monmouth, NJ.

Community Concerns

The Illinois/Rock Island Arsenal community argued DoD greatly deviated from the selection criteria by not basing its decisions regarding the Rock Island Arsenal on military value and cost savings. Rock Island Arsenal Tank Automotive and Armaments Command (TACOM) had a higher military value score than Detroit Arsenal TACOM, yet the lower-ranked facility would gain the management of the depot-level repairable mission. The community claimed facilities at Detroit Arsenal had insufficient space to accommodate Rock Island's TACOM mission. The community expressed concerns about discrepancies in the number of positions identified (740 versus 1,129) with the moves and efficiencies at TACOM Rock Island, which in their view underestimated true costs. Similarly, they asserted military construction costs identified in the COBRA data for Detroit Arsenal were grossly understated by either $42 million or $85 million, depending on the source of data. They claimed a move to Michigan raised Anti-terrorism and Force Protection issues, since Rock Island Arsenal meets and exceeds force protection requirements, while Detroit does not. Moving Rock Island TACOM away from the Engineering support and PEO combat system could also result in the loss of synergy.

The Lackland Air Force Base community claimed the DoD recommendation to disassemble the Cryptologic Systems Group (CPSG) could severely damage our national security, which therefore would violate several BRAC military value criteria. The community argued that the loss of intellectual capital and experienced workers in a very specialized field would be difficult to reconstitute.

Commission Findings

The Commission found there was a discrepancy in the number of positions identified to transfer from Rock Island Arsenal, IL. The entire TACOM-Rock Island organization with approximately 1,100 positions would be affected by this recommendation. Re-running COBRA to capture additional costs to account for DoD's personnel discrepancy resulted in increased moving costs, and a $15 million dollar increase in military construction for gaining facility Detroit Arsenal for this recommendation. However, even accounting for this cost increase, the overall Rock Island portion of this recommendation remained sound from a military value standpoint, as well as being cost effective.

Finally, the Commission found that disestablishing and realigning the mission of the Cryptologic Systems Group at Lackland Air Force Base has a potential to damage national security, and constituted a substantial deviation. This section of the recommendation was therefore deleted by the Commission by amendment.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 4 and 5, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Soldier Systems Center, Natick, MA, by relocating the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Philadelphia, PA, and reestablishing them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions and by disestablishing the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables and designating them as Defense Supply Center Philadelphia, PA, Inventory Control Point functions.

Realign Detroit Arsenal, MI, by relocating the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablishing them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions, and by disestablishing the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables and designating them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions.

Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory

Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to Detroit Arsenal, MI, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Detroit Arsenal, MI.

Realign Ft. Huachuca, AZ, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and designate them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Naval Support Activity Mechanicsburg, PA, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items, except those Navy items associated with Nuclear Propulsion Support, Level 1/Subsafe and Deep Submergence System Program (DSSP) Management, Strategic Weapon Systems Management, Design Unstable/Preproduction Test, Special Waivers, Major End Items and Fabricated or Reclaimed items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Marine Corps Base, Albany, GA, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for any residual Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Naval Support Activity Philadelphia, PA, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Hill Air Force Base, UT, and Robins Air Force Base, GA, by relocating the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items, except those Navy items associated with Design Unstable/Preproduction Test, Special Waivers and Major End Items to Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, and reestablishing them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions, and by disestablishing the procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables and designating them as Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, Inventory Control Point functions.

Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Aviation Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Aviation Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for Aviation depot-level repairables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, Aviation Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, and Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Missile Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH; reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Missile Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for Missile depot-level repairables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Missile Inventory Control Point functions; and realign a portion of the

remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions necessary to oversee the Inventory Control Point activities at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, Detroit Arsenal, MI, Soldier System Center, Natick, MA, and Redstone Arsenal, AL, to Headquarters Army Materiel Command (AMC).

Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by relocating the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by assigning the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for depot-level repairables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration

Recommendation # 177 (S&S 13)

One-time Cost:	$192.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($203.2M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($2,925.8M)
Payback Period:	Immediate

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, by disestablishing the Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, OH. Relocate the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna, PA, hereby designated the Susquehanna Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Tobyhanna, PA, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Tobyhanna Army Depot to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Tobyhanna Army Depot, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Susquehanna Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Naval Station Norfolk, VA, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Norfolk, VA, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Norfolk Naval Base and at Norfolk Naval Shipyard to support shipyard operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Norfolk Naval Shipyard operations, maintenance and production, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Susquehanna Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, by relocating the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Richmond, VA, to the Susquehanna Strategic Distribution Platform. Retain the minimum necessary storage and distribution functions and associated inventories at Defense Distribution Depot Richmond, VA, to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point.

Realign Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, NC by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, Cherry Point, NC, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Naval Aviation Depot Cherry Point, NC, to support depot operations, maintenance and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to

support Naval Air Depot Cherry Point, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Defense Distribution Depot Warner Robins, GA, hereby designated the Warner Robins Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories supporting depot operations, maintenance, and production at the Warner Robins Air Logistics Center with the supply, storage, and distribution functions at the Warner Robins Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, GA, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Albany, GA, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at the Maintenance Center Albany, GA, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support the Maintenance Center Albany, GA, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Warner Robins Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, Jacksonville, FL, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at the Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville, FL, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support the Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville, FL, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Warner Robins Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Anniston Army Depot, AL, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Anniston, AL, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Anniston Army Depot, AL, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Anniston Army Depot, AL, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Warner Robins Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, Corpus Christi, TX, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Defense Distribution Depot Oklahoma City, hereby designated the Oklahoma City Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Tinker AFB, OK, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories supporting depot operations, maintenance, and production at the Air Logistics Center, Oklahoma City, OK, with the supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories at the Oklahoma City Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Hill AFB, UT, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, Hill, UT, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at the Ogden Air Logistics Center, UT, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support the Ogden Air Logistics Center, UT, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Defense Distribution Depot, San Joaquin, CA, hereby designated the San Joaquin Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Naval Station Bremerton, WA, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, Puget Sound, WA, with all other supply, storage and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, WA, to support shipyard operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, WA, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the San Joaquin Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Naval Station, San Diego, CA, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, San Diego, CA, with all other supply, storage and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Naval Aviation Depot, North Island, CA, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support

Naval Aviation Depot, North Island, CA, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the San Joaquin Strategic Distribution Platform.

Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Barstow CA, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at the Maintenance Center Barstow, CA, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories at Defense Distribution Depot Barstow, CA, that are required to support the Maintenance Center Barstow, CA, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the San Joaquin Strategic Distribution Platform.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation achieves economies and efficiencies that enhance the effectiveness of logistics support to operational joint and expeditionary forces. It reconfigures the Department's wholesale storage and distribution infrastructure to improve support to the future force, whether home-based or deployed. It transforms existing logistics processes by creating four CONUS support regions, with each having one Strategic Distribution Platform and multiple Forward Distribution Points. Each Strategic Distribution Platform will be equipped with state-of-the-art consolidation, containerization and palletization capabilities, and the entire structure will provide for in-transit cargo visibility and real-time accountability. Distribution Depots, no longer needed for regional supply, will be realigned as Forward Distribution Points and will provide dedicated receiving, storing, and issuing functions, solely in support of on-base industrial customers such as maintenance depots, shipyards and air logistics centers. Forward Distribution Points will consolidate all supply and storage functions supporting industrial activities, to include those internal to depots and shipyards, and those at any intermediate level that may exist. This consolidation eliminates unnecessary redundancies and duplication, and streamlines supply and storage processes.

In addition to the actions in this recommendation, the Department is abolishing the Defense Distribution Depot at Red River Army Depot. This action is included as part of a recommendation to close the Red River Army Depot installation. The recommendation to fully close the installation achieves the objective of disestablishing the Defense Distribution Depot and is consistent with the intent of this recommendation.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUPS (JCSGs):

TECHNICAL

CO-LOCATE EXTRAMURAL RESEARCH PROGRAM MANAGERS

RECOMMENDATION # 178 (TECH 5)

ONE-TIME COST:	N/A
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	N/A
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	N/A
PAYBACK PERIOD:	N/A

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Close the Office of Naval Research facility, Arlington, VA; the Air Force Office of Scientific Research facility, Arlington, VA; the Army Research Office facilities, Durham, NC, and Arlington, VA; and the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency facility, Arlington, VA. Relocate all functions to the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD. Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating the Army Research Office to the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD. Realign the Defense Threat Reduction Agency Telegraph Road facility, Alexandria, VA, by relocating the Extramural Research Program Management function (except conventional armaments and chemical biological defense research) to the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation co-locates the managers of externally funded research in one campus. Currently, these program managers are at seven separate locations. The relocation allows technical synergy by bringing research managers from disparate locations together to one place. The end state will be co-location of the named organizations at a single location in a single facility, or a cluster of facilities. This "Co-Located Center of Excellence" will foster additional coordination among the extramural research activities of OSD and the Military Departments. Further it will enhance the Force Protection posture of the organizations by relocating them from leased space onto a traditional military installation.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

The Virginia community argued a "Co-Located Center of Excellence" already exists in Northern Virginia, promoting interagency synergy and providing mission-critical access to their civilian counterparts. DoD's proposal would isolate defense researchers and impede mission essential exchanges. They asked the Commission to preserve the flexibility to find the best environment for the "Center of Excellence." However, the community developed alternatives for consideration, which they contended would preserve vital synergistic relationships in the research community, meet AT/FP requirements, and cost less than DoD's proposal.

The North Carolina community argued existing coordination between Army Research Office (ARO) researchers and adjacent academic institutions and high-tech commercial entities is superior to the so-called "synergy" that might be gained through consolidation with other service research agencies. They stated relocating the facility would not be cost-effective and, existing NCR ARO liaison offices can facilitate interagency synergy requirements. They counter-proposed relocating to federally-owned land or leased space meeting AT/FP requirements available inside Research Triangle Park. They also suggested ARO liaison offices in Fort Belvoir and Arlington, VA should relocate and expand to enhance interoperability between the service organizations.

Commission Findings

The Commission found DoD's recommendation to collocate Extramural Research Program Managers at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD would have a detrimental effect on the research managers' ability to successfully perform their missions. Placing the organizations onto a military installation would restrict their key partners' access to them, and the Commission found that visibility and public accessibility is mission critical in the performance of their functions. The Commission also had concerns about the availability of space at the Bethesda Campus. Additionally, the Commission found that a "Co-located Center of Excellence" currently exists in Northern Virginia, which already promotes interagency synergy.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 2, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary.

Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation

Recommendation # 179 (Tech 6)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, Maxwell Air Force Base, AL, and Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating Air & Space Information Systems Research and Development & Acquisition to Hanscom Air Force Base, MA. Realign Eglin Air Force Base, FL, by relocating Air & Space Sensors, Electronic Warfare & Electronics and Information Systems Test & Evaluation to Edwards Air Force Base, CA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation will reduce the number of technical facilities engaged in Air & Space Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics and Information Systems RDAT&E from 6 to 2. Through this consolidation, the Department will increase efficiency of RDAT&E operations resulting, in a multi-functional center of excellence in the rapidly changing technology area of C4ISR.

Community Concerns

The Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base community argued that the movement of the Operations and Sustainment Systems Group (OSSG) from Maxwell-Gunter to Hanscom Air Force Base as part of the research and development Center of Excellence ran counter to the basic premise of this initiative. They stated OSSG is not a research and development organization but rather an operations and sustainment organization ensuring the day-to-day running and upkeep of information technology combat support systems. The community asserted that operations and sustainment are more closely aligned to the warfighter than to research and development. Moving OSSG to Hanscom Air Force Base would atrophy invaluable synergies at Maxwell-Gunter's on-site Defense Information Systems Agency reducing support for the warfighter. The community also believed the entire OSSG workforce was not properly captured in the DoD's cost-analysis, which incorrectly lowered the return on investment and increased annual savings.

The community claimed the DoD recommendation did not: (1) fit the concept of establishing a "Center of Excellence," (2) increase military value or decrease risk for the warfighter, (3) increase the ability to operate jointly, and (4) save money.

Accordingly, the Maxwell-Gunter community believes the Secretary of Defense's recommendation should be amended to move only Research, Development, Acquisition Test & Evaluation functions and personnel to Hanscom Air Force Base and retain Operations and Sustainment activities at Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base.

The Dayton community recommended that the Development and Fielding Systems Group (DFSG) and other OSSG elements be retained at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The community argued there would be a clear risk of failure in DFSG operations supporting acquisition programs, thereby jeopardizing logistics support for warfighting commanders. Specifically, they maintained that military value would be critically degraded, with a potential cost in dollars, performance and schedule delays due to the realignment of DFSG and OSSG elements to Hanscom Air Force Base. The Dayton community contended that when development contractors affected by the realignment were considered, projected savings would become a loss. The community further contended that creation of Hanscom Air Force Base as a "Center of Excellence" for potential "Joint" growth in the future is not feasible due to high costs in the Boston area and the lack of available land to expand. Further the community asserted that many civilians in DFSG are retired military, and will not move with the position.

The Dayton community observed that most of the work conducted at Hanscom Air Force Base relates to developing and acquiring C4ISR weapons systems and subsystems for rapid use by the warfighter. DFSG acquires commercial off-the-shelf software, assists customers with business process engineering, evaluates business management solutions and manages the acquisition and fielding of operational support systems for DoD.

The Eglin Air Force Base community asserted that the realignment of certain Eglin Air Force Base functions to Edwards Air Force Base is illogical. The community contended that Eglin's military value for Information Systems test and evaluation is almost double that of Edwards Air Force Base, and DoD made a significant error in methodology by lumping military value data of dissimilar functions together (Air & Space Sensors, Electronic Warfare & Electronics; and Information Systems). The community also argued that DoD significantly understated military construction cost and manpower necessary to support test and evaluation functions. The community further contended there will be no savings if Electronic Warfare & Electronics testing is consolidated at Edwards Air Force Base. The community believes that high operations tempo, limited availability of aircraft and the distance to Edwards' ranges would deny Special Forces located at Eglin the opportunity to train and test, significantly degrading operational readiness.

The Lackland AFB community argued realignment of the Cryptologic Systems Group to Hanscom AFB would negate the effectiveness from the consolidation and collocation of complementary intelligence functions. They claimed DoD evaluated the military value of the individual functions of the Cryptologic Systems Group rather than conducting a combined value assessment of its missions. The community also noted that splitting up the Systems Group into five separate locations is not cost effective, and identified a number of understated costs associated with the individual recommendations. Additionally, they claimed DoD's mission analysis is flawed because it omitted significant mission requirements such as support to the National Security Agency, the Air Intelligence Agency, and the special projects and space missions performed by the Group.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that DoD's recommendation to relocate activities to Hanscom Air Force Base would combine facilities with dissimilar functions and limit gains in efficiency, with the risk of reduced readiness. For example, Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base is primarily engaged in the operation and sustainment of information technology for legacy combat support systems, not the research, development and acquisition function. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base's Defense and Fielding Systems Group acquires commercial off-the-shelf software, assists customers with business process engineering, and evaluates business management solutions for fielded operational support systems. Last, Lackland Air Force Base's Cryptologic Systems Group provides a "one-stop-shop" for cryptologic systems, and breaking up the capabilities within this group is likely to decrease its efficiency and adversely impact the warfighter. Overall, the Commission found these organizations do not perform the C4ISR research, development and acquisition mission that is intended to be consolidated at Hanscom Air Force Base.

The Commission also found that issues associated with the loss of intellectual capital, the higher cost of living in the New England area, and the economic impact to the Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base area, also contributed to the need to keep the operational functions in place and not realign them to Hanscom Air Force Base.

The Commission also found that relocation of Air and Space Sensors, Electronic Warfare and Electronics and Information Systems test and evaluation personnel from Eglin to Edwards Air Force Base would reduce synergy that currently exists at Eglin Air Force Base between test organizations and users. Further, the Commission found that Eglin is ranked higher than Edwards in military value for this category. The Commission also found that a new $17 million facility was recently constructed at Eglin to support command and control, test and evaluation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary.

Consolidate Ground Vehicle Development & Acquisition in a Joint Center

Recommendation # 180 (Tech 7)

One-time Cost:	$3.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.9M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($17.1M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, AL, by relocating the joint robotics program development and acquisition activities to Detroit Arsenal, Warren, MI, and consolidating them with the Program Executive Office Ground Combat Systems, Program Executive Office Combat Support and Combat Service Support and Tank Automotive Research Development Engineering Center. Realign the USMC Direct Reporting Program Manager Advanced Amphibious Assault (DRPM AAA) facilities in Woodbridge, VA, by relocating the Ground Forces initiative D&A activities to Detroit Arsenal, Warren, MI.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation consolidates those USMC and Army facilities that are primarily focused on ground vehicle activities in development and acquisition (D&A) at Detroit Arsenal in Warren, MI, to increase joint activity in ground vehicle development & acquisition. The D&A being consolidated is centered on manned and unmanned ground vehicle program management. In Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), effectiveness in combat depends heavily on "jointness," or how well the different branches of our military can communicate and coordinate their efforts on the battlefield. This collection of D&A expertise will not only foster a healthy mix of ideas, but will increase the ground vehicle community's ability to develop the kinds of capabilities that can position us for the future as well as adapt quickly to new challenges and to unexpected circumstances. The ability to adapt is critical where surprise and uncertainty are the defining characteristics of the new threats.

The Joint Center for Ground Vehicle D&A located at Detroit Arsenal will be the Department of Defense's premier facility for ground vehicle D&A. Detroit Arsenal is located in southeastern Michigan where the Research and Development headquarters reside for General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, General Dynamics Land Systems, Toyota-North America, Nissan-North America, Hino, Hyundai, Suzuki, Visteon, Delphi, Johnson Controls, Dana, and many others. The synergies gained from having a critical mass located in southeastern Michigan, and being able to leverage the world's intellectual capital for automotive/ground vehicle Research and Development & Acquisition, will ensure the Department is prepared to meet the future demands.

The end state of this recommendation is to consolidate Department of Defense expertise in Ground Vehicle D&A activities at Detroit Arsenal. It promotes jointness, enables technical synergy, and positions the Department of Defense to exploit a center-of-mass of scientific, technical, and acquisition expertise with the personnel involved in ground vehicle Research, Development & Acquisition that currently resides at Detroit Arsenal.

Community Concerns

The Redstone Arsenal community stated that program management, development and acquisition functions for unmanned robotics systems are currently assigned to Redstone Arsenal, and assigning responsibility for unmanned components for ground combat vehicles to Detroit Arsenal would destroy existing collaborative working relationships. Robotics systems require three major components (vehicle, payload and controls) for an unmanned system to perform its mission. Ground vehicle development work should be retained because Redstone is the recognized leader in the integration of unmanned systems. They noted that several unmanned systems companies are established in the Redstone community and that moving

vehicle work to Detroit would significantly harm the synergies gained from established working relationships. The community questioned how the relocation would increase military value, and believed moving robotics-related vehicle development and acquisition work to Detroit would produce a negative return on investment.

Commission Findings

The Commission carefully examined community concerns with regard to the possible break-up of the existing center of excellence for developing and acquiring robotics components to be installed in combat vehicles. While the Commission recognizes the synergies that exist between developers of these components and private sector vendors located within the Redstone community, the Commission found merit in the underlying purpose of the recommendation, which is to consolidate programmatic decision-makers for ground combat vehicles with the Program Executive Office for Ground Combat Systems and the Tank Automotive Research and Development Center, both of which are located at Detroit Arsenal. The Commission expects that details concerning the exact number and type of personnel positions to be relocated will be determined during the post-BRAC implementation process. In making these final determinations, the Department may want to consider the overall impact the moves may have on the existing technically oriented robotics center of excellence at Redstone. Also, the Commission recognized that DoD's initial COBRA estimate improperly claimed savings for lease cost-avoidance at the Marine Corps' Woodbridge, VA facility. At the Commission's request, the Department provided a corrected cost and savings analysis which showed an 11-year return on investment, rather than the 2-year payback period originally reported. The Commission found that while adjusted savings are less than DoD's initial estimates, the recommendation provided for an overall enhancement of military value by collocating three geographically separated facilities into one location.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation

Recommendation # 181 (Tech 9)

One-time Cost:	$86.6M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($34.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($420.9M)
Payback Period:	1 Year

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Washington Navy Yard, DC, by disestablishing the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Washington Navy Yard and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA.

Realign Naval Station, Norfolk, VA, by disestablishing the Space Warfare Systems Center Norfolk, VA, and the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Norfolk, VA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA.

Realign Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, as follows: relocate Surface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Surface Warfare Center Division, Dahlgren, VA; relocate Subsurface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Station Newport, RI; and relocate the Command Structure of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA, and consolidate it with billets from Space Warfare Systems Command San Diego to create the Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic, Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA. The remaining Maritime Information Systems Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation functions at Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, are assigned to Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic, Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA.

Realign Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA, as follows: relocate Surface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Surface Warfare Center Division, Dahlgren, VA; relocate Subsurface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Station Newport, RI; disestablish Space Warfare Systems Center Norfolk, VA, detachment San Diego, CA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Pacific, Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA; disestablish Naval Center for Tactical Systems Interoperability, San Diego, CA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Pacific, Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA; and disestablish Space Warfare Systems Command San Diego, CA, detachment Norfolk, VA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic, Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek , VA.

Realign Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD, by relocating Subsurface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division to Naval Station Newport, RI.

Realign Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL, by disestablishing the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Jacksonville, FL.

Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by relocating the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Pensacola, FL, to Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC.

Realign Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, VA, by relocating the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Yorktown, VA, to Naval Station Norfolk, VA, and consolidating it into the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic detachment, Naval Station Norfolk, VA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

These recommended realignments and consolidations provide for multifunctional and multidisciplinary Centers of Excellence in Maritime C4ISR. This recommendation will also reduce the number of technical facilities engaged in Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, & Electronics and Information Systems RDAT&E from twelve to five. This, in turn, will reduce overlapping infrastructure increase the efficiency of operations and support an integrated approach to RDAT&E for maritime C4ISR. Another result would also be reduced cycle time for fielding systems to the warfighter.

Community Concerns

Except for the Naval Undersea Warfare Center (NUWC) Newport's observation that they would gain more people than expected, none of the gaining communities commented on recommendations to consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation. However, the Commission heard numerous comments from communities that could experience job losses under DoD's recommendation.

The Charleston, SC, community argued it should remain the East Coast center for maritime Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) research. They argued that the Space Warfare System Center has the highest military value on the East Coast of all Navy Information Systems Technology (IST) Development and Acquisition activities. It ranked higher than San Diego, CA for IST Test and Evaluation (T&E). Charleston, SC has the most efficient Navy C4ISR organization, lower labor rates, lower costs of living, and significantly fewer electronic emission issues than San Diego. They argued there are currently twice as many Space Warfare Command (SPAWAR) personnel in Charleston as Norfolk, VA and questioned the wisdom of separating Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic headquarters from the location where most of the work is performed. SPAWAR Charleston embodies a joint command, with nearly one-half of its work being non-Navy. According to the community, this recommendation would override the decision of BRAC 1993 to make Charleston the East Coast center of C4ISR with a new world class facility, far removed from the electronic encroachment problems which have plagued Norfolk.

- The Dahlgren, VA, community said the Navy would give up, under DoD's plan, inextricably linked mission capabilities because ship-borne warfare systems are specifically designed to be fully embedded within a ship's hull design, interoperable with the ship's own systems, as well as those of other ships in the battle group. Systems are functionally integrated and not separable as independent components. Furthermore, based on BRAC 1995 experiences, only 20 percent to 25 percent of Dahlgren area personnel are likely to move to high-priced San Diego, CA, creating program disruption risks.

The Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Newport, RI community believed realignment of submarine communications work from Newport, RI to San Diego, CA would generate no net savings, add significant costs, and damage existing critical Navy

capability resident only in Newport. They believe a historical transfer rate of about 15 percent will result in the loss of thousands of years of unique submarine communications experience. The proposed move would severely degrade end-to-end testing of submarine combat system infrastructure. Security and data latency issues would severely degrade the capability of the "virtual submarine" located in Newport if the land-based submarine radio rooms were extracted from the remaining submarine combat subsystems.

The Naval Base Ventura County (NBVC) community claimed the realignment would result in significant losses of intellectual capital, would adversely affect war fighting capabilities, and would waste hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayer money. Citing a preliminary survey showing that 18 percent will relocate, they estimated that only 20—25 percent of current staff will move if the C4ISR work is moved from NBVC to China Lake, CA. They also questioned the business case for the realignment asserting the TJCSG did an extremely poor job analyzing and managing data, judging military value and considering jointness.

Commission Findings

The Commission determined that the proposed movement of these components would seriously fracture the "system of systems work" performed at the affected installations. In particular, there was a high likelihood that the synchronization of the "virtual radio room," which was proposed to be moved to San Diego, would not be successfully coordinated with the remainder of the "virtual submarine" that would be left in Newport. The Commission found similar concerns for the weapon systems integration work conducted at Dahlgren. In addition, but subordinate to the technological issues, were concerns about the likely loss of intellectual capital with these moves for which the COBRA data reflects a need to move all personnel associated with their projects. While the Commission notes that intellectual capital losses can and have been successfully managed in the past, the amended recommendation has a higher ratio of savings-to-investment than the original DoD recommendation, and eliminates a strong likelihood that several key projects would prove extremely expensive to replicate, if not technologically impossible to implement as originally proposed.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign Washington Navy Yard, DC, by disestablishing the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Washington Navy Yard and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA.

Realign Naval Station, Norfolk, VA, by disestablishing the Space Warfare Systems Center Norfolk, VA, and the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Norfolk, VA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA.

Realign Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, as follows: relocate Surface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Surface Warfare Center Division, Dahlgren, VA; relocate Subsurface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Station Newport, RI; and relocate the Command Structure of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA, and consolidate it with billets from Space Warfare Systems Command San Diego to create the Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic, Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA. The remaining Maritime Information Systems Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation functions at Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, are assigned to Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic, Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA.

Realign Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA, as follows: relocate Surface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Surface Warfare Center Division, Dahlgren, VA; relocate Subsurface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Station Newport, RI; disestablish Space Warfare Systems Center Norfolk, VA, detachment San Diego, CA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Pacific, Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA; disestablish Naval Center for Tactical Systems Interoperability, San Diego, CA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Pacific, Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA; and disestablish Space Warfare Systems Command San Diego, CA, detachment Norfolk, VA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic, Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek , VA.

Realign Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD, by relocating Subsurface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division to Naval Station Newport, RI.

Realign Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL, by disestablishing the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Jacksonville, FL.

Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by relocating the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Pensacola, FL, to Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC.

Realign Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, VA, by relocating the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Yorktown, VA, to Naval Station Norfolk, VA, and consolidating it into the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic detachment, Naval Station Norfolk, VA.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Consolidate Navy Strategic Test & Evaluation

Recommendation # 182 (Tech 12)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Patrick Air Force Base, Cape Canaveral, FL, by relocating Nuclear Test and Evaluation at the Naval Ordnance Test Unit to Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic, Kings Bay, GA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation realigns the stand-alone East Coast facility working in full-scale Nuclear Test & Evaluation at Cape Canaveral into a fully supported Navy nuclear operational site at Kings Bay to gain synergy in security Anti-terrorism Force Protection (AT/FP), Fleet operational support and mission support infrastructure. Since 1956, the Fleet Ballistic Missile (FBM) Program, in support of the TRIDENT (D-Series) Missile, has executed land-based (pad) as well as sea-based (SSBN) test launches supported by the Naval Ordnance Test Unit (NOTU) at Cape Canaveral, FL. This facility provided both the launch support infrastructure as well as docking for sea-based pre- and post-launch events. Recent changes in ATFP requirements, the recent establishment of the Western Test Range in the Pacific, and the programmatic decision to no longer require land based (pad) launches at Cape Canaveral all lead to the realignment/relocation of this function to Kings Bay. This action aligns nicely with the overall Weapons and Armaments strategy to move smaller activities at remote sites into larger facilities to realize a significant synergy in support functions and costs while maintaining mission capability.

Community Concerns

The community contended that the proposed realignment of Naval Ordnance Test Unit (NOTU), Cape Canaveral, FL to Kings Bay, GA would reduce military value, degrade Anti-terrorism Force Protection (AT/FP), and eliminate jointness. The community stated that NOTU provides a full spectrum of submarine launched ballistic missile test and evaluation capabilities and that uprooting this operation at extensive cost in infrastructure, personnel relocations, contractor changes, and mission disruption, would reduce military value and degrade the mission. The community also contended that of equal importance, test missions will experience greater exposure to the potential of terrorist attack, Further, the current joint cooperation and cost sharing arrangement in place to support NOTU operations at Cape Canaveral Air Force Station would be lost along with the synergistic benefits of NOTU personnel working on a day-to-day basis with the Air Force's 45th Space Wing and personnel on the Eastern Test Range. The community believed the realignment undermines an active, essential

Joint Service interaction that is necessary to accomplish the test mission, thus violating DoD's basic premise of promoting transformation through close Joint Service interaction.

The community further contended that the port facility on Cape Canaveral enjoys immediate access to open water whereas Kings Bay is located on an inland waterway requiring lengthy surface transit to open water and the test launch point. The community believed this to be a disadvantage and clearly reduces military value. Lengthy and restricted transits render submarines vulnerable to terrorist operations.

According to the community, the NOTU labor force consists of missile flight test engineers, found at Cape Canaveral but not Kings Bay. The community stated that its statewide analysis shows that fewer than 30 percent of personnel are expected to relocate from Florida to Kings Bay.

The community stated their analysis showed that DoD failed to account for the cost and availability of mission essential contractor personnel at the receiving site who are critical to day-to-day operations, training and preparation for submarine systems checks and test firings.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that Kings Bay Submarine Base, GA, does not perform the test and evaluation mission that is performed by the Naval Ordnance Test Unit, Patrick Air Force Base, Cape Canaveral, FL. The Commission determined that Kings Bay performs a strategic operational mission, and the addition of the test and evaluation mission would represent a significant added responsibility.

The Commission found that implementation of DoD's recommendation would impair (1) existing day-to-day working relationships and synergy between Naval Ordnance Test Unit testing personnel and several organizations on Cape Canaveral, FL such as the Air Force's 45th Space Wing, and (2) the test and evaluation mission and testing schedule, due to the loss of intellectual capital, especially flight test engineers, increasing missile test workload, and the need for training at Kings Bay, GA; and that adjusted savings and cost estimates would increase the payback period from 7 to 10 years.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 4 and 5, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary.

Consolidate Sea Vehicle Development & Acquisition

Recommendation # 183 (Tech 13)

One-time Cost:	$1.5M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($0.22M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($2.0M)
Payback Period:	7 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Detroit Arsenal, MI, by relocating Sea Vehicle Development and Acquisition to Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division, Bethesda, MD, and Program Management and Direction of Sea Vehicle Development and Acquisition to Naval Sea Systems Command, Washington Navy Yard, DC.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation positions technical sites for jointness through co-location with functions at the receiving locations. It also increases efficiency by consolidating program management of Sea Vehicle Development and Acquisition (D&A) from three sites to two principal sites; the Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEASYSCOM) at the Washington Navy Yard (WNY), DC, and the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) Carderock Division, Bethesda, MD.

The consolidation and co-location leverages existing concentration of research, design and development, and acquisition support capabilities residing within the US Navy Headquarters and Warfare Center RD&A infrastructure. Program management for D&A will be at the Naval Sea Systems Command, Washington Navy Yard. In support of joint and transformational initiatives, this recommendation relocates management and direction of Theater Support Vessels (TSV) and other Sea Vehicle/Watercraft programs for US Army to the Naval Sea Systems Command, Washington Navy Yard. Consolidation of all program management of Sea Vehicle Programs at the Naval Sea Systems Command, Washington Navy Yard co-locates these functions and aligns with related program offices supporting Sea Vehicle Weapons and Combat systems, Hull Mechanical and Electrical, C4I integration and related sea vehicle equipment and support functions. This also places it near the principal technical direction and development agent for sea vehicles located at Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division in Bethesda, MD. This recommendation is consistent with the existing partnership collaboration between the USA and the USN on Theater Support Vessels as reflected in a Memorandum of Understanding between the US Army Program Executive Office (PEO) for Combat Support and Combat Service Support (PEO CS & CSS) and the US Navy PEO for Ships Systems.

The recommendation will enhance synergy by consolidating Sea Vehicle functions to major sites, preserve healthy competition, leverage existing infrastructure, minimize environmental impact, and effect reasonable homeland security risk dispersal. The recommendation will increase efficiency by making a robust acquisition organization available to all DoD Sea Vehicle and watercraft program requirements and will increase efficiency by reducing overall manpower requirements.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center

Recommendation # 184 (Tech 15)

One-time Cost:	$343.3M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($52.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($349.5M)
Payback Period:	7 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane, IN, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except gun/ammo, combat system security, and energetic materials to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head, MD, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except gun/ammo, underwater weapons, and energetic materials, to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

Realign Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except the Program Executive Office and Program Management Offices in Naval Air Systems Command, to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

Realign Naval Base Ventura County, Point Mugu, CA, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except underwater weapons and energetic materials, to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center, Yorktown, VA, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation to Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head, MD.

Realign Naval Base Ventura County, Port Hueneme, CA, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except weapon system integration, to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

Realign Fleet Combat Training Center, CA (Port Hueneme Detachment, San Diego, CA), by relocating all Weapons and Armaments weapon system integration Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation to Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren, VA.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren, VA, by relocating all Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except guns/ammo and weapon systems integration to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation realigns and consolidates those facilities working in Weapons & Armaments (W&A) Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation (RDAT&E) into a Naval Integrated RDAT&E center at the Naval Air Warfare Center, China Lake, CA. Additional synergistic realignments for W&A was achieved at two receiver sites for specific focus. The Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren, VA, is a receiver specialty site for Naval surface weapons systems integration and receives a west coast site for consolidation. This construct creates an integrated W&A RDAT&E center in China Lake, CA, energetics center at Indian Head, MD, and consolidates Navy surface weapons system integration at Dahlgren, VA.

All actions relocate technical facilities with lower overall quantitative Military Value (across Research, Development & Acquisition and Test & Evaluation) into the Integrated RDAT&E center and other receiver sites with greater quantitative Military Value.

Consolidating the Navy's air-to-air, air-to-ground, and surface launched missile RD&A, and T&E activities at China Lake, CA, would create an efficient integrated RDAT&E center. China Lake is able to accommodate with minor modification/addition both mission and lifecycle/sustainment functions to create synergies between these traditionally independent communities.

During the other large scale movements of W&A capabilities noted above, Weapon System Integration was specifically addressed to preserve the synergies between large highly integrated control system developments (Weapon Systems Integration) and the weapon system developments themselves. A specialty site for Naval Surface Warfare was identified at Dahlgren, VA, that was unique to the services and a centroid for Navy surface ship developments. A satellite unit from the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Port Hueneme, San Diego Detachment will be relocated to Dahlgren.

The Integrated RDAT&E Center at China Lake provides a diverse set of open-air range and test environments (desert, mountain, forest) for W&A RDAT&E functions. Synergy will be realized in air-to-air, air-to-ground, and surface launched mission areas.

This recommendation enables technical synergy, and positions the Department of Defense to exploit center-of-mass scientific, technical and acquisition expertise with weapons and armament Research, Development & Acquisition that currently resides at 10 locations into the one Integrated RDAT&E site, one specialty site, and an energetics site.

Community Concerns

The Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane, IN, community believed initial placement on DoD's closure list precluded its consideration as a gainer. Their joint customer base and Army Ammunition plant tenant were not recognized as a joint transformation asset, and that separate evaluation as a technical and industrial facility unfairly disadvantaged them in comparison to large Research Development & Acquisition (RD&A) facilities. They argued their highly experienced work

force helped them grow 20 percent per year since 2001, on one of the largest bases in the US with no encroachment problems. The combined recommendations for NSWC Crane would cost Martin County more than one-ninth of its jobs.

The Indian Head, MD community claimed initial placement on DoD's closure list precluded consideration as a "gainer," and that the recommendation would be reasonable if energetics work from other commands, including China Lake and Picatinny, were brought to Indian Head. The Indian Head community concurred with DoD's recommendations sending work to them, and strongly opposed proposed losses of workload.

The Ventura County, Point Mugu, CA community claimed DoD's data analysis and judgment of military value were poor and the recommendations would not enhance transformation and jointness. Most of the affected positions are not synergistic with the armaments and weapons work already at China Lake.

They pointed out their range is a unique national asset, used by Air Force, Navy, Missile Defense Agency, other DoD, Foreign Military Sales, commercial activities and NASA, and that no synergy would be gained by realigning the Sea Range to China Lake. Basing range support aircraft at China Lake would require construction and increase operating costs. Some test facilities would take many millions of dollars to move and/or rebuild. NBVC's intellectual capital took decades to develop. Few employees would move to China Lake, and therefore DoD's proposal would risk major disruptions to mission effectiveness. They also disputed DoD's cost estimates, questioning assumptions on the number of staff likely to relocate, the cost of sea range air support, and savings estimated for civil service personnel. They believe a 12-year payback period is more realistic than six years and that recurring savings will likely be less than half those estimated by DoD.

The community speculated that the Coast Guard and Department of Homeland Security might expand their presence on Point Mugu, CA.

The Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA, community noted that test and calibration equipment need not be purchased for China Lake if Seal Beach employees assist NSA Corona with calibration and other related work using Corona-based equipment.

Some members of the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Yorktown, VA, community said energetics work should be sent to Indian Head, and that a large percentage of Virginia employees would likely make this move. They noted that Indian Head, MD, would have been among the top three in most military value categories if the number of military personnel had been included in the evaluation.

However, others in the Yorktown, VA, community said DoD's recommendation is seriously flawed and should be rejected. They claimed locally generated cost, savings, and other data were changed or distorted at DoD to achieve the results needed to support DoD recommendations. Reported savings depended on staffing reductions unlikely to materialize as well as omitted or reduced implementation costs in COBRA. Correction of obvious errors would result in a net cost of over a million dollars, rather than a savings; and payback would stretch to over 20 years. They also argued DoD's recommendation would cause the Navy to lose capabilities and crucial magazine space, therefore hindering future operations.

The Port Hueneme, CA, community contended DoD overstated savings, and understated costs and the repayment period, including the additional costs incurred from training replacement staff and moving the aviation support unit. They said that savings are exaggerated by assuming 15 percent rather than GAO-recommended 5.7 percent for personnel savings. Most of the recommendations are Service-centric, contrary to DoD requirements for jointness and transformation, and would compromise existing synergies of the base, laboratories, and proximity to the Sea Range. They insisted operation of the Sea Range from China Lake would be less safe and more expensive. The realignment would result in significant losses of intellectual capital, adversely affect war fighting capabilities, and waste hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayer money. They stated the Navy ignored requests for clarification of issues involving personnel relocations and COBRA computed savings.

The Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren, VA, community said this particular recommendation conflicts with DoD's other recommendation to establish Dahlgren as a specialty site for Naval Surface Warfare, and would reduce military value and impair Navy warfighting capability. Consolidation of "big gun" RD&A and T&E at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ, would reduce the ability to engineer and integrate shipboard combat systems. Single siting violates a TJCSG guiding principal and, since Picatinny has neither big guns nor a test range, its transplanted employees would have to make frequent trips back to Dahlgren. Less than 20 percent of the educated, trained, and experienced engineering and technical workforce can be expected to move from the region, resulting in a brain drain.

According to the China Lake, CA, community, it was ranked highest in military value for research, acquisition, and T&E and was ranked first in two of three categories for Sensors/EW and Electronics. They argued that China Lake is the best site for synergism and efficiency and it has a record of identifying key problems and creating effective, affordable solutions.

Relocation of Point Mugu's electronic warfare capability to China Lake would improve integration of the next generation combat aircraft. They fully support DoD's recommendation to establish a full-spectrum, integrated RDAT&E center at China Lake. The community can and would provide needed utilities, good schools and affordable housing, and they stated the proposal would generate a relatively small increase from Ridgecrest's 1990s-level population. China Lake has a high retention rate and over 80 percent of the NAWC China Lake retirees stay in the community. They agreed that the Sea Range is a critical joint service asset, with the only question being the number of Point Mugu staff needed to efficiently and effectively operate the sea range.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the issues and concerns raised about the recommendation did not rise to the level of a substantial deviation from the Selection Criteria or Force Structure Plan. For instance, the Commission determined that the potential loss of intellectual capital was not likely to be as serious as feared by the affected communities. Moreover, Commissioners found unconvincing the arguments by the Point Mugu community that after 13 years under the same Commanding Officer as China Lake, all possible duplication had been wrung out, therefore rendering a significant percentage of the anticipated savings unachievable. The Commission found instead that military value would be enhanced over the long run by bringing the teams working on these major armament projects into a single "center of excellence."

However, the Commission was not able to reconcile the large differences between the number of affected personnel as proposed by DoD with the number of personnel identified by the community, primarily the number of people needed to support the Sea Range. The Commission urges the Secretary of the Navy, during the implementation process, to realign the Naval Integrated Weapons and Armaments RDAT&E functions for optimum effectiveness, rather than for narrow compliance with COBRA personnel numbers.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Create an Air Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center

Recommendation # 185 (Tech 18)

One-time Cost:	$2.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($1.4M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($17.9M)
Payback Period:	2 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT, by relocating Weapons and Armaments In-Service Engineering Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation to Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating Defense Threat Reduction Agency National Command Region conventional armament Research to Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Eglin is one of three core integrated weapons and armaments RDAT&E centers (with China Lake, CA, and Redstone Arsenal, AL) with high MV and the largest concentration of integrated technical facilities across all three functional areas. Eglin AFB has a full spectrum array of Weapons & Armaments (W&A) Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation (RDAT&E) capabilities. Accordingly, relocation of Hill AFB and DTRA NCR W&A capabilities will further complement and strengthen Eglin as a full spectrum W&A RDAT&E Center.

The overall impact of this recommendation will be to: increase W&A life cycle and mission related synergies/integration; increase efficiency; reduce operational costs; retain the required diversity of test environments; and facilitate multiple uses of

equipment, facilities, ranges, and people. Hill AFB and DTRA NCR technical facilities recommended for relocation have lower quantitative MV than Eglin AFB in all functional areas.

This recommendation includes Research, D&A, and T&E conventional armament capabilities in the Air Force and DTRA NCR. It consolidates armament activities within the Air Force and promotes jointness with DTRA NCR. It also enables technical synergy, and positions the DoD to exploit center-of-mass scientific, technical, and acquisition expertise within the RDAT&E community that currently resides as DoD specialty locations. This recommendation directly supports the Department's strategy for transformation by moving and consolidating smaller W&A efforts into high military value integrated centers, and by leveraging synergy among RD&A, and T&E activities. Capacity and military value data established that Eglin AFB is already a full-service, integrated W&A RDAT&E center. Relocation of W&A D&A In-Service Engineering (ISE) from Hill AFB to Eglin AFB will increase life cycle synergy and integration. ISE encompasses those engineering activities that provide for an "increase in capability" of a system/sub-system/component after Full Operational Capability has been declared. ISE activities mesh directly with on-going RDAT&E at Eglin AFB.

Relocation of DTRA NCR W&A technical capabilities will increase life cycle synergy and integration at Eglin AFB. Conventional armament capabilities possessed by DTRA NCR directly complement on-going RDAT&E at Eglin AFB. Cost savings from the relocation of DTRA NCR to Eglin AFB will accrue largely through the elimination of the need for leased space, and by virtue of the fact that Eglin AFB can absorb the DTRA NCR (and Hill AFB) functions without the need for MILCON.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found merit in DoD's proposal to create a full-spectrum capability at Eglin for Weapons and Armaments, and found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation. The Commission carefully examined the justification for the Secretary's recommendation to transfer in-service engineering responsibilities for research, development and acquisition, test and evaluation from Hill Air Force Base to Eglin Air Force Base, and found it would enhance long-term military value.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition

Recommendation # 186 (Tech 19)

One-Time Cost:	$66.8M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($9.1M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($51.8M)
Payback Period:	9 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign the Adelphi Laboratory Center, MD, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Crane, IN, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign the Fallbrook, CA, detachment of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Crane, IN, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Dahlgren, VA, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign the Louisville, KY, detachment of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Port Hueneme, CA, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division China Lake, CA, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Indian Head, MD, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Earle, NJ, by relocating weapon and armament packaging Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation realigns and consolidates those gun and ammunition facilities working in Weapons and Armaments (W&A) Research, Development & Acquisition (RD&A). This realignment would result in a more robust joint center for gun and ammunition Research, Development & Acquisition at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ. This location is already the greatest concentration of military value in gun and ammunition W&A RD&A.

Picatinny Arsenal is the center of mass for DoD's Research, Development & Acquisition of guns and ammunition, with a workload more than an order of magnitude greater than any other DoD facility in this area. It also is home to the DoD's Single Manager for Conventional Ammunition. Movement of all the Services' guns and ammunition work to Picatinny Arsenal will create a joint center of excellence and provide synergy in armament development for the near future and beyond, featuring a Joint Packaging, Handling, Shipping and Transportation (PHS&T) Center, particularly important in this current time of high demand for guns and ammunition by all the services. Technical facilities with lower quantitative military value are relocated to Picatinny Arsenal.

This recommendation includes Research, Development & Acquisition activities in the Army and Navy. It promotes jointness, enables technical synergy, and positions the Department of Defense to exploit center-of-mass scientific, technical, and acquisition expertise within the weapons and armament Research, Development & Acquisition community that currently resides at this DoD specialty location.

Community Concerns

The Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane, IN, community believes their initial consideration for closure unfairly precluded consideration as a gaining facility. They should not have been compared to large Research Development & Acquisition (RD&A) facilities since their business is mostly advanced research, in-service engineering, testing and evaluation. Their joint customer base was not recognized in evaluating "jointness." Crane is a very large base with no encroachment problems, has a firing range over three times longer than Picatinny Aresenal, NJ and is backed by 3.5 miles of uninhabited space. DoD's proposal would cost Martin County over 11 percent of its jobs.

They believe their fast, responsive performance on special mission projects was not properly recognized. Crane offers a secure isolated location with integrated specialized capabilities such as ordnance, power sources, pyrotechnics, explosives, demolition, night vision devices, small arms, and targeting devices. Crane's co-location with an Army Ammunition Activity provides valuable limited manufacturing and prototyping capability, extensive testing and evaluation resources, and storage capacity for a wide variety of ordnance and related devices.

The Fallbrook, CA, community believes the organization was inappropriately and negatively evaluated in comparison to RD&A activities, rather than on the test and evaluation (T&E) functions they actually perform. Fallbrook is contiguous to Camp Pendleton, CA with ready access to USMC personnel, equipment, and ammunition as well as facilities at Camp Pendleton and Hawthorne, NV. They questioned the Army's ability and willingness to address Marine Corps interests. Picatinny does not have significant T&E capabilities and must send testing and/or personnel to other facilities.

The Dahlgren, VA, community stated DoD's proposal ignored the goals of operational efficiency, enhanced synergy, and reduced excess capacity through consolidation of technical facilities while retaining at least two geographically separated sites. They said that if the work is transferred to Picatinny, personnel will have to return twice a week to conduct testing. They also observed that Navy guns are integrated parts of a ship and differ from relatively stand-alone Army guns. They warned of an employee brain drain, expecting no more than 20 percent to 25 percent of employees to relocate.

The Louisville, KY, community explained that prior BRAC rounds converted their facility to a public-private partnership in a highly synergistic relationship with three original equipment manufacturers. They stressed the difference between Navy and Army gun systems. Most importantly, they assert they should not have been even considered for realignment because they perform a key in-service engineering role, and only about one percent of their work is RD&A or T&E. They believe DoD's projected savings, attributable to the elimination of Civil Service jobs, is not realistic, citing GAO's previous analyses. The community projects a 17-year breakeven period rather than DoD's 13 years; with 20 year savings of only $42.4 million.

The Indian Head, MD community noted they were at a tremendous disadvantage because they were considered as a closing base until late in the process and thus were never considered as a potential receiver. In general they conceded that it made some sense to move their guns and ammunition work to Picatinny, but stressed that Indian Head is the DoD-designated Center of Excellence for Energetics, and thus the Energetics work and capability currently at China Lake and Picatinny (in particular) should be moved to Indian Head.

The NSWC Earle, NJ community noted that Earle is the Navy's designated expert in Packaging, Handling, Storage and Transportation (PHS&T), and DoD's only organization fully responsible for all four functions; explaining that integration of these functions is critical for handling ammunition in the confined spaces of Navy ships and aircraft. They believe the Navy should retain responsibility for all aspects of Navy ammunition handling. DoD's analysis was flawed because DoD misidentified the "S" in PHS&T to mean "shipping" rather than "storage." Picatinny does not have a packaging design department and only a limited testing capability. The Army's testing and transportation offices are not at Picatinny and neither was mentioned in DoD's proposal. Thus, the Army would still not have a unified PHS&T Center even if the recommendation is approved. They also noted that Air Force PHS&T is not included in DoD's recommendation.

The community criticized DoD's use of a 15 percent elimination of civilian job factor, rather than GAO's suggested 5.5 percent benchmark. They argue projected savings are overstated because Earle's ratio of working-level to high grade employees is 12:1 compared to Picatinny's 5:1.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the recommendation would enhance long-term military value after several individual components of the proposal were rejected or modified.

Specifically, the Commission found that Special Operations organizations were particularly pleased with the rapid and responsive support they receive from NSWC Crane. In the past, they had less satisfactory experiences with other organizations with similar capability, and they expressed a strong desire to continue the relationship with Crane; an installation with an Army tenant on-base that stores and manufactures limited amounts of ammunition, has special capabilities to design and test solutions to unique problems, and has been successful in turning around these quick-response projects in a matter of days, allowing for real-time adjustments that can be immediately put to use by the warfighter.

The Commission also found that NSWC Dahlgren has a unique capability to test large over-water guns, and that it possesses most of the expertise in Research, Development, and Acquisition and Testing and Evaluation of these large guns and of the weapons systems integration. The Commission determined that it made more sense to retain the life-cycle management of these guns at a single location, NSWC Dahlgren. However, the Commission found that minor caliber gun RD&A should be performed at Picatinny Arsenal.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1 and 4, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Realign the Adelphi Laboratory Center, MD, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Crane, IN, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ, except energetics and RD&A and T&E in support of Special Operations.

Realign the Fallbrook, CA, detachment of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Crane, IN, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign the Louisville, KY, detachment of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Port Hueneme, CA, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division China Lake, CA, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition except energetics to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Indian Head, MD, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition except energetics to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ. Consolidate energetics RD&A and T&E at Indian Head, MD except the RD&A and T&E performed at China Lake, CA and Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Earle, NJ, by relocating weapon and armament packaging Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

The Commission found that these changes and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Defense Research Service Led Laboratories

Recommendation # 187 (Tech 22)

One-time Cost:	$136.1M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($40.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($380.3M)
Payback Period:	3 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close the Air Force Research Laboratory, Mesa City, AZ. Relocate all functions to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH.

Realign Air Force Research Laboratory, Hanscom, MA, by relocating the Sensors Directorate to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and the Space Vehicles Directorate to Kirtland Air Force Base, NM.

Realign Rome Laboratory, NY, by relocating the Sensor Directorate to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and consolidating it with the Air Force Research Laboratory, Sensor Directorate at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH.

Realign Air Force Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by relocating the Information Systems Directorate to Hanscom Air Force Base, MA.

Realign Army Research Laboratory Langley, VA, and Army Research Laboratory Glenn, OH, by relocating the Vehicle Technology Directorates to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign the Army Research Laboratory White Sands Missile Range, NM, by relocating all Army Research Laboratory activities except the minimum detachment required to maintain the Test and Evaluation functions at White Sands Missile Range, NM, to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation realigns and consolidates portions of the Air Force and Army Research Laboratories to provide greater synergy across technical disciplines and functions. It does this by consolidating geographically separate units of the Air Force and Army Research Laboratories.

A realignment of Air Force Research Laboratory Human Factors Division from Brooks City Base, TX, research to Wright-Patterson AFB was initially part of this recommendation, and still exists, but is presented in the recommendation to close Brooks City Base, TX.

This recommendation enables technical synergy, and positions the Department of the Defense to exploit a center of mass of scientific, technical, and acquisition expertise.

Community Concerns

The Arizona AFRL Mesa City community argued there is a greater potential for synergistic activities by linking the Warfighting Training Laboratory with other Arizona activities, than from relocating to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The community felt the spirit of the DoD recommendation could be better met by re-establishing the Laboratory through a contractual privatization-in-place arrangement. This alternative would enhance future collaboration, improve training research, and reduce the Air Force's infrastructure footprint. The community estimates 20 year cost savings for the privatization-in-place option as $76 million compared to $66M estimated by DoD for its relocation recommendation. Community officials claimed Arizona State University would invest $2M per year to enhance the potential of the Warfighting Laboratory under the community's alternative.

The Kirtland Air Force Base community believed that moving the Mesa Laboratory to Kirtland Air Force Base would better align the mission with two operational units. According to the community, the Warfighting training laboratory needs to be in the field and on an installation with warfighters. The community argued that moving the laboratory to Wright-Patterson (with no warfighting flying missions) will make it less effective.

The Rome Research Site community argued that DoD's assertion that unifying separate laboratory functions will result in superior research and reduced costs is a dubious justification for relocating Rome's sensors mission to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. The Rome community contends that the recommendation would cause a loss of existing high value synergy for meeting the nation's homeland security and warfighting needs. The community further stated that a field survey at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, shows contractor savings assumptions are grossly overstated. In addition advocates claimed that net costs would exceed projected savings. The community further contended that unique sensor siting costs and frequency allocation issues were not properly considered. They also believed that when accurate and full information is considered, the payback period grows, savings decrease, and one-time costs increase.

The Rome Research Site community also believed that its high military value and cost-effectiveness were the defining reasons why DoD recommended that Rome remain as the headquarters for Information Technology. According to its advocates, relocation and splitting Information Technology functions from Wright-Patterson AFB and Rome to Hanscom AFB does not make sense and should be centralized at Rome Research Site.

The White Sands Missile Range community said DoD's BRAC criteria was supposed to primarily look at military value, with potential cost savings being just one part of the total criteria. They stated that the criteria used by DoD to develop its recommendations were based on the false and preconceived idea that combining all "like disciplines" would automatically create synergy and savings. The community also contends that DoD is under the illusion that moving individuals to a central location would create new "Centers of Excellence"; disregarding the existing Centers of Excellence developed by current test and evaluation directorates. The community believed that proper implementation of the BRAC criteria should have resulted in an expansion of Army Research Laboratory's role at White Sands Missile Range to take advantage of the of the excellent range capabilities, top-flight facilities and future joint operations expansion. The community also expressed concern over increased costs of transiting back and forth from Maryland to New Mexico to accomplish important testing activities that cannot be conducted at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that DoD rated Rome Laboratory (Rome Research Site) significantly higher in military value than either Wright-Patterson or Hanscom Air Force Base for the information technology research focus area. The Commission supports the concept of establishing and retaining a single site for information technology research, rather than multiple sites proposed by DoD. The Commission found that Rome Laboratory is the headquarters for the Information Systems Directorate, and rather than moving its Information Systems Directorate to Hanscom Air Force Base as originally called for in the Secretary's recommendation, it should be relocated to Rome.

The recommendation to relocate the Army Research Laboratory, White Sands Missile Range, NM to Aberdeen, MD was intended to consolidate geographically dispersed research activities performing similar work. Although Army has not specifically identified the number of research personnel to relocate to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, the Commission found that laboratory personnel need to be retained at White Sands Missile Range to support ongoing and future test and evaluation functions performed there. After conducting a cost and savings analysis of this portion of the recommendation, the Commission found that savings would not be realized until 100 years. While there appears to be some overlap in research capabilities resident at both White Sands and Aberdeen, the Commission found the poor return on investment, and the potential adverse impact on system effectiveness at the missile range in New Mexico, were greater than the marginal possible gains in military value.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 4 and 5, as well as from the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following:

Close the Air Force Research Laboratory, Mesa City, AZ. Relocate all functions to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH.

Realign Air Force Research Laboratory, Hanscom, MA, by relocating the Sensors Directorate to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and the Space Vehicles Directorate to Kirtland Air Force Base, NM.

Realign Rome Laboratory, NY, by relocating the Sensor Directorate to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and consolidating it with the Air Force Research Laboratory, Sensor Directorate at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH.

Realign Air Force Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by relocating the Information Systems Directorate to Rome Laboratory, NY.

Realign Army Research Laboratory Langley, VA, and Army Research Laboratory Glenn, OH, by relocating the Vehicle Technology Directorates to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

The Commission found that this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. The full text of this and all Commission recommendations can be found in Appendix Q.

Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation

Recommendation # 188 (Tech 24)

One-time Cost:	$17.7M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.7M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	($17.9M)
Payback Period:	9 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Robins Air Force Base, GA, and Hill Air Force Base, UT, by relocating fixed wing related Air Platform Development and Acquisition to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH.

Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by relocating fixed wing related Live Fire Test and Evaluation to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This recommendation completes the consolidation of all Fixed Wing Air Platform RDAT&E, begun during the previous BRAC rounds, at two principal sites: Naval Air Station (NAS) Patuxent River, MD, and Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (AFB), OH, while retaining several specialty sites. Research and Development & Acquisition will be performed at NAS Patuxent River and Wright-Patterson AFB. Lakehurst will be retained as a dedicated RDAT&E facility for Navy Aircraft Launch and Recovery Equipment and Aviation Support Equipment.

This recommendation includes Research, Development & Acquisition and Test & Evaluation activities in Fixed Wing Air Platforms across the Navy and Air Force. The planned component moves will enhance synergy by consolidating to major sites, preserve healthy competition, leverage existing infrastructure, minimize environmental impact, and effect reasonable homeland security risk dispersal. The relocation of Fixed Wing Air Platform Research was previously accomplished in response to the S&T Reliance Agreements resulting in the consolidation at Wright-Patterson AFB with the maritime related Fixed Wing Air Platform Research consolidated at NAS Patuxent River.

This recommendation consolidates Air Force Development & Acquisition functions currently resident at Logistic Centers (Hill AFB, Tinker AFB, and Robins AFB) at Wright-Patterson AFB. These moves will increase efficiency by creating RD&A centers with all attendant support activity and a robust acquisition organization available to all Air Force Fixed Wing Air Platform D&A functions.

The consolidation of all Fixed Wing Air Platform Survivability Live Fire T&E at China Lake is driven by the inefficiencies that currently exist between the two sites (Wright-Patterson AFB and China Lake), and the potential savings afforded by establishing a single live fire test range for fixed wing air platforms. China Lake has this capability and has been doing similar work related to weapons lethality for many years. This action will increase efficiency by reducing overall manpower requirements while also reducing redundancies that exist across the Live Fire Testing domain.

Community Concerns

The Robins and Hill Air Force Base communities expressed concern over the number of people potentially affected by DoD's recommendation to establish a research, development, acquisition, and test and evaluation center at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Robins' community representatives stated the people potentially impacted by this recommendation provide support for the fixed wing aircraft development and acquisition process as well as supporting operational aircraft. They argued the sustainment mission and applicable personnel should be retained at Robins, and that only development and acquisition personnel should be relocated to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Hill community representatives stated that the 18 positions potentially impacted by this recommendation include 9 engineering positions that have already been transferred from Hill to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

As a gaining activity, the Dayton community supported the location of additional fixed wing aircraft acquisition personnel at Wright-Patterson. Community representatives believed co-locating additional acquisition resources with the Program Executive Officer for Aeronautical Systems would create synergies. They stated this recommendation could be implemented with minimal disruption to ongoing programs. However, Ohio community officials opposed DoD's recommendation to realign the Air Force's live fire test and evaluation work to Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, California. Ohio-based advocates contended this would negatively impact live-fire testing of Air Force-unique weapon systems. As an alternative to DoD's recommendation, they suggested the Commission consider retaining both the Air Force facility at Wright-Patterson and the Navy facility at China Lake to be managed as a composite operation under a memorandum of agreement between the two services.

The Lakehurst Naval Air Engineering Station community argued the DoD recommendation left out the creation of a Center of Excellence for the specialty area of Aircraft Launch and Recovery Equipment, as well as Aviation Support Equipment, and urged the Commission to synchronize the DoD justification explanation with the Final Commission recommendation.

Commission Findings

The Commission found merit in DoD's recommendation to establish two primary centers for fixed wing research, development and acquisition, test and evaluation—one center located at Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD and established under previous BRAC rounds, and a new second site to be established at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. In addition, the Commission acknowledges and supports DoD's underlying plan to retain specialty sites, including the specialty site currently established at the Lakehurst Naval Air Engineering Station, NJ to support aircraft launch and recovery systems and aviation support equipment.

With regard to DoD's recommendation to relocate fixed wing live fire testing capability from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH to China Lake, CA, the Commission carefully weighed the benefits of consolidating to a single live fire test facility at China Lake versus retention of two facilities—one for Air Force-unique weapon systems and the other for Navy-unique weapon systems. The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's proposal to establish a single facility and noted that China Lake's military value score for fixed wing test and evaluation is substantially higher than Wright-Patterson AFB.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation

Recommendation # 189 (Tech 26)

One-time Cost:	$49.4M
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	($2.8M)
20-Year Net Present Value:	$11.8M
Payback Period:	26 Years

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, by relocating Air Force Materiel Command V-22 activities in rotary wing air platform development and acquisition to Patuxent River, MD. Realign the Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst, NJ, by relocating activities in rotary wing air platform development, acquisition, test and evaluation to Patuxent River, MD. Realign Ft. Rucker, AL, by relocating the Aviation Technical Test Center to Redstone Arsenal, AL, and consolidating it with the Technical Test Center at Redstone Arsenal, AL. Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA, by relocating activities in rotary wing air platform development and acquisition to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

Secretary of Defense Justification

This Air Land Sea & Space (ALSS) recommendation realigns and consolidates those activities that are primarily focused on Rotary Wing Air Platform activities in Development, Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (DAT&E). This action creates the Joint Center for Rotary Wing Air Platform DAT&E at the Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, AL, and enhances the Joint Center at the Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division (NAWCAD), Patuxent River, MD. The end state of this recommendation builds upon existing rotary wing air platform technical expertise and facilities in place at the two principal sites and provides focused support for future aviation technological advances in rotorcraft development.

The planned component moves enhance synergy by consolidating rotary wing work to major sites, preserving healthy competition, and leveraging climatic/geographic conditions and existing infrastructure, minimize environmental impact. These consolidations co-locate aircraft and aircraft support systems with development and acquisition personnel to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of rotary wing air platform design and development activities.

Community Concerns

The Robins community stated the 50 personnel potentially impacted by this recommendation provide support for the rotary wing development and acquisition process as well as sustaining operational aircraft. They believed the sustainment mission and applicable personnel authorizations should be retained at Robins and that only development and acquisition personnel should be relocated to Redstone Arsenal. The Fort Rucker and Redstone communities expressed support for the recommendation.

There were no formal expressions from the Wright-Patterson, Lakehurst and Patuxent River communities regarding the recommendation to establish a rotary wing aircraft research, development and acquisition, test and evaluation center at Naval Air Station Patuxent River.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that the number of positions to be transferred from the realigning organizations to create or enhance joint centers of excellence for development, acquisition and test and evaluation (DAT&E) of rotary wing aircraft at Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD, and Redstone Arsenal, AL, are not necessarily tied to the number of positions identified in the Department's COBRA analysis. In some cases, the Commission determined that the COBRA numbers were not based on full-time equivalent position counts, but instead on a tally of personnel whose duties at one time or another address DAT&E functions. The Commission believes DoD should use its discretion in determining what specific skill sets and personnel authorizations are needed to properly staff the new joint centers. The Commission notes that the 26-year payback is driven in large part due to requirements for new aircraft test and evaluation facilities at Redstone. These

issues were found by the Commission to be implementation matters that can be resolved successfully during the six-year implementation period, and did not rise to the level of a substantial deviation.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

Navy Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation

Recommendation # 190 (Tech 28)

One-time Cost:	N/A
Annual Recurring Costs/(Savings):	N/A
20-Year Net Present Value:	N/A
Payback Period:	N/A

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, Point Mugu, CA. Relocate the Sensors, Electronic Warfare (EW), and Electronics Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation (RDAT&E) functions to Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, China Lake, CA.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Consolidating the Sensors, EW, and Electronics RDAT&E functions at China Lake will eliminate redundant infrastructure between Point Mugu and China Lake and provide for the more efficient use of the remaining assets including the Electronic Combat Range and other integration laboratories at China Lake.

Community Concerns

The Naval Base Ventura County (Point Mugu) community opposed the realignment of sensor, electronic warfare and electronics research, development & acquisition, test & evaluation functions to Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, China Lake because the recommendation deviates from BRAC criteria, military value to the warfighter would be decreased, supporting data was absent and expected cost savings would not materialize. The community contended DoD did an extremely poor job analyzing the missions and value of the technical activities of Point Mugu. They cited the negative impact of DoD's recommendations on the warfighter, and the failure by DoD to recognize that all duplication and redundancy between Point Mugu and China Lake had been eliminated long ago, as reasons for the Commission to reject the recommendation. They stated Point Mugu is already recognized as the Joint Center of Excellence for Electronic Warfare. The community contended that human and intellectual capital would be lost because experts would refuse to relocate from the coast to the desert, disrupting mission performance.

The China Lake community supported the BRAC recommendation and cited the high military ranking of the installation. They stated that the consolidation supports transformation. The community further stated that co-locating sensors, electronic warfare and electronics capabilities with the laboratories and expertise at China Lake will further enhance the transformation of aviation systems. The community claimed their infrastructure, including water supply, sewer, schools and roads presented no insurmountable obstacles to receiving the large influx of people envisioned from the DoD recommendation.

Commission Findings

The Commission found that both Naval Base Ventura County (Point Mugu), CA, and Naval Air Warfare Center China Lake, CA, perform electronic warfare research, development, acquisition, and test and evaluation functions. China Lake is rated higher than Point Mugu for military value in 2 of 3 categories. It is rated significantly higher than Point Mugu in test

and evaluation, primarily because of its electronic warfare test range capability. Point Mugu works on the current EA-6B electronic warfare aircraft while China Lake works on the advanced EA-18G electronic warfare aircraft.

The Commission found that any consolidation of electronic functions could be accomplished outside the BRAC process because organizationally, both Point Mugu and China Lake work for Naval Air Systems Command.

The Commission closely examined community concerns about the possible loss of intellectual capital if too many experienced employees living in Santa Barbara opt not to move to China Lake. The Commission found that while careful management of the implementation could mitigate impacts to readiness and mission interruption risks, the cost and savings analysis showed a long 12-year payback with a one-time cost of about $73 million, and no net personnel eliminations, make the recommendation unsupportable.

The Commission found that the current management arrangement seems to be working well and if work needs to be shifted among the two sites, Naval Air Systems Command has the authority to accomplish needed changes without BRAC at an appropriate time based on workload and/or cost considerations.

Commission Recommendations

The Commission found that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final selection criteria 1, 4, and 5, and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission has rejected the recommendation of the Secretary. The Commission found this recommendation is consistent with the Force Structure Plan and final selection criteria.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

CHAPTER 2

ISSUES FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

As an independent commission, the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission examined tremendous volumes of information about the nation's domestic military installations. The Commission believes that during its independent analysis and review it gained insights and experiences that may be valuable to the President, Congress, the Department of Defense, and the general public. The Commission wishes to share these insights, raise major issues or concerns meriting further examination, or to pose questions and/or recommendations for future policymakers on the subjects under its jurisdiction.

Like the 1993 and 1995 Commissions, the 2005 Commission discusses below several major issues that arose during the course of its review and analysis process.

THE FUTURE OF BRAC

American military history records repeated transformation of military doctrine and force structure in response to geopolitical and technological developments. Over the last century, military force structure and strategy changed roughly every fifteen years. Recent history indicates these transformations are likely to continue, possibly at a more rapid pace.

When prior BRAC commissions convened, military strength was declining, with no apparent end in sight. The number of active-duty servicemembers fell from 3.5 million in 1968 to 2.1 million in 1974, where it had stabilized when the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 created the current BRAC system. By the time the 1995 BRAC Commission completed its business and disbanded, 1.5 million servicemembers were on active duty. However, the strategic and military situation prior to the Balkans, before 9/11, before Afghanistan, and before Iraq would be virtually unrecognizable today.

It is highly likely America's security environment and corresponding military organization will continue to change, necessitating periodic re-examinations of the infrastructure supporting that organization. The Base Closure and Realignment process has repeatedly proven its worth by enabling the painful and difficult decisions needed to restructure military installations into alignment with future military requirements. The BRAC process provides for a series of checks and balances between the Department of Defense, the Commission, and the President with oversight by the Congress. The need for such a process will continue after the 2005 Commission ends, and it is likely the Department of Defense will again request Congressional authorization of future base closures or realignments.

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 is a viable, proven, practical and effective mechanism to achieve difficult but necessary goals and the Commission strongly recommends future BRACs every 8 to 12 years, immediately following a Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). The Commission recommends that the next round of BRAC formally begin in 2015 and has proposed legislative text in Appendix R for referral and consideration by Congress and the President.

STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS AND THE TIMING OF BRAC

The Commission's work took place during a national strategic debate with an uncertain outcome. The nation is embroiled in a Global War on Terror, with significant deployments in Afghanistan and Iraq, in addition to other worldwide commitments. Simultaneously, military services (particularly the Army) are pursuing transformation of process, organization, and structure. Under the Integrated Global Posture and Basing Strategy (IGPBS), the United States is undertaking a massive movement of heavy forces, previously based in Europe and Korea, to locations within the continental United States. The Mobility Capabilities Study, soon to be finalized, will assess the ability to re-deploy these forces if necessary. The Commission conducted its analysis in the context of a force structure plan derived from the QDR completed in late 2001. Although national strategies have been modified since that time, the underlying strategic plan predates the Global War on Terror. The Department of Defense is now conducting a new QDR, and unofficial reports indicate that sizes and composition of forces may change drastically.

In short, it would have been far preferable for BRAC 2005 to have occurred *after* the new QDR so that the strategic underpinnings for nearly irreversible infrastructure and capacity changes could have been informed by the QDR's output, rather than BRAC providing input to the QDR. The QDR will provide a long-term strategic plan addressing force structure,

force modernization, infrastructure, and budget priorities. The Commission strongly recommends that future BRAC rounds begin *after* the QDR is completed. Infrastructure decisions should flow from a strategic vision, not the other way around.

Access to DoD Justification and Backup Data

Commission analysis of DoD's BRAC recommendations requires timely access to the backup data justifying the Department's recommendations. In April 2005, senior Commission staff met with senior DoD officials to discuss the release of all backup and certified data and, to facilitate the process, met again with senior DoD officials on May 9, 2005, to formally finalize Commission requirements.

DoD delivered Volume I of the BRAC report on May 13, three days earlier than the statutory deadline. Within seven days, DoD delivered the three Service and five of the six Joint Cross-Service Group-specific Analysis and Recommendation Volumes and the Force Structure Plan. The final Joint Cross-Service Group volume was delivered the next day, following a DoD security review. Between May 18 and May 28 the Commission received the corresponding "Supplemental Information," but DoD was unable to provide open access to the preponderance of backup data due to continuing internal concerns regarding the potential compromise of information. As a result of these concerns, most of the remaining data were classified "Secret" pending completion of an internal DoD review.

On June 1, 2005, DoD established a secure reading room for Commission and Congressional staff holding appropriate security clearances. However, only five staff clearances were complete by June 1, and the reading room was therefore virtually unusable until the required security clearances were processed for Commission staff. On June 14, 2005, DoD had finished its internal review and declassified and made publicly available all but approximately 2 percent of the backup and supporting data. By that date, most of the Commission's Review and Analysis staff had received appropriate clearances, and their analysis was well under way.

In hindsight, the Commission feels that the process could have been expedited had the Department anticipated the potential security risks presented by the aggregation of data and planned ahead to prevent problems with its release.

Other Methodological Problems

DoD's presentation of related actions in separate recommendations compounded the inherent complexity of the Commission's task. The Commission often had to deconstruct seemingly unrelated recommendations and reassemble all the actions proposed for individual installations or activities to obtain a clear picture of the Secretary's overall intent for the installations or activities. Determinations of compliance (or non-compliance) with the selection criteria and Force Structure Plan required multiple analyses to evaluate how a change in one recommendation might create a ripple effect across several others. The Commission even had to establish special "re-voting" procedures for use if subsequent votes substantially changed the rationale of an already "decided" matter. In future BRAC rounds, DoD should clearly identify interrelated recommendations and aggregate the net impact of all recommendations on each individual installation or activity.

The Commission also identified proposed actions with tenuous apparent relationships to each other bundled within specific recommendations. The Commission agrees with DoD's "Red Team" observation that combining unrelated proposals complicates the analysis of the recommendations and calls into question the validity of the methodology used in their assembly.

Additionally, the Commission found DoD's recommendations in some cases swept up, in one recommendation, hundreds of positions assigned to divisions or departments with similar sounding titles for realignment without an in-depth analysis to determine which of the hundreds of positions actually were intended to be moved. All too frequently site visits and community inputs revealed that tiny minorities of positions involved were indeed suitable for realignment, but that large numbers were not. It was not possible for the Commission to sort out, position by position, what was the correct number of positions to be realigned. The DoD recommendations were accompanied by COBRA analyses which contained numbers and costs relevant to the recommendation, but these analyses were based on aggregate numbers, not detailed manpower studies, and therefore are viewed by the Commission as illustrative examples of what a realignment or closure might cost or save, but are not to be viewed as part of the official report and are not directive in nature. The Commission recommends DoD to review each of the realignments to determine the appropriate number of positions to be moved.

Joint Cross Service Groups and Promoting Jointness

The Commission noted major differences between the role of Joint Cross-Service Groups (JCSG) in the 1995 and 2005 BRAC processes. In the 2005 BRAC, DoD gave the JCSGs their first-ever substantive role, in contrast with previous BRACs

where JCSGs were advisory to the military departments and were unable to advance their own recommendations. DoD's promotion of JCSGs allowed the military departments to focus on operational concerns, while also ensuring that common business functions benefited from the collective wisdom of all the services and defense agencies. Even though the JCSG process in 2005 was a vast improvement over prior efforts, there are always areas that could be improved, and the Commission highlights several such ideas below.

Combatant Commander (COCOM) input was formally solicited in October 2004, fairly late in the process. Although the Vice Chairman, JCS, was briefed on items of interest to the COCOMs before all Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC) and Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) meetings, the 2005 process could have benefited from a formal advisory role for the COCOMs. In the future, DoD should consider early and clear definitions of the use and weight of COCOM input. The COCOMs' operational experience and input would improve a numbers-driven exercise wholly executed in Washington, DC.

The JCSG process was hampered by the lack of DoD visits to sites considered for closure or realignment. The installations and Major Commands were not requested to consider the full operational impact of JCSG recommendations and were requested to only validate specific data requests supporting JCSG recommendations. Additionally, JCSG data requests were submitted piecemeal; at no time were installations or MAJCOMS requested to consider and/or evaluate the total operational impact of multiple JCSG recommendations on their installation.

In many cases, the first person involved in the BRAC process, other than a military service BRAC team member assigned to an installation, to actually visit a site facing closure or significant realignment was a BRAC Commissioner or staff member. While it is not practical for DoD representatives to visit all locations under review, the Commission believes that conducting an analytical process affecting infrastructure valued in the billions of dollars without ever physically looking at the major assets under review detracts from the credibility of DoD's process.

Each of the military departments gathered the data they submitted to COBRA differently. The Navy made data calls to the installations; the Army used a combination of data bases and data calls; the Air Force relied on central data bases. Halfway through the BRAC review, the Air Force uncovered approximately $900 million in possible changes to its COBRA input when it made site surveys while preparing budget justification books. The differences in service branch data collection were also reflected in the data submitted to the JCSGs. DoD's differing information collection systems complicated the Commission's review and analysis. These methodologies led to inconsistencies in individual responses to the questions within a service. Methodological differences complicated meaningful comparison of individual services' recommendations as well as of recommendations crossing service lines. In the future, DoD should consider a standardized method of data collection. Specifically, the Navy method could be used as the model, since it directly engages the installations where the recommendations will be executed as part of the analysis process. This is particularly important if DoD continues to conduct cross-service business functions through the JCSGs. Reliance on existing data bases that were originally designed to perform non-BRAC functions should not be used for future BRAC processes.

In addition, data should be normalized, especially when the services use conflicting data elements—e.g. differences in the square feet allowed per person—and do not standardize common Base Operating Support (BOS) rules. As joint basing becomes a reality, DoD should task a neutral party to study and recommend ways to normalize data, particularly in the real estate/installation areas amenable to common standards.

The Deputy Assistant Secretaries (DAS) deconflicted JCSG scenario options in order to integrate JCSG and military department scenarios. The process could be improved if an independent and dedicated integration group comprehensively presented all of the JCSG options and scenarios to the ISG. The independent group should be able to cancel or amend JCSG options in operational conflict with a service branch scenario if the tradeoffs between cost and risk are unacceptable.

Numerous DoD recommendations were premised on the assumption that realigning military department activities to one location would "enhance jointness." However, the mechanism for improving jointness was often left unspecified. As initially described by the Department of Defense, the 2005 BRAC was to be an opportunity to promote jointness and jointness was to be its overriding theme. However, of the hundreds of proposals submitted by the DOD, very few increased jointness, and some actually decreased or removed joint and cross-service connections. While jointness was initially described by the DOD as a high principle for the 2005 BRAC, in fact most of the DOD proposed consolidations and reorganizations were ***within*** the Military Departments, not across the Services.

Given the proposals from the DOD, in several instances the Commission acted to increase jointness through its final decisions. The Commission regrets that joint and cross service proposals were not a stronger part of the DOD recommendations overall.

Coordination of BRAC with Other Government Agencies

DoD and the Commission are mandated to assess costs and savings to the U.S. government as a whole, not just the Department of Defense. Co-ordination with other Departments such as Homeland Security (DHS, including the U.S. Coast Guard and FEMA), Veterans Affairs (VA), Justice (DoJ, including the FBI), and agencies such as the General Services Administration (GSA) is crucial to successful development and implementation of final recommendations. The Commission found a lack of sufficient interagency coordination in DoD's 2005 BRAC proposals.

For example, many recommendations affect installations used by the Coast Guard. If the Coast Guard has to assume the costs of keeping the installation operational, DoD's costs would not be saved as DoD projects, but simply shifted into the U.S. Coast Guard's already limited budget. Similarly, GSA may incur early termination fees as DoD implements several approved proposals to vacate leased space in the National Capital Region.

Additionally, DoD did not solicit input from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) regarding sharing of health care system capacity between DoD and VA, an unfortunate oversight given that the nation is at war and that VA hospitals are located in some of the areas affected by the DoD recommendations.

Neither the Commission nor DoD was well served by the lack of Department of Homeland Security input on the homeland defense role of military installations. While the U.S. Northern Command found "no unacceptable risk" in DoD's post-BRAC support provided to civil authorities, no corollary statement was forthcoming from DHS.

The 2005 BRAC Commission strongly recommends that DoD improve coordination with other affected federal agencies so that savings estimates do not ignore the increased or shifted costs of non-DoD Federal operations. Similarly, DHS must coordinate with DoD on future BRAC processes so DoD fully understands and incorporates the roles and uses of military installations in homeland security as well as in homeland defense missions and capabilities.

Coordination of BRAC with the Air National Guard

The states' Adjutants General (TAGs) expressed grave concerns due to lack of consultation or coordination with the active duty Air Force regarding the impact of the Secretary's recommendations on the Air National Guard. The Air Force stated its communications with the Director of the National Guard Bureau satisfied legal requirements but the Air Force process led to a negative reaction by the states, their TAGs, elected officials, and the general public. Several states are in court challenging the process. The Commission conducted three special hearings where these issues were raised and discussed. TAG and state dissention with the Air Force unnecessarily cost the Commission additional time and resources and damaged the previously exemplary relationship between the Air National Guard and the Air Force. For future BRAC rounds the Commission strongly recommends that all of the services provide for early and constructive TAG and Governor consultation and input on potential base closure and realignment proposals.

Commission Independence

BRAC Commissions' independence, both *de jure* and *de facto*, was a key ingredient in prior base closing and realignment rounds' success. The legislative and executive branches, and the citizens to whom they are accountable, are more likely to accept BRAC outcomes if they are convinced the Commission's review of DoD's complex and controversial base restructuring proposals are handled independently, objectively, and honestly. Thus, preserving and protecting the independence of the Commission (both perceived and actual) is not a mere academic exercise, but a necessity.

Independence is not determined solely by statute, but also by policies, perceptions, and practices. The 2005 Commission faced a short mission time frame, combined with delays in initiating administrative support. The 1993 and 1995 Commissions drew from a cadre of 15 permanent staff who rapidly geared up to handle the exploding workload when Commissioners were appointed. However, the permanent staff, office equipment, and office space were dispersed when the BRAC statute expired in 1995. The 2005 Commission had to literally re-create a 100-person operation from scratch in a matter of weeks. Additionally, staff could not be hired or detailed from other agencies prior to the appointment of the Chairman, and even then valuable time was expended overcoming the administrative obstacles inherent in standing up any organization. For example, DoD's Washington Headquarters Service (WHS), whose many responsibilities include support for DoD commissions, was unable, for a variety of reasons, to easily and quickly expedite accommodation to the needs of a large-scale, high-profile, fast-paced, non-DoD entity such as the BRAC Commission. The Commission's organizational needs and available support capabilities were inadvertently but systematically mismatched.

The Commission's mission could have been compromised but for the hard work of many individuals, and steady assistance from its support contractor. In addition to proposals for Congressional consideration, the Commission also recommends the Administration significantly reform arrangements for administrative support of future BRAC Commissions. For example, the Administration could establish a temporary caretaker staff of roughly 15 persons to begin organizing several months prior to the formal appointment of Commissioners. Once the Chairman is appointed and in place, he or she could hire an Executive Director, and the caretaker staff could either be kept or replaced as appropriate. The Commission would then have basic office infrastructure in place when Commissioners are confirmed and an Executive Director appointed. The Commission could then focus on the substance of its mission immediately and exclusively, rather than dissipating time and energy by simultaneously grappling with both logistics and substance.

Additionally, Congress should either ensure the Commission's activities do not span two fiscal years or alter appropriations language to allow expenditure of Commission funds throughout the Commission's lifetime, without regard to fiscal year. Similarly, the independence of a future Commission would be enhanced if it could manage its expenditures autonomously rather than continuously negotiating budget and expenses with DoD, a process inherent in the current organizational structure. If the Congress desires oversight and accountability for funds entrusted to the Commission, it could provide for review by GAO.

The widespread use of electronic document control and management is a success story recommended to future BRAC Commissions. Participants and public consumers of the 2005 BRAC process gave extremely high marks to the E-Library system established with the assistance of the Commission's support contractor. The Commission's web site, www.brac.gov, which had near-complete access to the E-Library, received approximately 25 million hits between May 19 (the launch date) and August 28 (more than three months). It provided unprecedented openness and transparency to the BRAC process, giving citizens access to nearly 200,000 unclassified documents at the click of a button. The Commission received approximately 500 electronic comments per week, received tens of thousands of pieces of written correspondence, and made available to the public such internal Commission documents as trip reports, base visit briefing books, memoranda of meetings, and all non-classified submittals to the Commission from interested base communities. Vast amounts of DoD material were initially scanned as unsearchable images but converted into user-friendly, full text-searchable documents when entered into the E-Library.

Threat Assessment

The Commission finds illogical the seemingly inverse order that the Department followed in arriving at its list of facilities for closure and realignment. In short, this consisted of the May 13, 2005, announcement of the Secretary of Defense's recommendations to be followed by a QDR later in the year. The Commission, as a result, looked to the 20-year threat assessment the Department was required to complete under Sec. 2912(a)(1)(A) of the Base Closure Law, as the basis for the force structure plan, probable end-strength levels and major military force levels that were submitted with the FY 2005 budget. The Commission could find no evidence that a 20-year threat assessment was ever prepared or submitted. Formal requests to DoD in July 2005 for a copy of the threat assessment also confirmed that no threat assessment was ever completed. Nonetheless, DoD's Base Closure and Realignment Report, Volume I and Volume II, May 2005, does contain a four-page summary titled "Probable Threats to National Security."

Recommendations on Statutory Changes to BRAC

In response to these and other issues considered during the 2005 BRAC process, the Commission has developed draft legislative proposals for the consideration of Congress. The full text and explanation of the proposals can be found in Appendix R.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

CHAPTER 3:

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE WITH BASE CLOSURE

HISTORY OF BASE CLOSURE

In the early 1960's, at the President's direction, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara developed and implemented a base closure program within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, with minimal consultation with the military departments or Congress. Hundreds of bases closures and realignments took place during this period, and more than 60 major bases were closed.

In 1965 President Johnson vetoed legislation that would have established reporting requirements providing more Congressional oversight in any DoD base closure program and the Department of Defense retained broad legal authority to complete base realignments and closures, and did so routinely throughout the 1960's.

The Congress failed to override President Ford's veto of the 1976 Military Construction Authorization Bill, which contained a provision prohibiting any base closure or reduction of more than 250 civilian employees until the Department had notified Congress of the proposed actions, assessed the personnel and economic impacts, followed the study provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and waited nine months.

However, in 1977, the Congress passed legislation (codified as Title 10, United States Code, Section 2687) requiring DoD to notify Congress if an installation became a closure or realignment candidate. The law also subjected proposed closure actions to NEPA's comprehensive environmental evaluation requirements and required reports on local economic and strategic consequences. In addition, DoD had to wait 60 days after Congressional notification before proceeding with proposed base restructurings. These and other procedural requirements established in Section 2687 effectively halted base closures. For a decade following the passage of Section 2687, attempts to close major installations failed, and proposed realignments of small military units were often thwarted by Congressional opposition.

THE 1988 COMMISSION

By 1988, the Defense budget had declined for three straight years and was predicted to decline further. To ensure that scarce DoD resources would be devoted to the most pressing operational and investment needs rather than maintaining unneeded property, facilities, or overhead, Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci chartered the Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure on May 3, 1988. Enacted in October 1988, Public Law 100-526 provided the statutory basis for this one-time approach. The law also provided relief from certain statutory impediments to closures, such as a partial exemption from NEPA, delegated property disposal authority, and an expedited process for Congressional review of BRAC recommendations.

The 1988 Commission recommended the closure of 86 military facilities and the realignment of 59 others, approximately 3 percent of the domestic base structure. Annual savings were estimated at $693.6 million.

Secretary Carlucci accepted all of the recommendations and Congress did not enact a joint resolution of disapproval. As a result, the Commission's 1988 recommendations went into effect and have the force of law.

The 1988 Commission was appointed by, and reported directly to, the Secretary of Defense. It generated its own list of recommended closures and realignments. All hearings and votes were conducted in closed sessions. Little information about how the Commission arrived at its recommendations was available to the public.

Critics of the 1988 closure process felt the closure list unfairly targeted facilities located in Congressional districts represented by Members out of favor with the Administration and that the absence of outside oversight allowed subjective biases or pre-ordained conclusions of the individual decision makers to find their way into the final recommendations. It was feared that without a clear and auditable analytical and decision-making process, favorable or unfavorable impressions of an installation could come from decision makers' personal experiences rather than quantifiable or objective military value.

Many of the 1988 Commission's experiences—both positive and negative—were incorporated and applied into lessons learned during future BRAC rounds.

CHANGING WORLD SITUATION

Public Law 100-526 established a onetime only Commission whose authority expired on December 31, 1988. With the end of the Cold War, proposals to close or realign bases were once again governed by the procedures mandated by Section 2687 of Title 10, United States Code—procedures that had *de facto* prevented base closures for over a decade.

In January, 1990, Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney unilaterally proposed closing 35 bases and realigning or reducing the forces at more than 20 others. Congress responded by passing the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Title XXIX of Public Law 101-510) which effectively halted all closures based on the Secretary's January, 1990 list and established a new series of procedures for closing or realigning bases.

P.L. 101-510: THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

P.L. 101-510 created an independent, five-year Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (still colloquially referred to as the "BRAC Commission"), with closure rounds in 1991, 1993, and 1995. The act outlined procedures, roles, and time lines for the President, Congress, Department of Defense (DoD), Government Accountability Office (GAO), and the BRAC Commission.

The 1990 legislation required that all bases be considered equally without regard to whether the installation had been previously considered or proposed for realignment or closure. DoD's recommendations had to be consistent with the current force-structure plan and congressionally approved selection criteria. For each of the next three BRAC rounds, the services (i.e., military departments) and DoD agencies submitted their candidates for closure and realignment to the Secretary of Defense and, after reviewing service candidates, the Secretary submitted his recommendations to the BRAC Commission for its independent review.

The 1991, 1993 and 1995 BRAC Commissions had four months to scrutinize and analyze the Secretary's recommendations. In addition, the Commission could add, delete, or modify the Secretary's list. The Commission submitted its report with recommendations to the President who had 15 days to either accept or reject the Commission's recommendations in their entirety; if he rejected them, the Commission could give the President a revised list of recommendations. If the President accepted the Commission's recommendations, he forwarded the list to the Congress, which could either do nothing and accept the list, or reject it in full by passing a joint resolution of disapproval. Such a resolution would be subject to Presidential veto. Unless rejected, the BRAC Commission's recommendations effectively became law.

The BRAC Commission was created "to provide a fair process that will result in the timely closure and realignment of military installations inside the United States." Public Law 101-510 required each Commission to conduct public hearings on the Secretary of Defense's list of closures and realignments and on any proposed changes to those recommendations. In addition, its records were made open to public scrutiny.

Procedurally, the P.L. 101-510 BRAC Commissions differed substantially from the 1988 DoD Commission. The 1988 Commission, working for the Secretary of Defense, generated an internal list of recommended closures and realignments. The 1991, 1993, and 1995 BRACs independently reviewed and analyzed DoD's recommendations and submitted its findings and recommendations directly to the President. The President could end the process at multiple stages (although he could not pick and choose among individual recommendations) if he believed the process was in danger of producing a poor outcome. To ensure an independent assessment, P.L. 101-510 required the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to provide the Commission a detailed analysis of DoD's recommendations and selection process, and to assist the Commission in its analysis of the Secretary's recommendations.

The process under which the 1991, 1993, and 1995 BRAC Commissions operated was open, largely transparent, and heavily insulated from partisan politics. The Commission met only during the non-election years of 1991, 1993, and 1995. All meetings and hearings were open to the public. The BRAC Commission provided numerous opportunities to interested parties, as well as community and Congressional leaders to provide testimony and express their viewpoints. Transcripts of hearings, correspondence, and other data received by the Commission were available for public review. For all BRAC Commissions conducted after November 30, 1993, public testimony presented before the Commission was under oath.

Major sites proposed for closure during the 1991 thru 1995 timeframe were visited by at least one commissioner, in order to gain a firsthand look at the installations and their mission capabilities.

THE 1991 COMMISSION

The 1991 Commission held 47 base visits, 14 regional hearings, and 9 investigative hearings in Washington, D.C. The Commission recommended the closure of 34 bases and the realignment of 48 others. These actions generated an estimated FY 1992-1997 net savings of $2.3 billion and recurring savings of $1.5 billion annually after a one-time cost of $4.1 billion. This represented a reduction of approximately 5.4 percent of the domestic base structure.

The President accepted all of the Commission's recommendations. The House rejected a resolution of disapproval and the recommendations of the 1991 Commission have the force of law. Initiation of the 1991 closures and recommendations was required by July 1993, with completion by July 1997.

THE 1993 COMMISSION

The 1993 Commission held 125 base visits, 17 regional hearings, and 16 investigative hearings in Washington, D.C. Its report to the President recommended the closure of 130 bases and the realignment of 45 others, approximately 6.2 percent of the domestic base structure. Estimated FY 1994-1999 net savings were approximately $3.8 billion after one-time costs of approximately $7.43 billion. The savings from these actions are estimated to total approximately $2.33 billion annually. The President accepted all of the Commission's recommendations and the Senate rejected a resolution of disapproval. Initiation of the 1993 recommendations was required by July, 1995 with completion by July, 1999.

THE 1995 COMMISSION

The third BRAC Commission to operate under P.L. 101-510 analyzed DoD recommendations affecting 146 domestic military installations, including 33 major closures, 26 major realignments, and an additional 27 changes to prior base closure round decisions, or "redirects." The Commission subsequently considered an additional 32 installations as possible alternatives and additions to the bases recommended for closure or realignment by DoD.

The statute required the Secretary of Defense to base all recommendations on a force-structure plan submitted to Congress with the Department's FY 1996 budget request and on selection criteria developed by the Secretary of Defense and approved by Congress. The 1995 selection criteria were identical to those used in 1991 and 1993.

The Commission held 13 investigative hearings, conducted 206 fact-finding visits to 167 military installations and activities, held 16 regional hearings nationwide, listened to hundreds of Members of Congress, and received thousands of letters from concerned citizens from across the country. At least one commissioner visited every major site proposed for closure or realignment. All meetings were open to the public. All data received by the Commission, including testimony under oath, as well as all transcripts of Commission hearings, were available for public review.

As required by law, The Government Accountability Office (GAO) evaluated DoD's selection process and recommendations, and provided their detailed analysis to both the Commission and the Congress.

After thorough review and analysis, the Commission recommended the closure or realignment of a grand total of 132 military installations in the United States, including 123 of DoD's 146 closure or realignment recommendations (an average Commission acceptance rate of 84.2%). Nine of the 36 installations considered at the Commission's initiative were ultimately adopted and approved (an average "add" acceptance rate of 25%).

The Commission estimated at the time these closures and realignments would require one-time, upfront costs of $3.6 billion, and would result in annual savings of $1.6 billion. Twenty-year savings were estimated at approximately $19.3 billion. 1995 was the first time that BRAC Commission recommendations proposed savings greater than those originally proposed by the Secretary of Defense.

The President transmitted the recommendations to Congress, where the House of Representatives rejected a resolution of disapproval and the Commission's recommendations effectively became law. However, two of the recommended closures, the Kelly, TX and McClellan, CA Air Logistics Centers, were implemented as "privatizations-in-place" rather than closures, with contractors assuming the facilities' workload.

TALLYING UP THE 1988, 1991, 1993, AND 1995 BRAC ROUNDS

According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS) BRACs made the following recommendations:

1988 BRAC: 145 recommendations

1991 BRAC: 82 recommendations

1993 BRAC: 175 recommendations

1995 BRAC: 132 recommendations

= 534 individual recommendations

However, the 1995 BRAC commission report stated that the cumulative number of BRAC decisions from all four rounds totaled 505. In December 1998, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the four BRAC commissions generated 499 recommendations, but that in its final tally "only 451 of these ultimately required action, primarily because 48 were changed in some manner by recommendations of a later commission."

The Department of Defense has estimated that the four previous BRAC rounds eliminated approximately 21 percent of DoD's 1988 installation capacity. These changes required an up-front investment of $22 billion, and through fiscal year 2001, produced net savings of approximately $17.7 billion, including the cost of environmental cleanup. Recurring savings and cost avoidances beyond 2001 are approximately $7.3 billion annually.

A total of 97 bases and installations categorized by DoD as "major" were closed as a result of the 1988 through 1995 processes. In addition, DoD has stated there were 55 "major" realignments and at least 235 smaller sized closures and realignments as a result of past actions. According to the Congressional Research Service, closure activities at all 451 major and minor facilities impacted by prior BRAC recommendations were completed by the end of FY 2001, as scheduled.

In independent studies conducted over the last decade, both the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office have consistently concluded that realigning and closing unneeded military installations produced savings that exceeded their costs. However, GAO has also noted that tracking auditable savings from BRAC is extremely difficult because DoD's accounting systems are not structured to capture this kind of data. Moreover, most of the "savings" take the form of cost avoidances—i.e., costs that would have been paid by DoD had BRAC not occurred, and were therefore avoided. Since the future is inherently unknowable, cost avoidances are much difficult to calculate in precise terms than cost savings.

GAO also produced slightly lower estimates of cost savings and avoidances from prior-BRAC rounds. Its reports and research led to the conclusion of net cumulative BRAC savings of $16.7 billion through the end of FY 2001, and annual savings of $6.6 billion.

STATUTORY EXPIRATION

From 1997 to 2000, the House of Representatives repeatedly rejected Administration requests to conduct two additional rounds of base closures in 2001 and 2005. In 1998, the Senate Armed Services Committee rejected an amendment to allow a single round of base closures. Congress allowed statutory authority for BRAC to expire and did not renew it until after the paradigm-shifting September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. As a result, the BRAC Commission's permanent caretaker staff and other institutional infrastructure disbanded after December 1995. The 2005 BRAC Commission would begin its work from scratch without any semblance of an ongoing operation.

CHAPTER 4

THE 2005 BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT PROCESS

KEY PROVISIONS OF THE LAW AUTHORIZING THE 2005 BRAC COMMISSION

The 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, or the first "BRAC" round since 1995, was authorized by Public Law 107-107 (the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, signed on December 22, 2001). That statute, and several later laws (especially P.L. 107-314 and P.L. 108-375), amended P.L. 101-510 (the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, P.L. 101-510), the authorization for the 1991, 1993, and 1995 BRAC rounds. The final result combines provisions that expired at the end of 1995 and new provisions directly authorizing and governing the 2005 BRAC process. Appendix C contains a complete copy of the 2005 BRAC authorizing statute as well as an index to the statute.

Both law and policy directed the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Commission to conduct an open and transparent process. The Commission's records, meetings, and hearings were (and are) open to the public, except for classified information. Testimony before the Commission is provided under oath. Notice of hearings was published in advance in the Federal Register. The statute also directed the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to analyze DoD's recommendations and publish a report on their findings.

Congress authorized the Commission to "add" additional installations to DoD's proposed BRAC closure and realignment recommendations only if the Commission provided the Secretary of Defense with a list of possible additions and gave him at least 15 days to explain the reasons why the installations were not originally recommended for closure or realignment; provided the Secretary with an opportunity to testify at a public hearing discussing the potential additions; and, after reviewing the Secretary's explanation, conducting a separate "Adds Hearing" at which seven of nine Commissioners must vote in favor of any proposed "add"; fourth, publishing a notice of all successfully proposed additions in the Federal Register not less than 45 days before transmitting its recommendations to the President. At least two Commissioners must conduct base visits and public hearings must be held on all proposed additions.

The statute directs Commissioners to vote on whether each DoD recommendation deviated substantially from the force structure plan and the final selection criteria. The Commission can change, or reject entirely, those recommendations it finds deviated substantially from the submitted force structure plan and selection criteria. However, any proposed change that would (a) add an installation for closure or realignment, or (b) increase the extent of the realignment beyond what was originally proposed by the Secretary, is considered an "add" and will require the votes of seven of nine Commissioners, as described in the paragraph above. The Commission cannot change recommendations that do not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and the final selection criteria.

The Commission reports its findings and recommendations to the President and to the American people by September 8, 2005. The Commission's final and approved changes have the force of law unless the President terminates the process by not forwarding the report to the Congress, or the Congress enacts a resolution of disapproval.

By September 23, 2005, the President must either forward the Commission's report to the Congress (accepting all recommendations as a whole) or return the report to the Commission for further evaluation. If he returns the report to the Commission, the President can indicate his disapproval of the report as a whole or in part. The BRAC Commission would then have until October 20, 2005, to resubmit its report to the President. The deadline for the President to transmit his approval and certification of a resubmitted report to Congress is November 7, 2005.

Congress has 45 days from the day it receives the report from the President to enact a joint resolution rejecting the report in full, or else the report effectively becomes law. If both chambers of Congress enact a joint resolution of disapproval, the

President can veto the resolution. A Presidential veto of a joint resolution would be sustained unless a two-thirds majority in both chambers votes to override (like any other bill or resolution).

The 2005 BRAC Commission will, by law, terminate on April 15, 2006.

Requirements for the Department of Defense

The Congress directed DoD to (1) define and implement an objective set of "selection criteria" for selecting bases and facilities for closure or realignment; (2) predicate closure/realignment recommendations on a force structure plan that reflected future threats, (3) prepare a Comprehensive (i.e., global in scope) Base Inventory to be submitted to the Congress as part of the budget justification documents supporting the Fiscal Year 2005 budget request; and (4) certify, in writing, that the 2005 round of BRAC was necessary and that it would result in annual net savings for each military department beginning not later than 2011.

Selection Criteria Finalized

P.L. 107-107 provided DoD with basic guidance on selection criteria but gave the Department discretionary authority to modify the criteria so long as "military value is the primary consideration in the making of recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations." P.L. 107-107 guidance followed very closely the historical selection criteria used in the 1991, 1993, and 1995 BRAC processes.

The Department published its draft selection criteria in the Federal Register for comment and review by the public on December 23, 2003. After reviewing the draft criteria, GAO testified before Congress on March 25, 2004, that DoD's selection criteria were generally sound and had "more specificity" in its four military value elements than the criteria used for prior rounds of BRAC. GAO expressed concern as to whether the selection criteria would adequately assess total restructuring costs and whether environmental remediation costs would be appropriately calculated.

Differences between the 2005 and prior round's selection criteria are centered on the four military value criteria. The 2005 DoD criteria emphasized cross-service or joint operational capabilities and emphasized a facility's location-specific attributes. Appendix E to this report provides a more complete comparison of the criteria.

DoD finalized the selection criteria without change and published them in the February 12, 2004, Federal Register. Congress later enshrined the final selection criteria into law (P.L. 108-375).

Force Structure, Worldwide Inventory, Certification Requirements

The DoD "Force Structure Plan" (printed in Appendix D in its unclassified form) provided both end-strength levels (numbers of divisions, air wings, aircraft carriers, etc.) and the baseline military infrastructure needed at the end of the BRAC process to support the future force structure. It included only a short description of future threats. Congress later amended P.L. 101-510 to require DoD to retain sufficient additional infrastructure to accommodate unexpected "surge" or temporary increases in military activity. The 2005 BRAC Commission's May 4, 2005, hearing discussed and evaluated the Force Structure Plan and its relationship to the BRAC process, among other issues.

The Department of Defense submitted its global inventory of military installations and facilities to Congress in March 2004. This inventory is derived from DoD's Facilities Assessment Database (FAD), a resource updated annually from the real property records of the Military Departments. It revealed that the Department owns more than 520,000 facilities (buildings and structures), of which about 87 percent are in the United States and territories. These real property records provided the basis for identifying facilities subject to BRAC analysis.

The Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (P.L. 108-375) prohibited DoD from revising the Force Structure Plan and Comprehensive Base Inventory after March 15, 2005, for BRAC purposes. This precluded changing the basic parameters for BRAC analysis while the selection process was under way.

DoD's March 23, 2004, budget justification documents included the required certification by Secretary Rumsfeld that the 2005 BRAC round was needed and justified and that the end result of the recommended restructuring "would result in annual net savings for each of the military departments beginning not later than fiscal year 2011."

Overseas Basing and BRAC

DoD conducted a comprehensive inventory of all overseas US military installations, and submitted the results to Congress during the FY 2005 budget process. DoD concluded that forward deployment of US military assets at foreign bases in Europe and the Middle East did not offer nearly as many advantages (in terms of speed of military response) as previously thought. As a result, President Bush announced on August 16, 2004 that as part of the nearly three-year Global Posture Review, approximately 60,000 to 70,000 personnel previously stationed overseas would be gradually returning home to the US.

The Commission's May 4, 2005, hearing discussed overseas realignments, their impact on BRAC, and the Global Posture Review. Overseas basing, while not explicitly mentioned in the final selection criteria, was subsequently incorporated in DoD's BRAC review and analysis, and is partially reflected in DoD's 2005 BRAC recommendations.

Major Differences between the 2005 and Prior BRAC Rounds

The 2005 Commission consists of nine members rather than eight, thereby minimizing the possibility of tie votes.

For the 2005 round, the time horizon for assessing future threats in preparing DoD's Force Structure Plan is 20 years rather than five.

Moreover, prior BRAC rounds occurred during a time of declining defense budgets where the focus was on eliminating excess capacity and realizing cost savings without sacrificing military value. The 2005 BRAC process took place during a time of war, where many military capabilities are surging to meet new battlefield requirements. Consequently, the emphasis on the 2005 round was on enhancing military value without sacrificing cost savings.

In 2005, DoD shifted away from a traditional focus on end-strengths, and toward a capabilities-based approach supporting an emphasis on joint operations. The 1988, 1991, and 1993 rounds did not include a Joint Cross-Service element. The 1995 round had such an element, but the three military departments (Army, Navy/Marines, and Air Force) could reject the recommendations of Joint Cross-Service Groups (JCSGs) within DoD that examined six areas: depot maintenance, military medical treatment facilities, test and evaluation, undergraduate pilot training, laboratories, and economic impact. The final military department recommendations were forwarded to the Secretary of Defense for his final review and approval. In contrast, DoD's 2005 BRAC process established seven JCSGs: Education and Training; Headquarters and Support Activities; Industrial; Intelligence; Medical; Supply and Storage; and Technical. These seven JCSGs developed specific recommendations alongside, and in most cases in cooperation with, the three military departments. More important, JCSG recommendations were submitted directly to the DoD Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC).

The 1995 criteria stated only that "the environmental impact" had to be considered with any base closure or realignment. The 2005 criteria required the Department of Defense (and ultimately the Commission) to consider "the impact of costs related to potential environmental restorations, waste management and environmental compliance activities."

Other changes include more detailed military value criteria and, more specifically, elements containing training areas, staging grounds, and homeland defense missions. Ten years ago, before the September 11th terrorist attacks, "homeland defense" was not a criterion. It is now a significant element among the military value criteria. Language on "joint warfighting, training, and readiness" supports Secretary Rumsfeld's well-publicized use the 2005 BRAC process to advance transformation and jointness goals. Military value scores generally reflect installations' capacity to absorb new missions, or provide "surge" capabilities.

The special rules applicable if the Commission proposes a closure or realignment not originally on the Secretary's May 13, 2005, list are described elsewhere in this chapter. The 1991 Commission added 35 bases for further consideration, the 1993 Commission added 72, and the 1995 Commission added 36, whereas the 2005 Commission added only eight.

In prior rounds, DoD recommendations were generally confined to one base per recommendation. Sometimes a closing/realigning base's workload was distributed among several receiving installations or activities, but only a single base would be closed or significantly realigned within the same recommendation. The 2005 DoD report often lumped several—sometimes dozens—of separate but interlinked BRAC actions under the broad title of a single "recommendation." The 1995 Commission evaluated DoD recommendations affecting 146 domestic military installations. The 2005 DoD report proposed at least 222 separately listed "recommendations," some of which were merely a broad thematic grouping for dozens of individually identifiable closures and realignments, each one affecting numerous people and communities. The figure of 222 includes 34 recommendations (affecting Navy and Marine Corps reserve centers) that the Commission counts as two recommendations. This consolidation leads to the Commission's count of 190 separate DoD recommendations that would

produce as many as 837 distinct and identifiable recommended BRAC "close" or "realign" actions; more than twice the number of BRAC actions from the 1988, 1991, 1993 and 1995 rounds combined. These 837 distinct actions involve another 160 "gaining" locations, receiving jobs from the closures and realignments. These actions include 435 actions recommended by DoD Joint Cross Service Groups, a category not identifiable in past BRAC rounds. The total number of DoD recommendations is more than double the number considered by all past BRAC Commissions combined. Appendix K of this report lists the DoD recommended BRAC actions identified by the Commission.

Congress amended the BRAC law to allow "privatization in place" only if it "is a method of closure or realignment of the military installation specified in the recommendations of the Commission" in the Commission's Final Report, and only if the Commission determines that privatization in place is "the most-cost effective method of implementation of the recommendation."

Similarly, the Congress prohibited the conversion of military facilities to "inactive status" in the 2005 BRAC. In prior rounds, "inactive" status mothballed a building, production line, or capability while preserving it for possible reactivation at a future date. Bases in inactive status still require substantial funds for maintenance while putting significant obstacles in the way of site reuse by the local community.

Finally, prior BRAC rounds did not take place in the face of the planned movement of tens of thousands of troops from abroad back to the United States.

Composition of the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Commission

The nine Commissioners chosen to serve on the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission have diverse backgrounds. Two served in Presidential Cabinet-level positions, two are former Members of Congress, four are former flag or general officers, and others offer decades of government, private sector, and science-based careers in public service. Commissioners were nominated as follows:

Nominated by President George W. Bush:

Commission Chairman Anthony J. Principi

General James T. Hill, US Army (Ret.)

Brigadier General Sue E. Turner, US Air Force (Ret.)

Nominated by President George W. Bush in consultation with House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert:

The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner

The Honorable James V. Hansen

Nominated by President George W. Bush in consultation with House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi:

The Honorable Philip E. Coyle, III

Nominated by President George W. Bush in consultation with Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist:

General Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton, US Air Force (Ret.)

Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., US Navy (Ret.)

Nominated by President George W. Bush in consultation with Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid:

The Honorable James H. Bilbray

Full biographical information on each Commissioner can be found in Appendix G.

The Commission staff, numbering over 100 persons, was drawn from diverse backgrounds encompassing government, law, academia, and the military. In addition to those hired directly by the Commission, or brought on as consultants, other staffers were detailed from the Department of Defense, the Government Accountability Office, the Department of Commerce, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Federal Aviation Administration. Detailees' expertise contributed significantly to the Commission's independent review and analysis. Additional staff assistance was provided by the Analytic Services (ANSER) Corporation.

The Commission created a review and analysis staff with five teams: Army, Navy/Marines, Air Force, Interagency Issues, and Joint Cross-Service. As required by law, a direct-hire civilian managed each of the teams. Department of Defense detailees

were limited to a maximum of 20 percent of the Commission's analysts. A complete list of all 2005 BRAC Commission full-time staff, as well as the organizational charts, can be found in Appendix H.

Commissioners pledged to recuse themselves from Commission decision-making potentially in conflict with their prior positions or that could cast doubt on the validity and legitimacy of the Commission's final recommendations. Commissioner Gehman recused himself from all official business dealing with military facilities in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Commissioner Coyle recused himself from Commission decisions affecting the State of California. Former Congressmen James Hansen and James Bilbray recused themselves from Commission decision making affecting the states of Utah, and Nevada, respectively.

To further protect the integrity of the 2005 process, all BRAC Commission staff members were required to receive special ethics briefings and were encouraged to meet with the Commission's legal team to disclose any potential or perceived conflicts of interest that might affect their work. Potential hires and contractor personnel were instructed during their interviews that maintaining the public's confidence in the integrity of the BRAC process was vital to the successful completion of the Commission's statutory mission. All Commission staff members were required to complete financial disclosure forms designed to uncover potential financial conflicts of interest and flag such items for further discussion with the General Counsel's legal team.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BRAC PROCESS

The Secretary of Defense initiated the Department's BRAC process with his November 15, 2002, memorandum, *Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure*. The Secretary emphasized eliminating excess capacity and transforming DoD by rationalizing infrastructure. Further policy guidance established policies, procedures, and authorities for selecting installations for realignment or closure.

The Secretary established the Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC) to oversee and operate the Department's BRAC 2005 process, set policy, and provide oversight. It was chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Defense and included the Secretaries of the Military Departments and their Chiefs of Service, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics) (USD(AT&L)). The IEC met more than 20 times during the BRAC process and presented a package of recommendations to the Secretary of Defense for his final review and approval.

The subordinate Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG), was chaired by the USD(AT&L) and composed of the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Military Department Assistant Secretaries for Installations and Environment, the Service Vice Chiefs, and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment). The ISG oversaw the joint cross-service (JCSG) analyses of common business-oriented functions and ensured the integration of that process with the Military Departments' analysis of all other functions. The ISG met more than 60 times during the BRAC process, setting milestones and resolving issues as the analyses unfolded.

Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld submitted Volume I (parts 1 and 2) of the Defense Department's recommendations for military base closures and realignments to the Commission, and to the public (including Congress), on Friday, May 13, 2005, earlier than required. Much of the primary back-up data, meeting minutes, and scenario evaluations used to develop and justify DoD's closure and realignment recommendations was initially deemed classified or sensitive information, and not de-classified and transmitted to the Commission and to Congress until June 17, 2005. This lengthy delay occurred despite language in Section 2903(c)(2) and Section 2903(c)(4) of the BRAC statute which required that the Department make "all information used by the Secretary to prepare the recommendations ... available to Congress ... [and] the Commission" within seven days of the recommendations' transmittal.

THE ARMY PROCESS

The Army's BRAC analysis unit, The Army Basing Study (TABS) Group directed by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Infrastructure Analysis, assessed Army installations, ensured consistency with DoD's force structure plan, the installation inventory, selection criteria, and the BRAC statute.

The Army collected data on each of its 97 installations, including 10 leased sites, determined excesses and shortages, and, using the Force Structure Plan, assessed its requirements and capacity, including a surge analysis to ensure capacity to accommodate uncertainty and future requirements.

The military value of each facility was then calculated using a common set of 40 attributes linked to the military value criteria. The Army defined military value broadly, capturing facility capability, not just current use. This approach permitted the Army to assess relative installation capabilities to contribute to current and future base uses. The military value (MV) is the summed collective scores of weighted attributes, ranked from 1 (highest) to 97 (lowest).

The Army then developed strategy-based scenarios facilitating transformation, rebasing of overseas units, Joint operations, and Joint business functions. Scenarios moved units and activities to installations with higher MV, taking advantage of excess capacity and divesting less relevant or less effective installations. The Army augmented its MV analysis with military judgment. Recognizing the unique aspects of US Army Reserve Component (USARC) stationing and infrastructure, the Army used a bottom-up review that involved USARC Commanders, state governors, and Adjutants General. After military value analyses were completed, the Army then determined the impact of the remaining four selection criteria.

The BRAC Senior Review Group (SRG), co-chaired by the Army's Under Secretary and Vice Chief of Staff, evaluated recommendations for the Army's Executive Office, Headquarters to consider for submission to the Secretary of Defense through the Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC).

THE NAVY PROCESS

The Navy's BRAC recommendations were developed by its Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG), consisting of nine senior military and civilian personnel and supported by the DoN Analysis Group (to analyze Navy-unique functions) and the Infrastructure Analysis Team (IAT) (providing analytic and staff support).

The IEG ensured evaluations complied with the Base Closure Act, implemented guidance from higher levels and considered the concerns of operational commanders. The IEG applied the selection criteria to the recommendations, ensured consistency with the 20-year Force Structure Plan, infrastructure inventory, and surge and homeland defense requirements.

The Navy analyzed 590 of the Navy and Marine Corps' 889 unique functions while Joint Cross Service Groups (JCSGs) analyzed 469. Some activities were analyzed by both the Navy and one or more JCSGs. Data calls collected information for the base structure database and subsequent analyses. Capacity analyses, conducted on a functional basis (e.g., ship berthing) rather than by installation category (e.g., naval stations), compared the current base structure to future force structure requirements and identified excess capacity within a functional area. Military values were then assigned to functional activities using an objective, quantitative methodology.

Configuration analysis, combining military value and capacity analyses of each function, identified activities best meeting the needs of the Navy and Marine Corps in light of future requirements while eliminating the most excess capacity. These solutions were the starting point for DoN Analysis Group evaluation of closure and realignment scenarios. These assessments—combined with calculations of return on investment, Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) analyses and inputs from senior Defense leadership—were used to craft additional options through an iterative process.

THE AIR FORCE PROCESS

The Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), consisting of 12 senior military and civilian executives, assisted in the development of the Air Force's BRAC recommendations. The Air Force BRAC analysis was rooted in the 20-year Force Structure Plan, the Air Force's facility inventory, and the selection criteria. Air Force analyses were shaped by three underlying rules: military value, both quantitative and qualitative—the primary factor; equal treatment for all installations; and determination of military value on the basis of capacity to support other core missions as well as current missions.

Estimates of the maximum capacity of each installation (based on data call responses, information from Headquarters, and weapons system templates) were used to identify an optimal set of bases to support a specified force. In using certified data to assess military value, the Air Force stressed installation characteristics that were (a) immutable, e.g., geographic location and proximity to other physical features or defense activities, terrain, and prevailing weather, (b) outside the control of the Air Force, or (c) difficult to replicate elsewhere due to expense or complexity, e.g., the installation's transportation infrastructure, missile silos, or basic airfield infrastructure.

Operational capability data, the military value criteria, and the weighing guidance assigned by the BCEG, were combined to assign a Mission Capability Index (MCI) score for eight mission areas (fighter, bomber, tanker, airlift, special operation/combat search and rescue, intelligence/surveillance/reconnaissance, unmanned aerial vehicles, and space control) to all 154 Air Force installations. All Active and Reserve Component installations were assessed on an equal basis and rank-ordered on their relative ability to support each of the eight missions.

The BCEG refined "first-look" scenarios through iterative deliberation, rejecting options that failed to improve aggregate military value or ran counter to compelling military rationale. The process continued until it reached potential force structure deployments conforming to Air Force principles and imperatives; improved aggregate military value; and were consistent with sound military judgment.

A Joint Action Scenario Team (JAST) coordinated and managed the development of joint operational basing scenarios, and passed along scenarios affecting other service department installations. Opportunities for joint basing were worked into Air Force scenarios and formal analyses and were briefed to BCEG as part of the development of the Air Force's candidate recommendations.

The BCEG reviewed potential closure and realignment options and selected the most promising for application of the COBRA model and criteria 5 through 8. The results of these analyses—i.e., payback (as determined by COBRA), community infrastructure support capability, and economic and environmental impacts of each scenario—were briefed to the BCEG and, if approved by the Secretary of the Air Force, sent to DoD's review group, the Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC).

THE JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP PROCESS

EDUCATION AND TRAINING JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP

The Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group (E&T JCSG) reviewed common business-oriented education and training functions, including flight training, professional development education, specialized skill training, and range activities. The Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) chaired the E&T JCS. Principals included senior members from each Military Department, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Staff. The E&T JCSG was organized into subgroups corresponding to the categories of functions evaluated and was chaired by a flag/general officer or civilian equivalent to evaluate the potential of cross-service, joint, and transformational opportunities to improve DoD's education and training programs.

The JCSG analyzed existing education and training capacity using certified data and developing recommendations best satisfying current and future DoD requirements. Military value was the primary consideration, balanced by other selection criteria and the future force structure to evaluate and document realignment and closure recommendations. Each subgroup calculated capacity for each function and sub-function using defined attributes and metrics. Questions, formulas, and filters were developed and tested for validity, adequacy, and quality. Certified data were obtained from responses to Military Department/Agency-controlled data calls. Each E&T subgroup analyzed installations' capacity, including potential surge requirements. Locations performing the full scope of each function were identified and assessed for military value based on a facility's functional capability. The military value criteria analyses dealt with each facility's mission capability, condition, potential for future contingencies, and cost of operation. The subgroups calculated the military value of facilities performing similar education and training functions, and the results were examined to identify strategy-based, data-supported realignment or closure scenarios. After scenarios were developed, the E&T JCSG applied criteria 5 through 8, using DoD BRAC standard procedures and/or models. DoD's Inspector General (DoD IG) independently validated the data's adequacy and quality throughout the process.

The 295 E&T JCSG subgroup-generated ideas were refined into 164 proposals which, after deliberation, were developed into 64 declared scenarios. After detailed analysis, 17 fully developed candidate recommendations were forwarded to the Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) for consideration. ISG disapproved two candidate recommendations, and the Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC) disapproved another two. During JCSG and MILDEP integration of candidate recommendations, four E&T candidate recommendations were absorbed into Military Department recommendations resulting in nine E&T JCSG recommendations.

THE HEADQUARTERS AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP

The Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross-Service Group (HSA JCSG) was created to address common business-related functions across DoD, Military Departments, and Defense agencies. The HSA JCSG had no counterpart in previous BRAC rounds and therefore had to define appropriate functions and sub-functions for analysis. The HSA JCSG had six members representing OSD, the Joint Staff, and the four services, chaired by the Army member. The HSA JCSG formed three subgroups: the Geographic Clusters and Functional (GC&F) Subgroup (Air Force lead) analyzed common functions of financial management, communications/information technology, personnel management, corrections, installation

management, and selected Defense Agencies. The Mobilization Subgroup (Marine Corps lead) analyzed joint mobilization. The Major Administration and Headquarters (MAH) Subgroup (Navy lead) analyzed all headquarters located within 100 miles of the Pentagon (the "DC area"), including leased space, selected headquarters outside the 100-mile radius, and common support functions (headquarters "back-shop" functions).

The HSA JCSG conducted a comprehensive review of assigned functions, evaluated alternatives, and developed and documented realignment and closure recommendations. The HSA JCSG established internal policies and procedures consistent with: DoD policy memoranda, the force structure plan and installation inventory; BRAC selection criteria; and the requirements of the BRAC statute. The HSA JCSG's strategy was guided by the principles of: improving jointness; eliminating redundancy, duplication and excess capacity; enhancing force protection; exploiting best business practices; increasing effectiveness, efficiency, and interoperability; and reducing costs.

JCSG capacity analysis focused on functions and activities with the highest potential for payoff. Functions and activities with excellent potential were placed initially into a middle tier from which they were either moved into the top tier and fully analyzed, or placed in a lower tier. In the lower tier they were either eliminated or sent to the Military Departments for an appropriate level of review. After capacity analyses were complete, the JCSG concluded that each functional area it reviewed had excess capacity, and it compiled target lists for further military value analyses.

Military value, as the primary consideration, was assessed by HSA JCSG using quantitative methods to examine headquarters, organizations, and activities performing assigned functions at current locations. Throughout the process, the military value scoring plans were reviewed and updated as necessary to ensure that the quantitative results were valid and fair and that the entities in the model could be differentiated.

Initial military value analyses served as the starting point for scenario development. The results of optimization, consideration of the overarching strategy, and military judgment contributed to the family of strategy-driven, data-verified scenarios the JCSG brought forward to its members for deliberation. The three HSA JCSG subgroups developed 204 ideas, which generated 194 proposals, 117 of which were analyzed fully as scenarios using criteria 1 through 8. Fifty scenarios were forwarded to the ISG as candidate recommendations. The ISG and IEC approved 47 and disapproved three. Integration of the HSA JCSG's recommendations with the Military Departments and the other JCSGs led to 21 final recommendations.

The Industrial Joint Cross-Service Group

The Industrial Joint Cross-Service Group (Industrial JCSG) reviewed DoD's industrial functions: maintenance (depot and intermediate), munitions and armaments (including their storage), and ship overhaul and repair. The Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) chaired the Industrial JCSG, which included members from each military service and the Joint Staff.

The Industrial JCSG conducted a comprehensive review of assigned functions, evaluated alternatives, and developed and documented realignment and closure recommendations. The Industrial JCSG established internal policies and procedures consistent with: DoD policy memoranda, the force structure plan, and installation inventories; BRAC selection criteria; and the requirements of the BRAC statute.

After establishing three subgroups based on the three main functions being analyzed, subordinate functions were identified, and the chair of each subgroup was a principal member of the Industrial JCSG and a subject matter expert. The subgroups comprised members from each service and, as needed for support, contract personnel.

Each subgroup identified installations related to its assigned functions and developed defined capacity measure attributes and metric questions related to the assigned functions. The Military Departments reviewed all questions, and the Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) approved them prior to each installation responding to the controlled data call with certified data. The subgroups used the certified data to analyze the capacity, including surge requirements, for their assigned functions, and created an inventory of installations performing industrial functions.

The subgroups developed strategy-based, data-supported realignment or closure scenarios to advance joint capabilities, maximize the use of capacity, align infrastructure with operations, save money, provide for future expansion capability, and maximize military value. The subgroups assessed the scenarios based on the remaining selection criteria (5 through 8) and using DoD's standard procedures and/or models.

The disparate nature of the functions did not lend themselves to a "one-size-fits-all" analytic approach or strategy. The functions can overlap, and to obtain a meaningful analysis the Industrial JCSG initially examined maintenance, munitions and armaments, and ship overhaul and repair as discrete functions.

The maintenance subgroup established a strategy to minimize the number of sites performing maintenance while retaining sufficient redundancy within the industrial base and maximizing military value at the commodity level. The munitions and armaments subgroup addressed the entire life-cycle of munitions, except RDT&E, and sought to create multi-functional installations that avoided single-point failures while eliminating excess capacity through closures versus realignments. The ship overhaul and repair subgroup efficiently and effectively addressed ship maintenance requirements as the Navy reallocated fleet forces by rationalizing the number of organic shipyards and the workloads flowing from the 2025 force structure. Finally, the subgroup consolidated ship maintenance support functions and consolidated and regionalized intermediate-level ship maintenance within geographic regions. The final outcome resulted in reduced excess capacity.

The Industrial JCSG reviewed and selected the most promising 120 of subgroup-developed scenarios for further analysis. After full development and JSG review of 34 candidate recommendations, all were sent to the Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC). The IEC reviewed and approved all but three, while several candidate recommendations were either combined or integrated into larger Military Department candidate recommendations.

The Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group

The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Counterintelligence and Security) chaired the Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) review of intelligence functions. The Group included senior members from the Defense Intelligence Agency, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, National Reconnaissance Office, National Security Agency, each Military Department, the Joint Staff/J2, and representation from the Director of Central Intelligence Community Management Staff. The Chair of the Intelligence JCSG represented Counterintelligence Field Activity and the Under Secretary of Defense, Intelligence elements.

The Intelligence JCSG reviewed all intelligence functions except those already evaluated by the Military Departments and other JCSGs. The Group evaluated alternatives and developed and documented realignment and closure recommendations for submission to the Secretary of Defense. The Group ensured consistency with Department of Defense policy memoranda, the 20-year Force Structure Plan, selection criteria, and the BRAC statute. Four analytical frameworks were used to evaluate intelligence functions: re-locate and upgrade facilities onto protected installations as appropriate; reduce vulnerable commercial leased space; realign selected intelligence functions/activities and establish facilities to support Continuity of Operations and Mission Assurance requirements; and provide infrastructure to improve the flow of information between analysts, collectors and operators at all echelons and to achieve mission synergy.

Its review identified facilities performing intelligence functions and developed attributes, metrics and questions for analysis. Data calls gathered certified data on intelligence facilities, and capacity analyses led to identification of excess capacity/shortage. A military value scoring plan was developed, and scores were computed for each facility. Afterwards, strategy-based, data-supported, realignment or closure scenarios consistent with the 20-year Force Structure Plan were developed, registered, and assessed against the remaining selection criteria (5 through 8) using DoD's standard procedures and models.

The Intelligence JCSG developed 21 ideas that led to 18 proposals. From these, 13 scenarios were declared. After using the BRAC selection criteria and military judgment, six candidate recommendations were presented to the Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG). The ISG and Infrastructure Executive Council approved three candidate recommendations. During the integration process, one of these recommendations was incorporated by the Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross-Service Group into their own proposal.

The Medical Joint Cross-Service Group

The Medical Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) reviewed DoD healthcare functions and provided base closure and realignment recommendations for the following functions: Healthcare Education and Training; Healthcare Services; and Medical and Dental Research, Development and Acquisition (RD&A). The Air Force Surgeon General chaired the Medical JCSG with membership drawn from Service Department senior medical leadership, the Joint Staff, and OSD.

The Medical JCSG established internal policies and procedures consistent with DoD policy memoranda, the force structure plan, installation inventory, final selection criteria, and the requirements of the BRAC statute.

Its efforts were focused on: supporting the warfighters (in garrison and deployed) and their families; maximizing military value while reducing infrastructure footprint and maintaining adequate surge capability; maintaining or improving access to care for all beneficiaries, including retirees; enhancing jointness; identifying and maximizing synergies from collocation or

consolidation opportunities; and examining out-sourcing opportunities. The group organized categories of functions into corresponding subgroups, and guided by the selection criteria, evaluated them on the Medical JCSG's key focus areas.

This iterative process was conducted concurrently with the Military Departments and the other Joint Cross Service Groups. The subgroups generated ideas, proposed overall scope for analyses and sent its recommendations for higher-level consideration.

The subgroups used data call responses to perform a capacity analysis and review surge requirements. All data collection was conducted and certified in accordance with BRAC process guidance, and at each step the DoD Inspector General independently validated the data's adequacy and quality.

After the capacity analysis was complete, a military value assessment of each function at each installation was developed, and military value data calls generated data for the quantitative portion of military value, which included both quantitative data, as well as military judgment. After reviewing the responses, the subgroups identified data-supported realignment or closure scenarios corroborating their strategies. Scenarios that advanced jointness, achieved synergy, capitalized on technology, exploited best practices, and minimized redundancy, while maintaining fundamental healthcare missions were selected for further analysis. Then DoD's standard procedures and/or models assessed selection criteria 5 through 8.

Twenty-two candidate recommendations were presented to the Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) and Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC) with final recommendations completed after review and adjudication by the ISG and IEC.

The Supply and Storage Joint Cross-Service Group

The Supply and Storage (S&S) JCSG reviewed common business-oriented supply and storage logistics functions. The Director, Defense Logistics Agency chaired the S&S JCSG, a deliberative body of senior flag and general officer logisticians from each Military Department, the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), and the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS). The S&S JCSG examined logistics economies and efficiencies with a goal of transforming military logistics into a networked, force-focused operation utilizing fewer sites and less capacity. The S&S JCSG's BRAC analysis followed those of the service departments and other JCSGs because continuing supply and storage functions at specific locations could depend on BRAC actions of another JCSG or defense component.

The S&S JCSG used an optimization model to rationalize capacity, maximize military value, and synchronize both with force structure capabilities. Given the inherent limitations of the computer-based optimization modeling tool, the S&S JCSG explored ancillary methodologies to identify business process improvements, better fiscal management, and reduce excess infrastructure.

To determine capacity, individual activities' infrastructure were examined for productivity of key resource inputs, e.g., labor (man hours) and actual space (office, warehouse, etc.). Capacities and functions were calculated from FY 2003 data responses. Questions, formulas, and filters were developed and tested for validity, adequacy, and data quality. A controlled data call obtained additional certified data. The information was sorted and assessed, with clarifications sought as needed, and then COBRA data were used to develop scenarios.

A quantitative scoring plan arrayed the relative military value of supply and storage activities across DoD and within categorical groupings of activities: Inventory Control Points (ICPs), Defense Distribution Depots (DDDs), and Defense Reutilization and Marketing Offices (DRMOs). The group identified strategy-based, data-supported business realignment scenarios to advance jointness, achieve synergy, capitalize on technology, exploit best business practices, and/or minimize redundancy. After the scenarios were developed, selection criteria 5 through 8 were then assessed using DoD's standard procedures and/or models.

In accordance with the BRAC statute and OSD guidance, the S&S JCSG assessed the relationship between the 20-Year Force Structure Plan and required supporting supply and storage capabilities. The correlation between the plan and actual supply and storage capabilities is indirect, making it difficult to ascertain the formal measurement of the impacts of recommendations. However, using military judgment, the group evaluated known and potential impacts of candidate recommendations. Comments submitted by the Military Departments and the JCS concerning supply, storage, and distribution requirements were also considered.

A sensitivity analysis assessed whether enough capacity remained to handle surges. The S&S JCSG deliberative body determined that demand on the system due to the global war on terrorism was an extraordinary demand on surge, and therefore 20 percent at the high end of surge was sufficient for the 20-year planning horizon associated with the force structure plan. Excess capacity was still visible when performance was calculated at these rates. This enabled the S&S JCSG to ensure that the post-BRAC supply and storage system would be able to handle future surge demands.

The recommendations applied BRAC criteria, capacity and military value analysis, assessment of requirements to support the 20-year force structure plan, and the use of military judgment. The S&S JCSG concluded its proposals would create a supply storage and distribution structure enabling DoD to more efficiently and effectively support joint and coalition forces in a transformed global environment while at the same time introducing new world-class business processes.

The Technical Joint Cross-Service Group

The Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG) reviewed Research, Development and Acquisition and Test and Evaluation (RDAT&E) functions. The Director, Defense Research and Engineering, chaired the TJCSG, which included senior members from each Military Department and the Joint Staff. The TJCSG coordinated with other JCSGs to consider outdoor ranges, medical research, some intelligence functions, and headquarters functions.

The TJCSG examined installations' RDAT&E functions including basic research, exploratory development, and advanced development. The development/acquisition function included system development and demonstration, systems modifications, experimentation and concept demonstration, product/in-service life-cycle support and acquisition. The test and evaluation function included the formal developmental test and evaluation (DT&E) and the formal operational test and evaluation (OT&E).

The TJCSG sought to establish multifunctional and multidisciplinary technical (RDAT&E) Centers of Excellence to provide scientific and technical advances enabling development of technologically superior capabilities and weapons. Existing DoD technical facilities with a disciplinary focus would complement the newly developed Centers. TJCSG infrastructure analysis and recommendations were configured to adapt to future uncertainties and surge capability.

The TJCSG established five subgroups: Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance (C4ISR); Air, Land, Sea, and Space Systems (ALSS); Weapons and Armaments (W&A); Innovative Systems (IS); and Enabling Technology (ET). Each evaluated technical activities and conducted detailed analyses for military value, capacity, scenario development and analysis, and finally, the development and evaluation of candidate recommendations for ISG review. A Capability Integration Team (CIT) and an Analytical Team supported the subgroups. The TJCSG also coordinated with other JCSGs, especially the Education and Training JCSG, the Headquarters and Support Activity JCSG, the Medical JCSG, and the Intelligence JCSG.

The TJCSG delineated RDAT&E functions using the FY 2003 Defense Technical Area Plan (DTAP) to identify discrete technical facilities that could be appropriately compared to one another; 39 technical facility categories were defined as "a collection of people and physical infrastructure that performs a technical function (or functions) in a specific technical capability area at a specific location." The TJCSG analyzed the technical capacity for each of these 39 technical facility categories and considered current capacity, surge capacity estimates, and possible future capacity estimates. The group issued standardized data calls to installations, and created a DoD database for comparative analyses of responses. A similar analysis was performed for military value. For both military value and capacity analyses, the general attributes of people, physical environments, physical structures and equipment, operational impact, and synergy were used to characterize the capacity and military value of technical functions.

The subgroups identified scenarios using military value and technical capacity to meet current and future needs and presented them to the TJCSG for deliberation and approval. If approved, the subgroups applied final Selection Criteria 5 through 8 to each scenario using DoD standardized procedures. The TJCSG deliberated and approved all assumptions prior to conducting analyses.

The TJCSG generated over 100 ideas that were developed into 69 declared scenarios and later narrowed into 23 candidate recommendations. In the recommendation coordination process, nine candidate recommendations associated with closures or other proposed actions were transferred to the Military Departments or other JCSGs for their use. The IEC disapproved one candidate recommendation, resulting in 13 TJCSG recommendations approved by OSD to create Centers of Excellence in the following three areas: Defense Research Laboratories; Integrated RDAT&E Centers; and Integrated C4ISR Centers.

Commission Review

The Commission established five teams within its Directorate of Review and Analysis (R&A)—one team to review each respective Service application of the military value criteria to the base closure process, an Interagency Issues Team that reviewed Criteria Five through Eight, and a Joint Cross-Service Team to review the application of military value by the recommendations issued by the seven Joint Cross-Service Groups (JCSGs). Each team analyzed the services' and JCSGs'

methodology to ensure general compliance with the law, to confirm accuracy of data, and to determine if base-specific recommendations were properly offered by the Secretary of Defense.

In addition, the Interagency Issues Team analyzed the final four criteria—Return on Investment, Economic Impacts, Community Infrastructure, and Environmental Impacts—across all services. The Interagency Issues Team also provided analysis on airspace issues when applicable.

Additions to the Secretary's Recommendation List

After reviewing and analyzing DoD's certified data, senior level review group deliberations, prior BRAC reports, assessing information obtained during base visits, regional hearings and other public input, reviewing the GAO report, and the personal impressions of Commissioners, the Commission identified 12 recommendations to consider adding to the Secretary's list. In a July 1, 2005, letter to the Secretary of Defense, the Commission posed questions about specific recommendations and installations, and requested the Department's rationale for not recommending the facilities closure, realignment, or significant restructuring in the original May 13, 2005, recommendations. The letter also invited the Secretary to testify at a special public hearing on July 18. The Department responded in writing on July 14.

On July 19, after reviewing the Department's testimony and responses, the Commission met and voted to consider eight of the 12 proposed "adds" for possible closure or realignment. In accordance with the law, seven of the nine Commissioners voted to "add" the facilities to the Commission's review. A complete list of the proposed additions is found in Appendix L. Notice of the proposed additions was published in the Federal Register on July 22.

At least two commissioners then visited each of the affected bases, and the Commission held two additional public regional hearings on the proposed additions. A complete list of all regional hearings and site visits is found in Appendices I and J.

In order to finally approve a recommendation to close or realign a facility added by the Commission, the Commission was required to (1) determine that the Secretary deviated substantially from the force-structure plan and final selection criteria by not including the base on the May 13th list, (2) determine that the additions would be consistent with the force-structure plan and final selection criteria, and (3) vote separately on each added facility recommendation with seven of the nine Commissioners voting in favor of the addition.

Criteria 1 through 4: Military Value

In accordance with P.L. 101-510, as amended, all of the information used by the Secretary of Defense to prepare his recommendations must be sent to Congress, the Commission, and the Comptroller General (i.e., the Government Accountability Office (GAO)). Within the Commission, each R&A team began its review and analysis with an examination of the documents provided by the Department.

Although the Base Closure Law required DoD to submit its explanatory and justification documents within seven days of the release of its selection list, DoD classified much of this information as SECRET and slowly declassified it over the period of a month. DoD delivered the supplemental information (consisting of Volumes III thru XII) to the Commission between May 18 thru 28, 2005. A reading room was established on June 1 for information that had been deemed classified, and by June 14 the vast majority of the back-up and justification data had been declassified and provided to the Commission. As the full range of documents was provided, the R&A teams utilized them to fully assess each recommendation in an objective manner.

First, all teams determined whether DoD's recommendations were based on the Force Structure Plan and the eight final selection criteria and whether all bases were considered equally. The teams then considered if functions, categories, subcategories, and base exclusions were reasonable.

Each of the teams reviewed the military departments' and JCSGs' process for assessing military value, as well as the reasonableness of the data they used and the comparisons they made. Each team examined the services' capacity analyses and identified installation functions and categories requiring additional scrutiny. Specific data analyses included a review and independent analysis of COBRA input data and military construction cost estimates, as well as the capacity of receiver installations to accept the proposed additional missions.

Throughout the review and analysis process, the Commission staff maintained an active, open, and ongoing dialogue with base-associated communities. Staff members accompanied Commissioners on base visits, attended regional hearings, and visited closure and realignment candidates and receiving installations. Site visits, regional hearings, and community

presentations (via meetings, mailings, and web site feedback) provided valuable context to the information provided by the Department of Defense.

Army Team Process

The Army Team's process for analyzing each DoD recommendation was to assess its justification against established Military Value selection criteria. In accordance with the statute, Army Team analysts sought to confirm for each recommendation the consistency of basing and organization plans with final selection criteria and DoD's Force Structure Plan. Each recommendation's justification was analyzed for effects on operational readiness, training, and jointness. All Army rebasing and closure initiatives were assessed to verify the basing potential for each gaining and losing location, and to ensure that potential operating and training space, and existing and proposed facilities, supported each recommendation's objectives. Every Army-related recommendation was assessed to identify its compatibility with ongoing and planned reorganizations of Army units, rebasing units from overseas into the US, and strategic repositioning of forces inside the US to support both operational readiness, training, mobilization, surge, and deployment considerations. DoD's estimates for costs and manpower resources to support each realignment or closure action were adjusted for new information, recomputed, and compared to DoD's assumptions to confirm or correct characterizations of each recommendation's effect.

For each military value criteria, community concerns about possible DoD deviations were also evaluated by the Army Team for accuracy, validity, relevancy, and magnitude. The Commission found that the Army generally followed established Military Value Selection Criteria in developing its BRAC recommendations. The Army's Reserve Component-related recommendations were recognized DoD-wide as properly developed and coordinated in a way that increased the military value of Reserve Component units nationwide. As the Army developed its BRAC recommendations, it was also waging war in Iraq and Afghanistan as part of the Global War on Terrorism, restructuring its units into modular forces to increase the number of combat brigades, and rebasing units from Germany and Korea into the US. Consequently, the Army matched its base structure to its force structure to support plans for both current and future training, operations, and deployment missions. Examples of recommendations that achieved increases in military value include consolidating Infantry and Armor training at a single base, consolidating human resources functions at a single base, restationing overseas units to US bases from which they can readily deploy, and creating new combat brigades with force structure generated from realignments to reduce soldier assignments to base support functions. On occasion, correctly locating a command to better perform its mission meant relocating it to a lower ranked installation and exercising military judgment. The Commission found this was the case for a major Army command that could better perform its command and control mission from a central US location because of its nationwide mission focus.

Although the vast majority of Army recommendations adhered to the Military Value Selection Criteria, the Army Team's analysis did find some errors and substantial deviations. For example, an aviation logistics recommendation miscalculated the cost of operations and manpower implications, prompting the Commission to amend and correct the deviation. In addition, the use of 2003 for a workload base year proved particularly troublesome in the area of depots because current vehicle maintenance workload due to wartime wear-and-tear had increased. Although Army industrial and depot recommendations to reduce excess capacity appeared reasonable on their face, the Commission chose to proceed cautiously due to statutorily mandated surge assessments and a 20-year force structure analytic horizon, and limited several depot closings during this time of war and uncertain future workload.

Navy-Marine Corps Team Process

The Navy-Marine Corps Team first evaluated each DoD recommendation, in accordance with the Base Closure Law, against the approved military value criteria and the Force Structure Plan to ensure that no proposals would degrade operational readiness. The potential affect on future mission growth was then assessed to ensure that proposed actions did not limit growth in any area, whether force structure, training, or support capability. Finally, the potential impact on jointness (war fighting, training, and readiness) was analyzed to ensure that there were no unintended limitations on future mission flexibility. The team then assessed the status of facilities slated to be closed, realigned, and gain forces and functions, to determine if the recommendations would enhance or degrade the capacity of the Navy and Marine Corps to sustain, train, and operate its forces. Similarly, future capacity was analyzed taking into consideration future uncertainties that could require surges in geographic areas or mobilizations to meet some future crisis. Finally, the Navy-Marine Corps Team assessed the ramifications of the recommended changes on the cost of operating the force in the changed environment and the effects on personnel.

For each military value criteria, community concerns about possible DoD deviations were also evaluated by the Navy/Marine Corps Team for accuracy, validity, relevancy, and magnitude. The Commission's conclusion was that in general, the Department of the Navy was consistent in its application of quantifiable data in each of the military value criteria. The Commission found that in the case of Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, while some excess capacity would exist even if closed, the margin of 8 percent was insufficient to provide enough flexibility for surge or future force structure growth. Hence the Commission voted to retain the shipyard. Although the Department's analytic case for closing Submarine Base New London was valid, the Commission felt that the unquantifiable aspects of Military Value Criteria 1, especially with respect to the synergies in place at the Sub Base, outweighed the solid business case presented by Navy.

Air Force Team Process

The Air Force Team focused on assessing the DoD justification against the military value selection criteria and the DoD Force Structure Plan, as required by law. The accuracy of installations' Air Force's Mission Compatibility Index scores was a key component of this analysis. Each recommendation was also analyzed for effects on operational readiness, training, and joint warfighting. The Air Force Team also considered the ability of installations to support mobilization, surge operations, and deployments. All proposed Air Force closure and realignments were assessed to verify the ability of receiving locations, including land, facilities, airspace and ranges, to accommodate the forces it was to receive. Finally, the Air Force Team evaluated the accuracy of cost and manpower implications of each recommendation.

In the case of the Air National guard, the Commission's recommendations were based on the military value criteria; the Air Force's objective of creating optimally-sized flying squadrons in light of the availability of fewer total aircraft; the interests of States in using Air National Guard resources for certain missions, such as homeland security; and the geographic distribution of units across the United States with special consideration to areas of strategic interest.

In making recommendations on each Guard and Reserve Component installation, the Commission did not direct the relocation of a specific number of aircraft from one to another. The Commission believes that decision is best made by the Secretary of Defense and that the Secretary must have full authority to move weapon systems, and their directly associated manpower, within the parameters of Commission recommendations. To this end, the Commission's recommendations, rather than citing specific aircraft movements from "losing" to "gaining" bases, instead established an end-state at "gaining" bases in terms of the number of primary aircraft authorized.

Joint Cross Service Team Process

The Joint Cross Service Team confirmed current and future mission capabilities and the impact of DoD's recommendations on military value, operational readiness, including the impact on joint war fighting, training, and readiness with DoD's Force Structure Plan, as required by law. Rebasing and closure initiatives were assessed to ensure the gaining and losing locations had available land, facilities and associated requirements to ensure that existing and proposed facilities supported the recommendation's objectives. Joint Cross Service Team-related recommendations, for both existing and potential receiving locations, were assessed to ensure the recommendations adequately considered contingency, mobilization, and surge requirements. DoD's cost of operations and manpower estimates were reviewed and adjusted when required to reflect current cost data and manpower information. Additionally, DoD's cost and savings estimates were clarified when individual components within a broad recommendation required visibility.

The Joint Cross Service Team analysts applied the military value criteria to DoD's recommendations. The team found that, generally, DoD followed the established Military Value Selection Criteria in developing its BRAC proposals.

In the Headquarters and Support Activities recommendations, the military values dealing with leased space appeared biased because DoD's assumptions concerning leased space led to a predetermined outcome.

The Industrial recommendations followed military value selection criteria except when similar functions were grouped together or were evaluated separately without regard to the collective mission value or operational costs of the affected organization. For example, DoD analysis of three recommendations affecting the Cryptologic Systems Group at Lackland Air Force Base evaluated military value of individual elements of the Cryptologic Systems Group, and the collective military value of the Group was not captured. Taken separately, the recommendations did not represent fairly the costs associated with individual or collective costs. The team also found instances of infrastructure problems severely limiting the ability to accomplish mission, facilities undervalued, and errors resulted in excessive manpower savings.

The Commission observed a lack of depot consolidation recommendations within the Air Force. DoD recommendations recognized and encouraged centers of excellence within individual military services such as the Fleet Readiness Centers in

the Navy but did not propose the same for Defense-wide centers of excellence, especially within DoD aircraft depot maintenance.

Overall, DoD's Supply and Storage recommendations followed military value principles, but military judgment took precedence over military value when the Army established three life cycle centers of excellence to provide the best possible support to the war fighters. In that case, one chosen center ranked lower than the losing center. Additionally, the numbers of positions identified to transfer were incorrect, which resulted in understated cost estimates.

The Commission found that the Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG) generally followed established military value selection criteria in developing its recommendations. However, the Commission overturned three of the TJCSG recommendations because of substantial deviation from BRAC military value criteria. One of the recommendations attempted to combine facilities with dissimilar functions, thereby limiting gains in efficiency and military readiness at the receiving activity. Another recommendation, if implemented, would have resulted in a significant mission impact and loss of existing synergy because the receiving installation did not have the mission. While collocation would have been achieved, the overall efficiency gains would have been limited. Last, another recommendation was rejected by the Commission because of the potential loss of highly experienced personnel supporting electronic warfare systems currently in use and scheduled to be phased out in the near future.

CRITERION 5: COSTS AND SAVINGS

The military service departments and Joint Cross Service Groups used the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (or COBRA) model to assess Selection Criterion #5, Return on Investment, for all proposed realignment and closure scenarios. COBRA is a quantitative cost model providing a uniform methodology to estimate and itemize the projected costs and savings associated with closure and realignment scenarios. While COBRA does not provide "budget quality" estimates, its consistent methodology supports comparative analysis of competing scenarios. COBRA employs extensive algorithms using data sets of standard and dynamic factors. Standard factors are generally constant values such as demographics, pay and allowances, and construction costing factors. Dynamic factors are scenario-specific values, including personnel realignments and eliminations, equipment moving requirements, and time-phasing of events. Using these data sets, COBRA calculates scenarios' costs, savings, 20-Year Net Present Value, and Return on Investment. Twenty-Year Net Present Value is the cumulative value (in 2005 dollars) of all costs and savings of a particular scenario from 2006 through 2025. Return on Investment is the period required (in years) before savings offset all the scenario's costs. Appendix M provides the COBRA (cost/savings) statistics for each Commission-approved recommendation. Appendix N compares the 2005 BRAC summary COBRA statistics to previous BRAC rounds.

DoD provided the Commission with COBRA data for each recommendation, as well as for alternative scenarios used in DoD deliberations but not ultimately recommended. Bundling of multiple scenarios into single recommendations produced over 225 individual COBRA runs supporting 190 DoD recommendations. The Commission verified all DoD COBRA submissions, resolving questions and concerns directly with DoD. DoD submitted revised COBRA runs correcting self- or Commission-identified mistakes or irregularities in its original runs.

The Commission produced over 600 independent COBRA runs developing and supporting comparative analysis of alternative scenarios, or variations of existing scenarios. Local communities also provided their own COBRA runs, which were verified by the Commission's COBRA Team, for Commission review and analysis. Communities displayed exceptional capabilities with the model, and their COBRA submissions frequently provided the Commission with valuable insights.

The COBRA model, while valuable as a comparative tool employing a uniform methodology, produces realistic results only if the model reflects unique scenario requirements, the input data are accurate, and output results are correctly interpreted. A DoD Joint Process Action Team adapted the model to current-day conditions and addressed shortcomings identified during previous BRAC rounds. As a result, COBRA runs reflected additional installation-specific data (e.g., locality rates and freight rates); the costs and savings of enclaves; and improved algorithms (e.g., Base Operating Support (BOS) costs and military construction).

Nevertheless, the Commission was compelled to address several key issues in DoD's assessment of Criterion 5, Return on Investment. GAO published similar concerns with respect to return on investment calculations. These concerns are addressed individually below.

Key Commission Concerns with DoD's Return on Investment Calculations

- Military Construction Cost Estimates
- Exclusion of Environmental Remediation Cost from Calculations
- Use of Authorized Positions Instead of Assigned Positions when Determining Savings from Personnel Eliminations
- Validity of Projected Savings from Business Process Reengineering Efforts

DoD policy guidance mandated the use of certified data for all analysis, including cost and savings analysis. GAO reports the DoD Inspector General, along with Services' Inspectors General, played significant roles in ensuring accuracy and senior-level certification of all data. The Commission had concerns, however, about the accuracy of some certified input data, especially military construction requirements. The Commission had the opportunity to review some post-recommendation site surveys and saw some with significant cost escalation, which would reduce projected savings.

DoD policy excluded environmental remediation from its COBRA calculation of costs and savings. DoD's exclusion of environmental remediation costs from COBRA results required the Commission to separately assess the effect of these costs on a recommendation's total return-on-investment. Previous BRAC rounds' environmental remediation costs usually exceeded original cost estimates. While the Commission is well aware of the difficulties in accurately estimating these costs and supports DoD's continued efforts to produce more precise cost estimates, the Commission is concerned that any significant increase in costs would further diminish the savings of this BRAC round.

It is the view of the Commission that DoD's depiction of military personnel savings (as opposed to cost avoidances) further distorts assessment of actual savings attributable to DoD's BRAC recommendations. DoD counted as "savings" the salary and other personnel costs of individuals eliminated from installations recommended for closure or realignment. DoD projected that its recommendations, if approved, would generate approximately $47.8 billion in savings over 20 years, including the elimination of almost 27,000 military personnel. However, DoD's 20-Year Force Structure Plan projects no reduction in military end strength by any service except the Navy. Thus, while personnel "slots" now assigned to installations recommended for closure or realignment might be redeployed elsewhere, DoD's net personnel costs would remain constant and no "savings" realized if "savings" are defined to mean reduced costs. The Commission remains adamant that military personnel savings projected by DoD mask the amount of expenditures that would be reduced through implementation of BRAC recommendations. Recalculating projected savings of DoD's recommendations, excluding savings attributed to military personnel eliminations, reduces net 20-year savings to $18.6 billion, or 39% of the initial projection.

The Commission is also concerned about (a) savings DoD claims for business process re-engineering recommendations, and (b) savings that are computed on the basis of positions authorized for a process or installation rather than the positions actually assigned. GAO thoroughly reviewed and analyzed these two issues, and the Commission echoes the concerns stated in GAO's July 1, 2005 report. Specifically, the Commission questions DoD's assumptions supporting projected savings attributed to recommendations of the Industrial and Supply and Storage Joint Cross Service Groups that purport to improve the business process. While the Commission does not doubt these recommendations may create efficiencies, no savings would be realized if savings are calculated based on staffing levels actually filled or intended to be filled. For example, DoD's Fleet Readiness Centers recommendation estimates saving 1,187 civilian and contractor positions and 353 military positions. The Commission found that 776 of the civilian and contractor positions and 303 of the military billets projected to be "saved" are not currently filled and hence have no current costs. Exclusion of these "savings" has a significant effect on assessment of this recommendation, which has the highest 20-year net present value savings of all of DoD's recommendations.

It is the Commission's conclusion that, (1) given the magnitude of the DoD reported savings associated with military personnel costs; (2) the potential to not realize the amount of savings attributed to business process reengineering; (3) the high probability that actual implementation costs, including the costs of environmental remediation, will exceed original estimates; and (4) the use of authorized rather than filled positions in calculating personnel-based savings; the Department could assume a high financial risk during the BRAC implementation period, 2006–2011. The Commission therefore recommends that DoD produce a detailed BRAC implementation plan to mitigate the financial risks (in addition to operational and force management risks) implicit with base realignment and closures. In fact, the Commission is concerned that, given the combined potential effect of all of these factors, there is a likelihood that the 2005 BRAC round could produce only marginal net savings over the 20-year period.

CRITERION 6: ECONOMIC IMPACT

The Commission's economist, detailed from the Department of Commerce, was directed to assess DoD's compliance with BRAC selection criterion 6: "the economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations." Three major aspects of DoD's approach were evaluated: methodology, identifiable geography, and data reliability for all areas affected by the recommendations.

The Commission commends DoD for its uniform and consistent estimates of the regional economic impact on affected areas. The Joint Process Action Team 6 (JPAT6) consistently identified BRAC-affected economic areas, carefully calculated the impact of each recommendation using reliable data sources and meticulously documented data sources and findings. Further, the Commission concurs with GAO's finding, in its July 1 report, that DoD's economic impact "methodology has limitations but is reasonable for BRAC purposes."

DoD's analysis assumed that other socioeconomic or financial outcomes—such as the area's housing market, fiscal conditions, or school funding—would eventually correlate with employment changes in the affected areas. While it would be preferable to not have to make this assumption, the Commission realized that alternative methods to comprehensively estimate the impact of BRAC actions on regional economies would be just as debatable, lack uniformity, and be costly and time-consuming to implement for all affected areas.

EVALUATION

Because the 2005 BRAC language for Criterion 6 is little changed from 1995, DoD decided to retain the 1995 BRAC methodology to estimate economic impact, or more precisely, employment impact for affected areas. However, unlike prior rounds, DoD did not enumerate a cumulative BRAC impact for BRAC 2005 because the impacts of the 1993 and 1995 BRACs have been realized by now. The Commission agrees that this approach was consistent and compliant with criterion 6's guidance.

Methodology and Geography: DoD calculated the economic impact of its proposals for areas physically containing the affected installations and labeled these areas as regions of influence (ROIs). ROIs could be metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), micropolitan statistical areas (MISAs), or Metropolitan Divisions, collectively referred to as metro areas for brevity. DoD designated the appropriate counties as ROIs for installations located in counties not belonging to a metro area. Accurate assessment of the regional economic impact depends upon identification of the correct ROI.

Although some communities disputed DoD's use of metro areas for its ROI assignments, the Commission believes DoD's assignment of installations to certain metro areas or counties before calculating economic impact was sound.

Except for isolated errors (e.g., Hawthorne and Tobyhanna Army Depots), the Commission finds DoD assigned affected installations to appropriate ROIs (i.e., affected metro areas or counties). The Commission finds that DoD treated all affected installations and areas on a consistent and equal basis.

The Commission was concerned by ROI assignments for about a dozen installations whose economic impacts may not be correctly identified and allocated. In these instances, the installations were assigned to specific metro areas, although they were physically located close to borders of additional metro areas or counties, whose impacts were not reflected in the model. For example, Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, which is recommended for closure, is located on the border of the Portland-South Portland-Biddeford MSA and the Boston-Cambridge-Quincy MSA. DoD allocated all employment impact (-2.8%) to the latter area and none to the former.

Calculator: DoD's approach and methodology, including the model used in BRAC 2005, were very similar to those used in BRAC 1995. In determining regional economic impact, DoD used products (input-output employment multipliers) from a proprietary economic modeling source to calculate the total employment effects—gains or losses in jobs—of a specific DoD recommendation on a region's economy. This device is a popular method to estimate the economic consequences of external changes to a regional economy.

DoD created the Economic Impact Tool (EIT) to uniformly estimate direct and indirect job changes and aggregate them to get total net changes from 2006 through 2011 for all affected regions.

Unlike mathematical tools used in previous BRAC rounds, EIT allows users to track personnel changes and movements for any actions in affected installations. In order to capture the relative economic impact on all affected regions, DoD used impact ratios, expressed as a fraction or percent of total job change, to ROI employment level. These ratios allow analysts to assess the magnitude of impact regardless of the regional economic structure. For example, 200 job losses in small, remote

areas like Aroostook County (Maine) had a different impact than the same job losses in larger, urban areas like Portland-North Portland MSA (also in Maine).

The Commission believes that the estimated impact on most of the 250 ROIs affected by its 190 recommendations in BRAC 2005 are in an acceptable range. In addition, the Commission finds that the DoD's direct job multipliers are generally higher than those computed by communities with different economic models. This issue met DoD's goal of erring on the high end of job impact estimates.

The Commission found, and GAO also observed, that DoD's methodology is an acceptable tool for determining the total employment impact on affected regions; however, the Commission also noted community concerns about the static nature of DoD's model, which can only account for:

- Job Changes: EIT equates economic impacts with potential job gains or losses only. It offers no insight into other important factors such as excess housing capacity, infrastructure, or public schools. DoD addressed community infrastructure capabilities for gaining installations only in Criterion 7.
- Snapshot Condition: EIT assumes job losses or gains occur instantly rather than actually and gradually over a six-year period (2006–2011).

The model also lacks the capability to account for other regional issues such as:

- Fiscal Impact: Revenue losses by state and local government through lower income, property, or sales tax collections.
- Brain Drain: The loss of skilled labor force, including contractors or military family members.

The Commission concluded that while DoD should continue to refine its economic impact models, projecting the impact of BRAC actions is an inherently imprecise science. Any new theoretical model for comprehensively estimating other impacts of BRAC actions on regional economies could depend upon debatable methodology, lack a uniform approach, and be costly and time-consuming to implement for all affected areas equally.

Economic Data: Direct job changes, EIT's most important input for determining indirect effects, were extracted from COBRA's database. EIT reports also compared an area's annual job growth for the 1988–2002 period, unemployment rates for 1990–2003, and per capita incomes 1988–2002 to national averages.

The Commission found that EIT data were appropriate and timely for BRAC 2005 purposes and deadlines. However, the Commission also found that the EIT reports were designed mainly for DoD's decision makers to broadly understand how BRAC 2005 recommendations might affect particular ROIs. They provide little interpretation of economic conditions in affected areas.

The reports are informative, but provide little context for communities to explore or digest their unique economic structures or conditions. For example, EIT results are less helpful in understanding the huge differences between closing or realigning facilities in densely populated urban areas with diversified economies and shutting down or downsizing facilities like DFAS Limestone in Aroostook County (Maine), realigning Eielson AFB in Fairbanks MSA (Alaska), or closing Hawthorne Army Depot in Mineral County (Nevada).

Finally, the Commission is also concerned about underestimated economic impacts due to the failure of the EIT to consider non-BRAC programmatic changes, which also have economic impacts, as well as BRAC changes. The Commission realizes that although the DoD approach completely complies with the law, the cumulative impact of both BRAC and non-BRAC changes on affected communities may be underestimated.

Based on DoD's recommendations, the Commission estimated that 10 communities would have high negative impacts (due to both closures and realignments) while seven communities would have high positive impacts (due to realignments). The model is too static to incorporate other factors that may take place regardless of any BRAC actions. The Commission's assessment of the estimated economic impact of its final recommendations can be found in Appendix O.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE BRAC ROUNDS

1. DoD should use a consistent standard in designating geographic units for all BRAC selection criteria. Currently, geographic areas are defined differently for different purposes:

- Criteria 1–4: 50-mile radius from the installation to determine labor pool and resources for the installation.
- Criterion 6: ROIs, i.e., MSAs, MISAs, or counties (2004 redefinition by OMB).

- Criterion 7: MSAs and PMSAs (Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas based on 1990 definitions by OMB) for demographic, cost of living, employment data. MHAs (Military Housing Areas) which are a combination of data collecting by zip codes, 20-mile radius from the installations, and 60-minute commuting time.

2. For data consolidation and maintenance, DoD should do one of the following:

- Incorporate EIT into COBRA because EIT's database can be designed to be a subset of COBRA's and draw installations' personnel data from COBRA's database.
- Merge EIT's database with selection criterion 7's database to create a common database eliminating inconsistencies and reducing maintenance and data updating.

3. Eliminate redundancy in data collection and maintenance for criteria 6 and 7.

- Population and unemployment rates are collected in both criteria separately.

Criterion 7: Community Infrastructure

A DoD Joint Process Action Team (JPAT), with representatives of the three Military Departments and OSD, assessed each DoD recommendation, using a consistent Department-wide approach, for compliance with BRAC selection criterion 7, "the ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel." The JPAT identified ten common attributes – demographics, child care, cost of living, education, employment, housing, medical providers, safety/crime, transportation, and utilities – to evaluate the ability of a community's infrastructure to support existing and potential additional forces, missions, and personnel. The Military Departments and Joint Cross-Service Groups used the JPAT final report in their BRAC 2005 analyses.

Army analysts compared the number of common attributes at gaining and losing installations to assess the gaining community's ability to absorb additional units relative to the losing community. The goal was to locate units at installations with the capacity to absorb additional missions, and assess the need for additional local-area infrastructure support. The Army identified an issue at Fort Gillem based on local community concerns that the infrastructure of the installation would not be accessible for reuse if multiple enclaves were established. The Commission directed the establishment of a contiguous enclave.

The Navy created installation profiles summarizing common community attributes. In addition, the Navy collected certified data regarding community infrastructure impacts in scenario data calls. The Navy identified no significant, quantifiable community infrastructure impacts that would hinder any of its closure or realignment recommendations.

The Air Force summarized data for each installation affected by proposed BRAC actions, based on analysis of detailed reports submitted to OSD as supporting documentation. The Air Force identified no significant, quantifiable community infrastructure impacts for any of its closure or realignment recommendations.

Each Joint Cross-Service Group evaluated communities affected by their recommendations using the common attributes and associated questions established by the JPAT. JCSGs identified no significant, quantifiable community infrastructure impacts for their closure or realignment recommendations.

The Commission reviewed the Community Infrastructure Assessments for all DoD oriented recommendations, and took these assessments into account in considering the Secretary's compliance with this selection criterion.

Criterion 8: Environmental Impact and Remediation

While the BRAC statute requires "priority consideration to the military value criteria" DoD, and the Commission, are also required to consider "the environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities," a broader and more detailed environmental standard than applied in prior rounds.

DoD assessed environmental resource impacts, the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, and the impact of costs related to potential waste management and environmental compliance activities. A DoD Joint Process Action Team (JPAT) developed procedures, analytical tools, and databases to facilitate a common analytical approach for the Services and Joint Cross Service Groups (JCSGs) assessing environmental selection criteria.

The JPAT obtained environmental data from all DoD installations and provided procedural instructions for environmental assessment. It developed three templates—1) Installation Environmental Profiles; 2) Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts; and 3) Summary of Cumulative Scenarios' Environmental Impacts—to facilitate use of the data.

Environmental Resources Impacts and Costs

DoD used these templates, profile information, and other certified data to summarize impacts on ten resource areas for both losing and gaining installations—air quality; cultural/archeological/tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints/sensitive resource areas; marine mammals/marine resources/marine sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species/critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands. A Summary of Cumulative Environmental Impacts was generated for installations affected by more than one scenario under final DoD consideration.

DoD did not include environmental restoration costs in Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) estimates on the grounds those costs would be incurred without regard to BRAC. BRAC certified data included only estimated "costs-to-complete" for Installation Restoration (IR) sites managed and reported under the Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA). DERA costs are calculated on a "clean-to-current-use" standard. The presence of DERA-managed sites was a land use constraint for installations receiving missions as a result of a potential realignment decision

The cost to remediate munitions contamination was not captured in estimated-cost to-complete for IR sites with operational ranges, due to the unknown nature of munitions contamination and reuse requirements. Auditable or certifiable cost estimates for operational ranges require site surveys and analysis not attainable within the BRAC timeframe. Experience shows range remediation costs vary from small to very significant depending on the type, quantity, and location of munitions used over the entire life of the range, other uses of the range such as open burn, open detonation and burial sites, potential future uses of the land, and the lack of an agreed-upon process for hazard identification and removal.

DoD's exclusion of environmental restoration costs in payback calculations avoided the perverse incentive of rewarding (through retention) polluted sites or encouraging closure of clean sites. DoD's approach was consistent with procedures used in prior BRAC rounds and responds to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) concerns. GAO stated that final restoration cost determinations could be problematic before a closure decision, since neither reuse plans nor studies to identify related restoration requirements would have been initiated.

Although the cost of environmental restoration did not dictate closure decisions, these costs are noted in installation environmental profiles, the summaries of scenarios' environmental impacts, and the summary of cumulative scenarios' environmental impact.

COBRA Model Assessment of Environmental Costs

The COBRA model captures both recurring and non-recurring environmental compliance and waste management activity costs. These expenses are included in the Base Operating Support (BOS) statistics and in Criterion 5 using COBRA estimates for each evaluated scenario. COBRA also includes one-time costs associated with waste management or compliance activities specific to shutdown or realignment of a facility. These costs are then included in COBRA's estimated payback calculations, as noted in the Summary of Scenario Environmental Impact.

Commission Analysis of Environmental Restoration Costs

The Commission reviewed DoD's environmental cost data as clarified or corrected, when necessary, through the DoD Clearing House, A summary of the environmental restoration cost data is provided below, with more detailed information in Appendix P.

In general, DERA includes the costs associated with remediation of pre-1986 contamination. After this time frame, costs are generally included in facilities' operating or compliance budgets.

The estimated costs to complete environmental restoration of DERA-managed sites and the military munitions response program (MMRP), at the 33 major facilities proposed for closure by DoD are as follows:

DoD Proposed	Commission Results
Army, 14 major closures, $615,940,000;	Army, 12 major closures, $170,180,00;
Navy, 9 major closures, $121,6100,000;	Navy, 6 major closures, $50,610,000;
Air Force, 10 major closures, $180,590,000.	Air Force, 5 major closures, $5,390,000.
Total cost: $918,140,000.	**Total cost: $226,180,000.**

These environmental cost estimates include neither cleanup of currently operational ranges nor costs such as underground storage tanks, oil/water separators, waste water treatment plants and wash racks. Estimates for some of these costs are not available to the Commission. Through FY 2003, DoD had already spent $684,700,000 on environmental restoration at the 33 major facilities proposed for closure.

Eight Army installations indicated they have operational ranges. The cost to close or remediate these ranges could be $70,000,000 to $655,200,000. Remediation cost estimates at four additional installations (Newport Chemical Depot, Deseret Chemical Depot, Umatilla Chemical Depot and Fort Monroe) with some type of ordnance or other explosive material are incomplete or impossible to estimate without future studies.

Environmental clean-up "cost-to-complete" also does not include controlled burning or decontamination or demolition of industrial structures heavily contaminated with explosives. This could be an issue for six of the 33 major closures, with costs ranging from $1 to $10 million each.

Completion dates for DERA-managed-sites range from 2011 to 2032, indicating that additional resources may be needed to complete cleanups within the BRAC timeframe.

In summary, the Commission's review of environmental restoration costs found that:

- the costs associated with the military munitions response program (MMRP) are substantial
- DoD's MMRP primarily addresses closed ranges and other closed/abandoned areas with unexploded ordnance, discarded munitions, and munitions constituents but does not address restoration of currently operational ranges
- DoD may need to decontaminate heavily contaminated structures at closing facilities, but these costs are not included in Environmental Restoration "costs-to-complete."
- costs to close other types of environmental sites could be substantial and are unknown at this time
- current completion dates for environmental restoration may impact reuse
- land-use controls will restrict reuse at some facilities.

Government Accountability Office (GAO) Environmental Impact Assessment

GAO's July 1, 2005 report on the DoD's recommendations and selection process generally accepted DoD's process and discussed estimated environmental restoration costs. The report concludes that increased costs may be incurred as closures are implemented, more intensive environmental investigations occur, and additional hazardous conditions arise. Finally, the report concludes the services' preliminary estimates are based on restoration standards applicable for the current use of the base property. Community reuse plans sometimes reflect different uses which could lead to more stringent, and thus more expensive, restoration.

GAO indicated a $949,100,000 cost to complete environmental restoration using data from the DoD's Scenario Summaries. Some Military Departments provided data from sources other than the FY2003 DERA reports to Congress. The Commission used revised cost-to-complete remediation figures from certified answers to questions submitted to DoD.

The BRAC Commission generally agrees with GAO's assessment of potential environmental restoration impacts due to unknown factors and land-use changes. The Commission notes that, except for the emerging Military Munitions Response Program, DoD's environmental program appears to be further along than in previous BRAC rounds.

THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE (GAO)

The law authorizing the 2005 base closure process directed the Comptroller General to independently assess the Department of Defense process and recommendations and provide his findings to the Congress and the BRAC Commission by July 1, 2005. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) was also invited to testify before the Commission and delivered sworn testimony on May 3 and July 18, 2005.

In preparing its July 1 report, the GAO's stated objectives were to (1) determine the extent to which DoD's recommendations achieved DoD's stated BRAC goals, (2) determine if the process for developing recommendations was logical and reasoned, and (3) identify issues warranting further attention by the Commission. GAO noted that the sheer number of individual DoD recommendations (more than all previous rounds combined) made it impossible to separately analyze and evaluate each proposal. Instead, the GAO assessed major trends and common themes cutting across multiple recommendations.

GAO's July 1, 2005 report concluded that DoD had varying degrees of success in achieving its 2005 BRAC goals of (a) reducing excess infrastructure and producing savings, (b) furthering transformation, and (c) fostering jointness.

Specifically, GAO concluded the DoD, military department, and Joint Cross Service Group selection process "was generally logical, reasoned, and well documented." DoD's process was marked by an emphasis on objective certified data, backed up by subjective military judgment in those instances when numbers could not tell the whole story.

GAO gave high marks to the military services and seven joint cross-service groups, (which focused on common business oriented functions) for adapting their analytical approaches to the unique aspects of their respective responsibilities while still remaining consistent in the use of military value criteria, including new considerations introduced in this round, such as surge and homeland defense needs.

GAO noted that many DoD proposals focused on reserve bases while closing relatively few active bases. Importantly, GAO wrote that "Projected savings are almost ... as large ... as all prior BRAC rounds combined, but about 80 percent of the projected 20-year net present value savings (savings minus up-front investment costs) are derived from only 10 percent of the recommendations." The report also pointed out several instances in which DoD bundled otherwise unrelated recommendations with long payback periods with a recommendation providing substantial savings and a rapid payback, thereby creating a combined recommendation with an attractive savings and payback profile. GAO analysts found that approximately 36 of all DoD recommendations had a payback of six years or more, while 25 did not produce savings in excess of costs for a decade or more.

Overall, GAO estimated that the DoD proposals would reduce the total plant replacement value of all military facilities by five percent, or $27 billion. GAO forecast that an up-front investment cost of $24 billion would be required to implement the DoD recommendations. GAO also cautioned that "there are clear limitations associated with DoD's projection of nearly $50 billion in savings over a 20-year period. Much of the projected net annual recurring savings (47 percent) is associated with eliminating jobs currently held by military personnel. However, rather than reducing end-strength levels, DoD indicates the positions are expected to be reassigned to other areas, which may enhance capabilities but does not result in actual dollar savings available for other uses. Sizeable savings were projected from efficiency measures and other actions, but "underlying assumptions have not been validated and could be difficult to track over time."

GAO raised questions about several specific recommendations, such as the Red River Army Depot, Submarine Base New London, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Ellsworth Air Force Base, Hawthorne Army Depot, and Watervliet Arsenal.

GAO also recommended that the Commission pay special attention to those major recommendations approved by the military departments, Joint Cross Service Groups, and/or Infrastructure Steering Group, but changed or dropped in the final weeks by the Infrastructure Executive Council (sometimes for reasons of "military judgment" that are hard to quantify).

This GAO's concern was partly reflected in the questions and possible "adds" sent to Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld on July 2, 2005. The Commission's potential additions list included at least five installations about which GAO expressed specific concerns (Pearl Harbor, HI; Naval Postgraduate School, CA; Air Force Institute of Technology, OH; Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME; and Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND).

GAO generally found that the 2005 round made measurably greater progress on DoD's transformation and jointness goals than in prior BRAC rounds. The Joint Cross-Service Groups had a greatly expanded role in 2005 and were allowed to develop their own candidate recommendations and scenarios for direct ISG and IEC consideration. The military service

departments could not block JCSG recommendations by not forwarding them to the Secretary of Defense, as occurred in 1995. Indeed, many of the JCSG proposals were accepted or incorporated into military service department recommendations. GAO stated there was unprecedented coordination between the JCSGs and the service departments.

However, GAO also noted several missed opportunities and noted that "progress in each area varied, with many decisions reflecting consolidations within, and not across, the military services. In addition, transformation was often cited as support for proposals, but it was not well defined, and there was a lack of agreement on various transformation options."

GAO also noted that while the Army did not use the same military value analysis for Reserve Component facilities, it sought extensive national and state-level Reserve and Guard input and feedback when putting together its Reserve and Guard recommendations. In contrast, the Air Force and Navy/Marine Corps applied the same military value analysis to their Reserve Components, but the Air Force in particular did not involve any state-level officials or Adjutants General in their decision-making processes.

Last, GAO identified four other issues for the Commission's consideration: "(1) instances of lengthy payback periods (time required to recoup up-front investment costs), (2) inconsistencies in how DoD estimated costs for BRAC actions involving military construction projects, (3) uncertainties in estimating the total costs to the government to implement DoD's recommended actions, and (4) potential impacts on communities surrounding bases that are expected to gain large numbers of personnel if DoD's recommendations are implemented."

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

2005

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report

Table of Contents

Volume Two

Section Name

Appendix A: Abbreviations

Appendix B: Definitions

Appendix C: BRAC Statute

Appendix D: Force Structure Plan

Appendix E: Final Selection Criteria

Appendix F: Closures and Realignments by State, 1988–1995

Appendix G: Commissioners' Biographies

Appendix H: Staff List

Appendix I: Hearings Held by Commission

Appendix J: Commissioner and Staff Base Visits

Appendix K: DoD Closure and Realignment Recommendations List

Appendix L: Bases Added by the Commission, 2005

Appendix M: COBRA Analysis of Commission Final Recommendations

Appendix N: COBRA Comparison of BRAC 1988–2005

Appendix O: Economic Impact of Commission Final Recommendations

Appendix P: Selected Environmental Remediation Costs

Appendix Q: Commission's Final Recommendations

Appendix R: Legislative Proposal

Appendix S: "Life After BRAC" Resource Finder

Appendix T: Maps

Index by State

Index by Recommendation

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX A

ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATION	TRANSLATION
AAP	Army Ammunition Plant
AC	Active Component
AD	Army Depot
AFAA	Air Force Audit Agency
AFB	Air Force Base
AFEWES	Air Force Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator
AFMC	Air Force Materiel Command
AFRC	Armed Forces Reserve Center
AFRES	Air Force Reserve
AFRL	Air Force Research Laboratory
AGB	Air Guard Base
AGS	Air Guard Station
ALC	Air Logistics Center
AMC	Army Materiel Command
AMSA	Area Maintenance Support Activity
ANG	Air National Guard
ARNG	Army National Guard
AR	Army Reserve
ARB	Air Reserve Base
ARC	Air Reserve Component
ARL	Army Research Laboratory
ARS	Air Reserve Station
AS	Air Station
ASA (I&E)	Assistant Secretary of the Army for Infrastructure and Environment
ASD	Assistant Secretary of Defense
ASIP	Army Stationing and Installation Plan
ASO	Aviation Supply Office
AT&L	Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics
ATCOM	Aviation Troop Command
BAH	Basic Allowance for Housing
BCT	Brigade Combat Team

BCEG .....Base Closure Executive Group (Air Force)

BDE .....Brigade

BEA .....Bureau of Economic Analysis

BLS .....Bureau of Labor Statistics

BOS .....Base Operating Support

BRAC .....Base Realignment and Closure process (see also DBCRC)

BSAT .....Base Structure Analysis Team

BSDB .....Base Structure Data Base

BSEC .....Base Structure Evaluation Committee

C4I .....Command, Control, Communications, Computers, and Intelligence

C4ISR .....Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance

CD .....Chemical Depot

CECOM .....Communications and Electronics Command

CERCLA .....Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liabilities Act

CFR .....Code of Federal Regulations

CHAMPUS .....Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services

CIRF .....Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility

CINC .....Commander-in-Chief

COBRA .....Cost of Base Realignment Actions

CONUS .....Continental United States

CSEI .....Cumulative Scenario Environmental Impacts

DASA (IA) .....Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, Infrastructure Analysis

DASD .....Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense

DBCRC .....Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (see BRAC)

DCMC .....Defense Contract Management Command

DCS .....Deputy Chief of Staff

DERA .....Defense Environmental Restoration Account

DIA .....Defense Intelligence Agency

DIS .....Defense Investigative Service

DISA .....Defense Information Systems Agency

DISC .....Defense Industrial Supply Center

DLA .....Defense Logistics Agency

DLR .....Depot Level Reparable

DLSC .....Defense Logistics Services Center

DOC .....Department of Commerce

DOD .....Department of Defense

DOD IG .....Department of Defense, Inspector General

DOE .....Department of Energy

DOI .....Department of the Interior
DON .....Department of the Navy
DPSC .....Defense Personnel Support Center
DRMS .....Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service
DSCC .....Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH
DSCP .....Defense Supply Center Philadelphia, PA
DSCR.....Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA
DSDC .....DLA Systems Design Center
E&T .....Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group
ECS .....Expeditionary Combat Support
EDA .....Economic Development Administration
EFA NW .....Engineering Field Activity Northwest
EFA NE.....Engineering Field Activity Northeast
EIG .....Engineering Installation Group
EIS.....Environmental Impact Statement
EIT .....Economic Impact Tool
EOH.....Executive Office, Headquarters
EOP.....Executive Office of the President
EPA .....Environmental Protection Agency
FAC .....Facility Analysis Category
FCS .....Future Combat Systems Program
FISC .....Fleet and Industrial Supply Center
FORSCOM .....Forces Command
FPS .....Facility Planning System
FSC .....Federal Supply Classes
GAO .....Government Accountability Office
GSA .....General Services Administration
H&SA.....Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross-Service Group
HQ .....Headquarters
HQDA .....Headquarters, Department of the Army
I&E .....Installations and Environment
IAP .....International Airport
IC&AD .....Investigations Control and Automation Directorate
ICP .....Inventory Control Point
IEC .....Infrastructure Executive Council
IGPBS .....Integrated Global Presence Basing Study
IMA .....Installation Management Agency
IND.....Industrial Joint Cross-Service Group

INT.....Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group

ISG.....Infrastructure Steering Group

ISSC .....Information Systems Software Command

IUSS .....Integrated Undersea Surveillance System

ISG .....Infrastructure Steering Group

IVT .....Installation Visualization Tool

JPAT .....Joint Process Action Team

JCS .....Joint Chiefs of Staff

JCSG .....Joint Cross-Service Group

JAST .....Joint Action Scenario Team

LANTIRN .....Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared System (Night)

LSC .....Logistics Support Center

LMI .....Logistics Management Institute

LOS.....Line of Sight

MACOM .....Major Command

MAP .....Municipal Airport

MCAF .....Marine Corps Air Facility

MCAS .....Marine Corps Air Station

MCB .....Marine Corps Base

MCI .....Mission Compatibility Index

MCLB .....Marine Corps Logistics Base

MCRD.....Marine Corps Recruiting Depot

MED.....Medical Joint Cross-Service Group

MHPI .....Military Housing Privatization Initiative

MILCON .....Military Construction

MILDEP .....Military Department (Army, Navy/Marines, Air Force)

MODA .....Multiple Objective Decision Analysis Model

MOS .....Military Occupational Skills

MSA .....Metropolitan Statistical Area

MV .....Military Value

MVA .....Military Value Analysis

MVI .....Military Value of Installations

MVP .....Military Value Portfolio

NAAQS .....National Ambient Air Quality Standard

NADEP .....Naval Aviation Depot

NAES .....Naval Aviation Engineering Station

NAF .....Naval Air Facility

NAS .....Naval Air Station

NATSF .....Naval Air Technical Services Facility

NAVAIR .....Naval Air Systems Command

NAVFAC .....Naval Facility

NAVMASSO .....Naval Management Systems Support Office

NAVSEA .....Naval Sea Systems Command

NAWC .....Naval Air Warfare Center

NBDL .....Naval Biodynamics Laboratory

NCCOSC .....Naval Command, Control, and Ocean Surveillance Center

NCR .....National Capital Region

NEPA .....National Environmental Policy Act

NESEC .....Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center

NETC .....Naval Education and Training Center

NGA.....National Geospatial Intelligence Agency

NHRC .....Naval Health Research Center

NISE .....Naval In-Service Engineering

NISMC .....Naval Information Systems Management Center

NMRI .....Naval Medical Research Institute

NPRDC .....Navy Personnel Research and Development Center

NPS .....Nuclear Power School

NPV .....Net Present Value

NRC .....Naval Reserve Center

NRD .....Naval Recruiting District

NRF.....North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Response Force

NRL .....Naval Research Laboratory

NSB .....Naval Submarine Base

NSWC .....Naval Surface Warfare Center

NSY .....Naval Shipyard

NTC .....Naval Training Center

NTTC .....Naval Technical Training Center

NUWC .....Naval Undersea Warfare Center

NWAD .....Naval Warfare Assessment Division

NWS .....Naval Weapons Station

ODIN .....Online Data Interface

OEA .....Office of Economic Adjustment

OGC .....Office of the General Counsel

OLF.....Outlying Field

OMB .....Office of Management and Budget

ONR .....Office of Naval Research

OSD .....Office of the Secretary of Defense
OT&E .....Operational Test and Evaluation
PAA .....Primary Aircraft Authorizations
PEO .....Program Executive Office
PG .....Proving Ground
POTUS .....President of the United States
PPI .....Public-Private Initiative
PPV .....Public-Private Venture
PWC .....Public Works Center
R&A.....Research and Analysis
R&D .....Research and Development
RC .....Reserve Component
RC (ARNG).....Readiness Center, US Army National Guard
RC PAT .....Reserve Component Process Action Team
RC (USAR).....Reserve Center, US Army Reserve
RDAT&E .....Research, Development, Acquisition, Testing, and Evaluation
RDT&E .....Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation
REDCAP .....Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor
REDCOM .....Readiness Command
ROI .....Return on Investment
ROI .....Region of Influence
RPLANS .....Real Property Planning and Analysis System
RRC .....Regional Readiness Command
S&S .....Supply and Storage Joint Cross-Service Group
SAILS .....Strategic Analysis of Integrated Logistics Systems
SECDEF .....Secretary of Defense
SDIV .....Southern Division
SIMA .....Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity
SIOP .....Single Integrated Operational Plan
SPAWAR .....Space and Naval War Systems Command
SRF .....Ship Repair Facility
SRG .....Senior Review Group
SSEI .....Scenario Summary of Environmental Impacts
SSN .....Attack Submarine, Nuclear-Powered
SSBN.....Submarine, Ballistic Missile, Nuclear-Powered
STRICOM .....Simulation, Training, and Instrumentation Command
SUPSHIP .....Supervisors of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair
TABS .....The Army Basing Study

TAG .....The Adjutant General

TC .....Transition Coordinator

TECH .....(or TJCSG) Technical Joint Cross-Service Group

TRADOC .....Training and Doctrine Command

TRICARE.....Tri-service (and dependent) health care coverage program

UAV .....Unmanned Aerial Vehicle

UCAV .....Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicle

UPT .....Undergraduate Pilot Training

USAAA .....United States Army Audit Agency

USA.....United States Army

USAF .....United States Air Force

USAR.....United States Army Reserve

USC .....United States Code

USD .....Under Secretary of Defense

USD (AT&L) .....Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics)

USMC.....United States Marine Corps

USN .....United States Navy

WDIV .....Engineering Field Division West

WPSTA .....Weapons Station

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX B

TERMS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THE 2005 BRAC PROCESS

20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE (SEE NET PRESENT VALUE)

ACCOUNT

The Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 established by section 2906A of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-510), as amended. The legislation authorizing the 2005 BRAC round also authorized the use of this specialized account, which was designed by Congress to ensure that BRAC-related revenues are used only to pay for BRAC-related expenditures, and not other ordinary governmental or DoD expenditures. *(source: Base Closure Law, Section 2910(1))*

ACTION

The activities necessary to implement final and approved recommendations of the Commission to close or realign military installations. Actions can include the acquisition of such land, the construction of such replacement facilities, the performance of such activities, and the conduct of such advance planning and design as may be required to transfer functions from a military installation being closed or realigned to another military installation. An "action" is also frequently referred to as a "BRAC action" or "Final Action." *(source: Base Closure Law, Section 2905(a)A)*

ANNUAL SAVINGS/ANNUAL RECURRING SAVINGS

Savings that are expected to occur annually after the costs of implementing a BRAC action have been offset by savings. Sometimes these savings take the form of additional resources that can be spent on other priorities, and other times they are in the form of future cost avoidances. *(source: Government Accountability Office, GAO-05-785, Military Bases)*

BASE CLOSURE LAW

The provisions of Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Pub. L. 100-526, 102 Stat.2623, 10 U.S.C. S 2687 note) or the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 100-526, Part A of Title XXIX of 104 Stat. 1808, 10 U.S.C. S 2687 note).
(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)

BASE CLOSURE EXECUTIVE GROUP (BCEG)

The Secretary of the Air Force chartered the Base Closure Executive Group to advise and assist him in developing BRAC recommendations. The BCEG comprised 12 senior military and civilian executives. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

BRAC

"BRAC" is an acronym that stands for "Base Realignment and Closure." It refers to the process the Department of Defense (DoD) has used to reorganize its installation infrastructure to more efficiently and effectively support its force structure, increase operational readiness and facilitate new ways of doing business. BRAC is also frequently used colloquially to refer to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission as the "BRAC Commission," even though the Commission's

initials are technically "DBCRC." Thus, "BRAC" by itself refers to the DoD part of the base closure process, but "BRAC Commission" refers to the independent Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
(source: 2005 Commission; Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)

BRAC Report

The Final Report to the President containing the Commission's findings and conclusions, based on a review and analysis of the Secretary of Defense recommendations. Unless the BRAC Report is rejected by either the President or Congress on an all-or-nothing basis, the Commission's final recommendations contained within the Report become law. *(source: Base Closure Law)*

Candidate recommendation

A scenario that a joint cross-service group or military department has formally analyzed against all eight selection criteria and which it recommends to the Infrastructure Steering Group and Infrastructure Executive Council respectively for approval by the Secretary of Defense. A joint cross-service group candidate recommendation must be approved by the Infrastructure Steering Group, the Infrastructure Executive Council, and the Secretary of Defense before it becomes a DoD recommendation. A military department candidate recommendation must be approved by the Infrastructure Executive Council and the Secretary of Defense before it becomes a DoD recommendation. *(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/scenario-tracker/scenario-tracker.html)*

CERCLA

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, also known as the Superfund, is the legal framework for the identification, restoration, and transfer of contaminated property. In 1986, CERCLA was revised to require federal agencies to comply with CERCLA in the same manner as everyone else. This amendment also included certain standards that must be met prior to the transfer of federal property. In 1992, CERCLA was amended to clarify that property could be transferred when a remedial action is in place and operating pursuant to an approved remedial design. This allows the transfer prior to complete remediation of contamination. *(source: 2005 BRAC Commission)*

CERFA

The Community Environmental Response Facilitation Act, which became law in October 1992, amends the statutory language of CERCLA Section 120(h) which deals with the transfer of federal property. CERFA contains provisions for the expedited identification and transfers of uncontaminated parcels at closing bases while long-term cleanup of contaminated parcels continues. *(source: 2005 BRAC Commission)*

Certified data

P.L. 101-510, section 2903 (c)(5), requires specified DoD personnel to certify to the best of their knowledge and belief that information provided to the Secretary of Defense or the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission concerning the realignment or closure of a military installation is accurate and complete. *(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)*

Changes as a percent of employment (see also Total economic impact)

The result of dividing total job changes by economic area employment. The resulting calculation is a quantitative measure of how much a region's job or employment base will be affected by a particular BRAC action. *(source: 2005 Commission)*

Clean Air Act

The Clean Air Act refers to statutes and federal regulations upon which the nation's air pollution control program is based. The program is carried out by the Environmental Protection Agency and state regulatory programs. The program is based primarily on the 1970 version of the Act. The most recent comprehensive amendments were made in 1990. *(source: 1995 Commission Report)*

Close/Closure

A BRAC action in which all missions or activities of a certain installation have ceased or have been relocated. All personnel positions (military, civilian, and contractor) will either be eliminated or relocated, except for personnel required for caretaking, conducting any ongoing environmental cleanup and disposal of the base, or remaining in authorized enclaves. *(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)*

Close, Except

The vast majority of the missions at an installation will cease or be relocated. Almost all military, civilian, and contractor personnel jobs will be either eliminated or relocated. All but a small portion of the base will be declared excess, and the property disposed. The small portion retained will often be facilities in an enclave for use by the reserve components, or a specialized facility that is expensive and/or difficult to rebuild elsewhere. Generally, active component management of the base will cease. Outlying, unmanned ranges or training areas retained for reserve component use do not count against the small portion retained. Closure (missions ceasing or relocating) and property disposal are separate actions under Public Law 101-510. *(source: 1995 Commission Report)*

COBRA

An acronym for the Cost of Base Realignment Actions model, which is an analytical tool for estimating the costs and savings associated with the execution of a realignment or closure action. COBRA provides a consistent and auditable method of evaluating and comparing different courses of proposed actions in terms of the resulting economic impacts for those costs and savings measured in the model. The model calculates the one-time costs, annual recurring costs/savings, return on investment, and 20-year net present value of each action. *(source: 1995 Commission Report and COBRA Users Manual)*

COBRA Application

This is the actual software (computer program) which processes data and performs "COBRA runs," or data analysis. *(source: 2005 Commission)*

Commission

The independent Commission established by section 2902 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended (P.L. 101-510). The formal name of the Commission is the "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission" (DBCRC). However, it is common for the DBCRC to be referred to colloquially as the "BRAC Commission." Commissions are usually specified further by the year in which they operated and issued their final recommendations. Thus, the 2005 BRAC Commission had nine Commissioners, while the 1991, 1993, and 1995 Commissions had eight Commissioners, and the 1988 Commission had twelve. *(source: Base Closure Law; 2005 Commission)*

Community Preference

Section 2914(b)(2) of BRAC requires the Secretary of Defense to consider any notice received from a local government in the vicinity of a military installation that the local government would approve of the closure or realignment of the installation. *(Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)*

Congressional Defense Committees

The Committees and Subcommittees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, which authorize and appropriate funding for the Department of Defense. *(Base Closure Statute; 2005 Commission)*

Counties

The legal districts into which a state is divided. These districts may include geographic areas such as cities, boroughs, or municipalities. *(source: 2005 Commission)*

Data certification

Section 2903 (c)(5) of the base closure law requires specified DoD personnel to certify to the best of their knowledge and belief that information provided to the Secretary of Defense or the 2005 Commission concerning the realignment or closure of a military installation is accurate and complete.
(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)

Disestablish

Term used to describe a planned action which eliminates missions, units, or activities. Fighter wings are inactivated, and/or a mission at a base is terminated. In some cases, a "disestablished" mission does not directly translate into lost jobs for a community because the personnel are simply reassigned to new or different missions at the same installation. *(source: Department of Defense; 1995 Commission Report)*

Economic area

An area or region of influence assigned to each installation for BRAC 2005. DoD used the Office of Management and Budget's definitions for Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), Micropolitan Statistical Areas (MISAs), or Metropolitan Division as its economic areas in BRAC 2005. *(source: 1995 Commission Report; 2005 Commission)*

Economic Development Administration

The EDA, which is a part of the Department of Commerce, is authorized to provide economic development grants to help communities implement their economic development plans. The EDA's grants and technical assistance are particularly important for communities which have experienced a base closure or significant realignment. *(source: 1995 Commission Report)*

Employment

Total employment (total number of jobs, both part-time and full-time jobs) in the economic area in calendar year 2002, the latest year available when the BRAC 2005 Economic Impact Tool was developed. Employment data are compiled by the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis. *(source: 2005 Commission)*

Enclave

A smaller section of a military installation that remains intact after part is closed or realigned and that will continue with its current role and functions subject to specific modifications. *(source: 1995 Commission Report)*

Force Structure/Force Structure Plan

Numbers, size, and composition of the units that make up the U.S. defense forces; e.g., divisions, ships, air wings, aircraft, tanks. *(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)*

Gain, Receiving Base

A base which receives additional missions, units, or activities that are being relocated from a closing or realigning base. In cases where the base is both gaining and losing missions, the base is a gainer or receiving base if it will experience a total net increase of military and civilian personnel. *(source: Department of Defense; 1995 Commission Report)*

Inactivate, Mothball, Layaway

Terms used when retention of facilities and real estate at a closing or realigning base is necessary to meet the future mobilization, surge, or contingency needs of the Department of Defense. Bases, or portions of bases, that are considered mothballed will not be excessed and disposed. It is possible they could be leased for interim economic uses. Congress sharply limited the ability of the Department to inactivate bases during the 2005 BRAC round. *(source: Department of Defense; 1995 Commission Report; 2005 Commission)*

In Civ

The number of civilian personnel authorizations relocating into the installation from another economic area. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

In Mil

The number of military personnel authorizations relocating into the installation from another economic area. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

Indirect Changes

The sum of estimated indirect and induced job changes in the community associated with the change in total direct jobs.

- Indirect job changes are the net gain or loss of local non-government jobs supporting installation material, service, and infrastructure needs, such as local motor pool parts distributors or base operations support (BOS) contractors.
- Induced job changes are the net addition or loss of local non-government jobs in industries that provide goods or services to the households of direct or indirect installation employees. Examples are local grocery stores, retail stores, and restaurants.

(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)

Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC)

One of two senior groups established by the Secretary of Defense to oversee and operate the BRAC 2005 process. The Infrastructure Executive Council, chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and composed of the Secretaries of the Military Departments and their Chiefs of Services, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (or USD (AT&L)), was the policy-making and oversight body for the entire DoD portion of the BRAC 2005 process.
(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)

Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG)

The subordinate of two senior groups established by the Secretary of Defense to oversee and operate the DoD portion of the BRAC 2005 process. The Infrastructure Steering Group, chaired by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (i.e., USD (AT&L)), and composed of the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Military Department Assistant Secretaries for installations and environment (I&E), the Service Vice Chiefs, and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations & Environment (i.e., DUSD (I&E)), oversaw joint cross-service analyses of common business-oriented functions and ensured the integration of that process with the Military Department and Defense Agency specific analyses of all other functions. *(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)*

Installation, (AKA Facility or Base)

A military base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility for any ship, or other activity under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, including leased space, that is controlled by, or primarily supports, DoD's activities. *(Source: Base Closure Law)*

Joint Process Action Team (JPAT)

An entity created by the Department of Defense to assist the Department with the 2005 BRAC process. The Department established four Joint Process Action Teams (JPATs). Each JPAT (named for the selection criterion on which it worked) was tasked to develop procedures, analytical tools, and databases to facilitate a common analytical approach to the four nonmilitary value selection criteria. JPAT 5 focused on the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) model and was chaired by the Army. JPAT 6, Economic Impact, was chaired by the Office of the Secretary of Defense; JPAT 7, Community Infrastructure Impact, was chaired by the Air Force; and JPAT 8, Environmental Impact, was chaired by the Navy. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

Losing installation

An installation from which missions, units, or activities would cease or be relocated pursuant to a closure or realignment recommendation. An installation can be a losing installation for one recommendation and a receiving installation for a different recommendation. *(source: Government Accountability Office, GAO-05-785 Military Bases)*

Metropolitan Division

A Metropolitan Division, in general, is smaller than a metropolitan statistical area (MSA). A Metropolitan Division is a portion of an MSA whose core population is at least 2.5 million, which has been subdivided to form smaller groupings of counties. In the latest redefinition round (November 2004), OMB identified 29 Metropolitan Divisions in the United States and Puerto Rico. *(source: 2005 Commission)*

Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)

The U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB), under the White House, develops standards that define metropolitan and micropolitan statistical areas (MSAs and MISAs) for the purpose of collecting demographic and economic data, based on a combination of population density and commuter patterns. The basic components of these areas are counties or county-equivalents, such as cities, municipalities, or townships. *(source: 2005 Commission)*

An MSA must have at least one urban area with at least 50,000 people, plus adjacent counties that have strong social and economic integration with the core, as measured by commuting patterns. In the latest redefinition round (November 2004), OMB identified 369 MSAs in the United States and Puerto Rico. *(source: 2005 Commission)*

Micropolitan Statistical Area (MISA)

An MISA has a definition similar to that of an MSA except that it has a smaller urban area as its core (population of 10,000 to 50,000 people). In the latest redefinition round (November 2004), OMB identified 578 MISAs in the United States and Puerto Rico. *(source: 2005 Commission)*

Military Departments

The Military Departments are the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, which includes the Marine Corps, and Department of the Air Force.
(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)

Military value

Referring to one or more of the first four BRAC selection criteria, which are collectively referred to as the military value criteria and are expected to receive priority consideration in the analytical process that results in recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations within the United States. *(source: Government Accountability Office, GAO-05-785, Military Bases)*

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Analysis

An analysis conducted to evaluate an installation's disposal decisions in terms of the environmental impact. The NEPA analysis is useful to the community's planning efforts and the installation's property disposal decisions. It is used to support DoD decisions on transferring property for community reuse.
(source: Department of Defense: http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)

Net Gain/(Loss) Civ

The net change in the number of civilian personnel authorizations by installation. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

Net Gain/(Loss) Mil

The net change in the number of military personnel authorizations by installation. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

Net mission contractors, aka Non-government personnel

The net change in the number of non-government employees who perform one or more of the military missions on the installation, and whose work tasks are virtually identical to those of government civilian employees or military personnel, expressed in full-time equivalents. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

Net present value (20-Year)

The present value of future costs of a scenario, discounted at the appropriate rate, minus the present value of future savings from the scenario over a 20-year planning period. In the context of BRAC, net present value is taking into account the time value of money in calculating the value of future cost and savings. *(source: Government Accountability Office, GAO-05-785, Military Bases)*

Office of Economic Adjustment

The OEA is an agency within the DoD that is in charge of helping communities plan for base closure and realignments. The Office also provides planning grants to impacted communities. *(source: 1995 Commission Report)*

One-time cost

Nonrecurring cost to implement BRAC recommendations. *(source: 1995 Commission Report)*

Out Civ

The number of civilian personnel authorizations that are either eliminated or relocated from the installation to a new location outside of their current economic area. Relocations within the same economic area do not constitute a BRAC economic impact. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

Out Mil

The number of military personnel authorizations that are either eliminated or relocated from the installation to a new location outside of their current economic area. Relocations within the same economic area do not constitute a BRAC economic impact. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

Payback period

The time required for cumulative estimated savings to exceed the cumulative estimated costs incurred in net present value terms as a result of implementing BRAC actions. *(source: Government Accountability Office, GAO-05-785, Military Bases)*

RCRA

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act was passed in 1976 and amended in 1984. RCRA provides cradle-to-grave control of hazardous waste by imposing management requirements on the military as generators and transporters of hazardous wastes and owners and operators of treatment, storage, and disposal facilities. The RCRA covers federal and private sites, and applies mainly to active facilities. The military can perform environmental cleanup under the Corrective Action portion of RCRA. *(source: 1995 Commission Report)*

Realignment

An action that both reduces and relocates functions and military/civilian personnel positions, but does not include a reduction in force resulting from workload adjustments, reduced personnel or funding levels, or skill imbalances. Only a

portion of the base may be excessed and the property disposed, with realignment (missions ceasing or relocating) and property disposal being separate actions under Public Law 101-510. In cases where the base is both gaining and losing missions, the base is being realigned if it will experience a net reduction of DoD military and/or civilian personnel. In such situations, it is possible that no property will be excessed. *(source: Base Closure Law; Department of Defense, http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsimweb/brac/definition.htm)*

Receiving Installation

An installation to which missions, units, or activities would be relocated pursuant to a closure or realignment recommendation. An installation can be a receiving installation for one recommendation and a losing installation for a different recommendation. *(source: Government Accountability Office, GAO-05-785, Military Bases)*

Redevelopment Authority (or Local Redevelopment Authority)

In the case of an installation to be closed or realigned under the base closure law, the term "redevelopment authority" means an entity (including an entity established by a State or local government) recognized by the Secretary of Defense as the entity responsible for developing the redevelopment plan with respect to the installation or for directing the implementation of such plan. *(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)*

Redevelopment Plan

In the case of an installation to be closed or realigned under the base closure law, the term "redevelopment plan" means a plan that (A) is agreed to by the local redevelopment authority with respect to the installation and (B) provides for the reuse or redevelopment of the real property and personal property of the installation that is available for such reuse and redevelopment as a result of the closure or realignment of the installation.
(source: http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)

Redirect

A recommendation from the Secretary of Defense, or a decision of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, to change a base closure or realignment decision made by a prior Commission. The term is generally used when the receiver installation is changed. There are no "redirect" actions to be taken by the 2005 BRAC Commission because all prior BRAC Commission final recommendations have already been implemented. *(source: 1995 Commission Report)*

Red Team

In the latter stages of the DoD portion of its BRAC analysis, the Department engaged a small group of executive-level former government officials to provide additional advice. Called the "Red Team," this group was asked to provide an independent assessment of candidate recommendations. The Red Team met with each Military Department and JCSG. It reviewed candidate recommendations, report drafts, and supporting materials. The team's insights, according to DoD, provided valuable feedback and suggestions for improving the quality of the candidate recommendation packages that the Secretary ultimately approved and sent to the Commission for review.
(source: Department of Defense; http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/minutes/brac_red_team.html)

Relocate

The term used to describe the movement of missions, units or activities from a closing or realigning base to another base. Units or missions do not realign from a closing or a realigning base to another base, they relocate. *(source: Department of Defense, http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsimweb/brac/definition.htm)*

Scenario Tracking Tool

The Scenario Tracking Tool was used by DoD during the Infrastructure Steering Group's (ISG's) de-confliction process. For this purpose, a *scenario* was defined as "a proposal that has been declared for formal analysis by a Military Department/JCSG deliberative body." The content of a scenario was the same as the content of a proposal. The only difference is that it had

been declared for analysis by a deliberative body. Once declared, a scenario was registered at the ISG by inputting it into the "ISG BRAC Scenario Tracking Tool," which is capable of showing all scenarios, as well as those that eventually became candidate recommendations. A *candidate recommendation* was defined as "a scenario that a JCSG or Military Department has formally analyzed against all eight selection criteria and which it recommended to the ISG and IEC respectively for SecDef approval. A JCSG candidate recommendation must be approved by the ISG, IEC, and SecDef before it becomes a recommendation. A Military Department candidate recommendation must be approved by the IEC and SecDef before it becomes a recommendation."

A final DoD *recommendation* was defined as "a candidate recommendation approved by the SecDef." The Commission has been tasked by Congress to review each DoD recommendation to see if it complied with, or substantially deviated from, the eight selection criteria. *(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/scenario-tracker/scenario-tracker.html)*

Secretary

The Secretary of Defense. (source: Base Closure Law)

Surge

A term incorporated in one of the military value selection criteria for the 2005 BRAC round: "the ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements." The term is not otherwise defined, and application of the term can vary by specific operational or support categories. *(source: Government Accountability Office, GAO-05-785, Military Bases)*

Total direct changes

The actual net changes in number of military, civilian, and non-government personnel authorizations by installation. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

Total economic impact (see also Indirect change and Change as a percent of employment)

An aggregation of economic effects or impact of a BRAC action on a particular installation. It includes both direct and indirect job changes, expressed as a percent of the total employment in the economic area. *(source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)*

Total job changes

The sum of the total direct and indirect changes entries. (source: Department of Defense, May 13, 2005, BRAC Report)

Transformation

According to the Department's April 2003 Transformation Planning Guidance document, transformation is "a process that shapes the changing nature of military competition and cooperation through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, people and organizations that exploit our nation's advantages and protect against our asymmetric vulnerabilities to sustain our strategic position, which helps underpin peace and stability in the world." *(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)*

United States

The entire Nation, which includes 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States. *(source: Department of Defense, http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/definitions_brac2005.html)*

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX C
BASE CLOSURE STATUTE

BRAC STATUTE—INDEX

SECTION NUMBER AND NAME	PAGE NUMBER
Section 2901: Short Title and Purpose	C-3
Section 2902: The Commission	C-3
Section 2903: Procedures for Making Recommendations for Base Closures and Realignments	C-6
Section 2904: Closure and Realignment of Military Installations	C-10
Section 2905: Implementation	C-11
Section 2906: Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990	C-27
Section 2906A: Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005	C-30
Section 2097: Reports	C-32
Section 2908 Congressional Consideration of Commission Report	C-32
Section 2909: Restriction on Other Base Closure Authority	C-34
Section 2910: Definitions	C-35
Section 2911: Clarifying Amendment	C-36
Section 2912: 2005 Round of Realignments and Closures of Military Installations	C-36
Section 2913: Selection Criteria for the 2005 Round	C-38
Section 2914: Special Procedures for Making Recommendations or Realignments and Closures for 2005 Round; Commission Consideration of Recommendations	C-39

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACT OF 1990

(As amended through FY 05 Authorization Act)

SEC. 2901. SHORT TITLE AND PURPOSE

(a) SHORT TITLE.--This part may be cited as the "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990".

(b) PURPOSE.--The purpose of this part is to provide a fair process that will result in the timely closure and realignment of military installations inside the United States.

SEC. 2902. THE COMMISSION

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.--There is established an independent commission to be known as the "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission".

(b) DUTIES.--The Commission shall carry out the duties specified for it in this part.

(c) APPOINTMENT.--(1)(A) The Commission shall be composed of eight members appointed by the President, by and with the advise and consent of the Senate.

(B) The President shall transmit to the Senate the nominations for appointment to the Commission--

(i) by no later than January 3, 1991, in the case of members of the Commission whose terms will expire at the end of the first session of the 102nd Congress;

(ii) by no later than January 25, 1993, in the case of members of the Commission whose terms will expire at the end of the first session of the 103rd Congress; and

(iii) by no later than January 3, 1995, in the case of members of the Commission whose terms will expire at the end of the first session of the 104th Congress.

(C) If the President does not transmit to Congress the nominations for appointment to the Commission on or before the date specified for 1993 in clause (ii) of subparagraph (B) or for 1995 in clause (iii) of such subparagraph, the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this part with respect to that year shall be terminated.

(2) In selecting individuals for nominations for appointments to the Commission, the President should consult with--

(A) the Speaker of the House of Representatives concerning the appointment of two members;

(B) the majority leader of the Senate concerning the appointment of two members;

(C) the minority leader of the House of Representatives concerning the appointment of one member; and

(D) the minority leader of the Senate concerning the appointment of one member.

(3) At the time the President nominates individuals for appointment to the Commission for each session of Congress referred to in paragraph (1)(B), the President shall designate one such individual who shall serve as Chairman of the Commission.

(d) TERMS.--(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), each member of the Commission shall serve until the adjournment of Congress sine die for the session during which the member was appointed to the Commission.

(2) The Chairman of the Commission shall serve until the confirmation of a successor.

(e) MEETINGS.--(1) The Commission shall meet only during calendar years 1991, 1993, and 1995.

(2)(A) Each meeting of the Commission, other than meetings in which classified information is to be discussed, shall be open to the public.

(B) All the proceedings, information, and deliberations of the Commission shall be open, upon request, to the following:

(i) The Chairman and the ranking minority party member of the Subcommittee on Readiness, Sustainability, and Support of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, or such other members of the Subcommittee designated by such Chairman or ranking minority party member.

(ii) The Chairman and the ranking minority party member of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, or such other members of the Subcommittee designated by such Chairman or ranking minority party member.

(iii) The Chairmen and ranking minority party members of the Subcommittees on Military Construction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, or such other members of the Subcommittees designated by such Chairmen or ranking minority party members.

(f) VACANCIES.--A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment, but the individual appointed to fill the vacancy shall serve only for the unexpired portion of the term for which the individual's predecessor was appointed.

(g) PAY AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.--(1)(A) Each member, other than the Chairman, shall be paid at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(B) The Chairman shall be paid for each day referred to in subparagraph (A) at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314, of title 5, United States Code.

(2) Members shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) DIRECTOR OF STAFF.--(1) The Commission shall, without regard to section 5311(b) of title 5, United States Code, appoint a Director who has not served on active duty in the Armed Forces or as a civilian employee of the Department of Defense during the one-year period preceding the date of such appointment.

(2) The Director shall be paid at the rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive

Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

(i) STAFF.--(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Director, with the approval of the Commission, may appoint and fix the pay of additional personnel.

(2) The Director may make such appointments without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and any personnel so appointed may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that an individual so appointed may not receive pay in excess of the annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-18 of the General Schedule.

(3)(A) Not more than one-third of the personnel employed by or detailed to the Commission may be on detail from the Department of Defense.

(B)(i) Not more than one-fifth of the professional analysts of the Commission staff may be persons detailed from the Department of Defense to the Commission.

(ii) No person detailed from the Department of Defense to the Commission may be assigned as the lead professional analyst with respect to a military department or defense agency.

(C) A person may not be detailed from the Department of Defense to the Commission if, within 12 months before the detail is to begin, that person participated personally and substantially in any matter within the Department of Defense concerning the preparation of recommendations for closures or realignments of military installations.

(D) No member of the Armed Forces, and no officer or employee of the Department of Defense, may--

(i) prepare any report concerning the effectiveness, fitness, or efficiency of the performance on the staff of the Commission of any person detailed from the Department of Defense to that staff;

(ii) review the preparation of such a report; or

(iii) approve or disapprove such a report.

(4) Upon request of the Director, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail any of the personnel of that department or agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this part.

(5) The Comptroller General of the United States shall provide assistance, including the detailing of employees, to the Commission in accordance with an agreement entered into with the Commission.

(6) The following restrictions relating to the personnel of the Commission shall apply during 1992 and 1994:

(A) There may not be more than 15 persons on the staff at any one time.

(B) The staff may perform only such functions as are necessary to prepare for the transition to new membership on the Commission in the following year.

(C) No member of the Armed Forces and no employee of the Department of Defense may serve on the staff.

(j) OTHER AUTHORITY.--(1) The Commission may procure by contract, to the extent funds are available, the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) The Commission may lease space and acquire personal property to the extent funds are available.

(k) FUNDING.--(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such funds as are necessary to carry out its duties under this part. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

(2) If no funds are appropriated to the Commission by the end of the second session of the 101st Congress, the Secretary of Defense may transfer, for fiscal year 1991, to the Commission funds from the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207 of Public Law 100-526. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

(3)(A) The Secretary may transfer not more than $300,000 from unobligated funds in the account referred to in subparagraph (B) for the purpose of assisting the Commission in carrying out its duties under this part during October, November, and December 1995. Funds transferred under the preceding sentence shall remain available until December 31, 1995.

(B) The account referred to in subparagraph (A) is the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established under section 207(a) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(l) TERMINATION.--The Commission shall terminate on December 31, 1995.

(m) PROHIBITION AGAINST RESTRICTING COMMUNICATIONS.--Section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, shall apply with respect to communications with the Commission.

SEC. 2903. PROCEDURE FOR MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS

(a) FORCE-STRUCTURE PLAN.--(1) As part of the budget justification documents submitted to Congress in support of the budget for the Department of Defense for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1994, and 1996, the Secretary shall include a force-structure plan for the Armed Forces based on an assessment by the Secretary of the probable threats to the national security during the six-year period beginning with the fiscal year for which the budget request is made and of the anticipated levels of funding that will be available for national defense purposes during such period.

(2) Such plan shall include, without any reference (directly or indirectly) to military installations inside the United States that may be closed or realigned under such plan--

(A) a description of the assessment referred to in paragraph (1);

(B) a description (i) of the anticipated force structure during and at the end of such period for each military department (with specifications of the number and type of units in the active and reserve forces of each such department), and (ii) of the units that will need to be forward based (with a justification thereof) during and at the end of each such period; and

(C) a description of the anticipated implementation of such force-structure plan.

(3) The Secretary shall also transmit a copy of each such force-structure plan to the Commission.

(b) SELECTION CRITERIA.--(1) The Secretary shall, by no later than December 31, 1990, publish in the *Federal Register* and transmit to the congressional defense committees the criteria proposed to be used by the Department of Defense in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part. The Secretary shall provide an opportunity for public comment on the proposed criteria for a period of at least 30 days and shall include notice of that opportunity in the publication required under the preceding sentence.

(2)(A) The Secretary shall, by no later than February 15, 1991, publish in the *Federal Register* and transmit to the congressional defense committees the final criteria to be used in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part. Except as provided in subparagraph (B), such criteria shall be the final criteria to be used, making such recommendations unless disapproved by a joint resolution of Congress enacted on or before March 15, 1991.

(B) The Secretary may amend such criteria, but such amendments may not become effective until they have been published in the *Federal Register*, opened to public comment for at least 30 days, and then transmitted to the congressional defense committees in final form by no later than January 15 of the year concerned. Such amended criteria shall be the final criteria to be used, along with the force-structure plan referred to in subsection (a), in making such recommendations unless disapproved by a joint resolution of Congress enacted on or before February 15 of the year concerned.

(c) DOD RECOMMENDATIONS.--(1) The Secretary may, by no later than April 15, 1991, March 15, 1993, and March 1, 1995, publish in the *Federal Register* and transmit to the congressional defense committees and to the Commission a list of the military installations inside the United States that the Secretary recommends for closure or realignment on the basis of the force-structure plan and the final criteria referred to in subsection (b)(2) that are applicable to the year concerned.

(2) The Secretary shall include, with the list of recommendations published and transmitted pursuant to paragraph (1), a summary of the selection process that resulted in the recommendation for each installation, including a justification for each recommendation. The Secretary shall transmit the matters referred to in the preceding sentence not later than 7 days after the date of the transmittal to the congressional defense committees and the Commission of the list referred to in paragraph (1).

(3)(A) In considering military installations for closure or realignment, the Secretary shall consider all military installations inside the United States equally without regard to whether the installation has been previously considered or proposed for closure or realignment by the Department.

(B) In considering military installations for closure or realignment, the Secretary may not take into account for any purpose any advance conversion planning undertaken by an affected community with respect to the anticipated closure or realignment of an installation.

(C) For purposes of subparagraph (B), in the case of a community anticipating the economic effects of a closure or realignment of a military installation, advance conversion planning--

(i) shall include community adjustment and economic diversification planning undertaken by the community before an anticipated selection of a military installation in or near the community for closure or realignment; and

(ii) may include the development of contingency redevelopment plans, plans for economic development and diversification, and plans for the joint use (including civilian and military use, public and private use, civilian dual use, and civilian shared use) of the property or facilities of the installation after the anticipated closure or realignment.

(4) In addition to making all information used by the Secretary to prepare the recommendations under this subsection available to Congress (including any committee or member of Congress), the Secretary shall also make such information available to the Commission and the Comptroller General of the United States.

(5)(A) Each person referred to in subparagraph (B), when submitting information to the Secretary of Defense or the Commission concerning the closure or realignment of a military installation, shall certify that such information is accurate and complete to the best of that persons knowledge and belief.

(B) Subparagraph (A) applies to the following persons:

(i) The Secretaries of the military departments.

(ii) The heads of the Defense Agencies.

(iii) Each person who is in a position the duties of which include personal and substantial involvement in the preparation and submission of information and recommendations concerning the closure or realignment of military installations, as designated in regulations which the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe, regulations which the Secretary of each military department shall prescribe for personnel within that military department, or regulations which the head of each Defense Agency shall prescribe for personnel within that Defense Agency.

(6) Any information provided to the Commission by a person described in paragraph (5)(B) shall also be submitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives to be made available to the Members of the House concerned in accordance with the rules of that House. The information shall be submitted to the Senate and House of Representatives within 24 hours after the submission of the information to the Commission.

(d) REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE COMMISSION.--(1) After receiving the recommendations from the Secretary pursuant to subsection (c) for any year, the Commission shall conduct public hearings on the recommendations. All testimony before the Commission at a public hearing conducted under this paragraph shall be presented under oath. [*The preceding sentence shall apply with respect to all public hearings conducted by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission after November 30, 1993.*]

(2)(A) The Commission shall, by no later than July 1 of each year in which the Secretary transmits recommendations to it pursuant to subsection (c), transmit to the President a report containing the Commission's findings and conclusions based on a review and analysis of the recommendations made by the Secretary, together with the Commission's recommendations for closures and realignments of military installations inside the United States.

(B) Subject to subparagraph (C), in making its recommendations, the Commission may make changes in any of the recommendations made by the Secretary if the Commission

determines that the Secretary deviated substantially from the force-structure plan and final criteria referred to in subsection (c)(1) in making recommendations.

(C) In the case of a change described in subparagraph (D) in the recommendations made by the Secretary, the Commission may make the change only if the Commission--

(i) makes the determination required by subparagraph (B);

(ii) determines that the change is consistent with the force-structure plan and final criteria referred to in subsection (c)(1);

(iii) publishes a notice of the proposed change in the *Federal Register* not less than 45 days before transmitting its recommendations to the President pursuant to paragraph (2); and

(iv) conducts public hearings on the proposed change.

(D) Subparagraph (C) shall apply to a change by the Commission in the Secretary's recommendations that would--

(i) add a military installation to the list of military installations recommended by the Secretary for closure;

(ii) add a military installation to the list of military installations recommended by the Secretary for realignment; or

(iii) increase the extent of a realignment of a particular military installation recommended by the Secretary.

(E) In making recommendations under this paragraph, the Commission may not take into account for any purpose any advance conversion planning undertaken by an affected community with respect to the anticipated closure or realignment of a military installation.

(3) The Commission shall explain and justify in its report submitted to the President pursuant to paragraph (2) any recommendation made by the Commission that is different from the recommendations made by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (c). The Commission shall transmit a copy of such report to the congressional defense committees on the same date on which it transmits its recommendations to the President under paragraph (2).

(4) After July 1 of each year in which the Commission transmits recommendations to the President under this subsection, the Commission shall promptly provide, upon request, to any Member of Congress information used by the Commission in making its recommendations.

(5) The Comptroller General of the United States shall--

(A) assist the Commission, to the extent requested, in the Commission's review and analysis of the recommendations made by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (C); and

(B) by no later than April 15 of each year in which the Secretary makes such recommendations, transmit to the Congress and to the Commission a report containing a detailed analysis of the Secretary's recommendations and selection process.

(e) REVIEW BY THE PRESIDENT.--(1) The President shall, by no later than July 15 of each year in which the Commission makes recommendations under subsection (d), transmit to the Commission and to the Congress a report containing the President's approval or disapproval of the Commission's recommendations.

(2) If the President approves all the recommendations of the Commission, the President shall transmit a copy of such recommendations to the Congress, together with a certification of

such approval.

(3) If the President disapproves the recommendations of the Commission, in whole or in part, the President shall transmit to the Commission and the Congress the reasons for that disapproval. The Commission shall then transmit to the President, by no later than August 15 of the year concerned, a revised list of recommendations for the closure and realignment of military installations.

(4) If the President approves all of the revised recommendations of the Commission transmitted to the President under paragraph (3), the President shall transmit a copy of such revised recommendations to the Congress, together with a certification of such approval.

(5) If the President does not transmit to the Congress an approval and certification described in paragraph (2) or (4) by September 1 of any year in which the Commission has transmitted recommendations to the President under this part, the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this part with respect to that year shall be terminated.

SEC. 2904. CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

(a) IN GENERAL.--Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall--

(1) close all military installations recommended for closure by the Commission in each report transmitted to the Congress by the President pursuant to section 2903(e);

(2) realign all military installations recommended for realignment by such Commission in each such report;

(3) carry out the privatization in place of a military installation recommended for closure or realignment by the Commission in the 2005 report only if privatization in place is a method of closure or realignment of the military installation specified in the recommendations of the Commission in such report and is determined by the Commission to be the most cost-effective method of implementation of the recommendation;

(4) initiate all such closures and realignments no later than two years after the date on which the President transmits a report to the Congress pursuant to section 2903(e) containing the recommendations for such closures or realignments; and

(5) complete all such closures and realignments no later than the end of the six-year period beginning on the date on which the President transmits the report pursuant to section 2903(e) containing the recommendations for such closures or realignments.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL.--(1) The Secretary may not carry out any closure or realignment recommended by the Commission in a report transmitted from the President pursuant to section 2903(e) if a joint resolution is enacted, in accordance with the provisions of section 2908: disapproving such recommendations of the Commission before the earlier of--

(A) the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date on which the President transmits such report; or

(B) the adjournment of Congress sine die for the session during which such report is transmitted.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection and subsections (a) and (c) of section 2908, the days on which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of

more than three days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of a period.

SEC. 2905. IMPLEMENTATION

(a) IN GENERAL.--(1) In closing or realigning any military installation under this part, the Secretary may—

(A) take such actions as may be necessary to close or realign any military installation, including the acquisition of such land, the construction of such replacement facilities, the performance of such activities, and the conduct of such advance planning and design as may be required to transfer functions from a military installation being closed or realigned to another military installation, and may use for such purpose funds in the Account or funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for use in planning and design, minor construction, or operation and maintenance;

(B) provide--

(i) economic adjustment assistance to any community located near a military installation being closed or realigned, and

(ii) community planning assistance to any community located near a military installation to which functions will be transferred as a result of the closure or realignment of a military installation, if the Secretary of Defense determines that the financial resources available to the community (by grant or otherwise) for such purposes are inadequate, and may use for such purposes funds in the Account or funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for economic adjustment assistance or community planning assistance;

(C) carry out activities for the purposes of environmental restoration and mitigation at any such installation, and shall use for such purposes funds in the Account. [*Amendments to this subsection took effect on December 5, 1991.*]

(D) provide outplacement assistance to civilian employees employed by the Department of Defense at military installations being closed or realigned, and may use for such purpose funds in the Account or funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for outplacement assistance to employees; and

(E) reimburse other Federal agencies for actions performed at the request of the Secretary with respect to any such closure or realignment, and may use for such purpose funds in the Account or funds appropriated to the Department of Defense and available for such purpose.

(2) In carrying out any closure or realignment under this part, the Secretary shall ensure that environmental restoration of any property made excess to the needs of the Department of Defense as a result of such closure or realignment be carried out as soon as possible with funds available for such purpose.

(b) MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY.--(1) The Administrator of General Services shall delegate to the Secretary of Defense, with respect to excess and surplus real property, facilities, and personal property located at a military installation closed or realigned under this part--

(A) the authority of the Administrator to utilize excess property under subchapter

II of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code;

(B) the authority of the Administrator to dispose of surplus property under subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code;

(C) the authority to dispose of surplus property for public airports under sections 47151 through 47153 of title 49, United States Code; and

(D) the authority of the Administrator to determine the availability of excess or surplus real property for wildlife conservation purposes in accordance with the Act of May 19, 1948 (16 U.S.C. 667b).

(2)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B) and paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), the Secretary of Defense shall exercise the authority delegated to the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1) in accordance with--

(i) all regulations governing the utilization of excess property and the disposal of surplus property under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and

(ii) all regulations governing the conveyance and disposal of property under section 13(g) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(g)).

(B) The Secretary may, with the concurrence of the Administrator of General Services--

(i) prescribe general policies and methods for utilizing excess property and disposing of surplus property pursuant to the authority delegated under paragraph (1); and

(ii) issue regulations relating to such policies and methods, which shall supersede the regulations referred to in subparagraph (A) with respect to that authority.

(C) The Secretary of Defense may transfer real property or facilities located at a military installation to be closed or realigned under this part, with or without reimbursement, to a military department or other entity (including a nonappropriated fund instrumentality) within the Department of Defense or the Coast Guard.

(D) Before any action may be taken with respect to the disposal of any surplus real property or facility located at any military installation to be closed or realigned under this part, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Governor of the State and the heads of the local governments concerned for the purpose of considering any plan for the use of such property by the local community concerned.

(E) If a military installation to be closed, realigned, or placed in an inactive status under this part includes a road used for public access through, into, or around the installation, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Governor of the State and the heads of the local governments concerned or the purpose of considering the continued availability of the road for public use after the installation is closed, realigned, or placed in an inactive status.

(3)(A) Not later than 6 months after the date of approval of the closure or realignment of a military installation under this part, the Secretary, in consultation with the redevelopment authority with respect to the installation, shall--

(i) inventory the personal property located at the installation; and

(ii) identify the items (or categories of items) of such personal property that the Secretary determines to be related to real property and anticipates will support the implementation of the redevelopment plan with respect to the installation.

(B) If no redevelopment authority referred to in subparagraph (A) exists with respect to an installation, the Secretary shall consult with--

(i) the local government in whose jurisdiction the installation is wholly located; or

3(ii) a local government agency or State government agency designated for the purpose of such consultation by the chief executive officer of the State in which the installation is located.

(C)(i) Except as provided in subparagraphs (E) and (F), the Secretary may not carry out any of the activities referred to in clause (ii) with respect to an installation referred to in that clause until the earlier of--

(I) one week after the date on which the redevelopment plan for the installation is submitted to the Secretary;

(II) the date on which the redevelopment authority notifies the Secretary that it will not submit such a plan;

(III) twenty-four months after the date of approval of the closure or realignment of the installation; or

(IV) ninety days before the date of the closure or realignment of the installation.

(ii) The activities referred to in clause (i) are activities relating to the closure or realignment of an installation to be closed or realigned under this part as follows:

(I) The transfer from the installation of items of personal property at the installation identified in accordance with subparagraph (A).

(II) The reduction in maintenance and repair of facilities or equipment located at the installation below the minimum levels required to support the use of such facilities or equipment for nonmilitary purposes.

(D) Except as provided in paragraph (4), the Secretary may not transfer items of personal property located at an installation to be closed or realigned under this part to another installation, or dispose of such items, if such items are identified in the redevelopment plan for the installation as items essential to the reuse or redevelopment of the installation. In connection with the development of the redevelopment plan for the installation, the Secretary shall consult with the entity responsible for developing the redevelopment plan to identify the items of personal property located at the installation, if any, that the entity desires to be retained at the installation for reuse or redevelopment of the installation.

(E) This paragraph shall not apply to any personal property located at an installation to be closed or realigned under this part if the property--

(i) is required for the operation of a unit, function, component, weapon, or weapons system at another installation;

(ii) is uniquely military in character, and is likely to have no civilian use (other than use for its material content or as a source of commonly used components);

(iii) is not required for the reutilization or redevelopment of the installation (as jointly determined by the Secretary and the redevelopment authority);

(iv) is stored at the installation for purposes of distribution (including spare parts or stock items); or

(v)(I) meets known requirements of an authorized program of another Federal department or agency for which expenditures for similar property would be necessary, and (II) is the subject of a written request by the head of the department or agency.

(F) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (C)(i) and (D), the Secretary may carry out any activity referred to in subparagraph (C)(ii) or (D) if the Secretary determines that the carrying out

of such activity is in the national security interest of the United States.

(4)(A) The Secretary may transfer real property and personal property located at a military installation to be closed or realigned under this part to the redevelopment authority with respect to the installation for purposes of job generation on the installation.

(B) With respect to military installations for which the date of approval of closure or realignment is after January 1, 2005, the Secretary shall seek to obtain consideration in connection with any transfer under this paragraph of property located at the installation in an amount equal to the fair market value of the property, as determined by the Secretary. The transfer of property of a military installation under subparagraph (A) may be without consideration if the redevelopment authority with respect to the installation—

(i) agrees that the proceeds from any sale or lease of the property (or any portion thereof) received by the redevelopment authority during at least the first seven years after the date of the initial transfer of property under subparagraph (A) shall be used to support the economic redevelopment of, or related to, the installation; and

(ii) executes the agreement for transfer of the property and accepts control of the property within a reasonable time after the date of the property disposal record of decision or finding of no significant impact under the National Environmental policy act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(C) For purposes of subparagraph (B), the use of proceeds from a sale or lease described in such subparagraph to pay for, or offset the costs of, public investment on or related to the installation for any of the following purposes shall be considered a use to support the economic redevelopment of, or related to, the installation:

(i) Road construction.
(ii) Transportation management facilities.
(iii) Storm and sanitary sewer construction.
(iv) Police and fire protection facilities and other public facilities.
(v) Utility construction.
(vi) Building rehabilitation.
(vii) Historic property preservation.
(viii) Pollution prevention equipment or facilities.
(ix) Demolition.
(x) Disposal of hazardous materials generated by demolition.
(xi) Landscaping, grading, and other site or public improvements.
(xii) Planning for or the marketing of the development and reuse of the installation.

(D) The Secretary may recoup from a redevelopment authority such portion of the proceeds from a sale or lease described in subparagraph (B) as the Secretary determines appropriate if the redevelopment authority does not use the proceeds to support economic redevelopment of, or related to, the installation for the period specified in subparagraph (B).

(E)(i) The Secretary may transfer real property at an installation approved for closure or realignment under this part (including property at an installation approved for realignment which will be retained by the Department of Defense or another Federal agency after realignment) to the redevelopment authority for the installation if the redevelopment authority agrees to lease, directly upon transfer, one or more portions of the property transferred under this subparagraph to the Secretary or to the head of another department or agency of the Federal Government.

Subparagraph (B) shall apply to a transfer under this subparagraph.

(ii) A lease under clause (i) shall be for a term of not to exceed 50 years, but may provide for options for renewal or extension of the term by the department or agency concerned.

(iii) A lease under clause (i) may not require rental payments by the United States.

(iv) A lease under clause (i) shall include a provision specifying that if the department or agency concerned ceases requiring the use of the leased property before the expiration of the term of the lease, the remainder of the lease term may be satisfied by the same or another department or agency of the Federal Government using the property for a use similar to the use under the lease. Exercise of the authority provided by this clause shall be made in consultation with the redevelopment authority concerned.

(v) Notwithstanding clause (iii), if a lease under clause (i) involves a substantial portion of the installation, the department or agency concerned may obtain facility services for the leased property and common area maintenance from the redevelopment authority or the redevelopment authority's assignee as a provision of the lease. The facility services and common area maintenance shall be provided at a rate no higher than the rate charged to non-Federal tenants of the transferred property. Facility services and common area maintenance covered by the lease shall not include—

(I) municipal services that a State or local government is required by law to provide to all landowners in its jurisdiction without direct charge; or

(II) firefighting or security-guard functions.

(F) The transfer of personal property under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the provisions of subchapters II and III of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, if the Secretary determines that the transfer of such property is necessary for the effective implementation of a redevelopment plan with respect to the installation at which such property is located.

(G) The provisions of section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)) shall apply to any transfer of real property under this paragraph.

(H)(i) In the case of an agreement for the transfer of property of a military installation under this paragraph that was entered into before April 21, 1999, the Secretary may modify the agreement, and in so doing compromise, waive, adjust, release, or reduce any right, title, claim, lien, or demand of the United States, if—

(I) the Secretary determines that as a result of changed economic circumstances, a modification of the agreement is necessary;

(II) the terms of the modification do not require the return of any payments that have been made to the Secretary;

(III) the terms of the modification do not compromise, waive, adjust, release, or reduce an right, title, claim, lien, or demand of the United States with respect to in-kind consideration; and

(IV) the cash consideration to which the United States is entitled under the modified agreement, when combined with the cash consideration to be received by the United States for the disposal of other real property assets on the installation, are as sufficient as they were under the original agreement to fund the reserve account established under section 204(b)(7)(C) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act, with the depreciated value of the investment made

with commissary store funds or nonappropriated funds in property disposed of pursuant to the agreement being modified, in accordance with section 2906(d).

(ii) When exercising the authority granted by clause (i), the Secretary may waive some or all future payments if, and to the extent that, the Secretary determines such waiver is necessary.

(iii) With the exception of the requirement that the transfer be without consideration, the requirements of subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) shall be applicable to any agreement modified pursuant to clause (i).

(I) In the case of an agreement for the transfer of property of a military installation under this paragraph that was entered into during the period beginning on April 21, 1999, and ending on the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, at the request of the redevelopment authority concerned, the Secretary shall modify the agreement to conform to all the requirements of subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D). Such a modification may include the compromise, waiver, adjustment, release, or reduction of any right, title, claim, lien, or demand of the United States under the agreement.

(J) The Secretary may require any additional terms and conditions in connection with a transfer under this paragraph as such Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(5)(A) Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Secretary shall take such actions as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure that final determinations under paragraph (1) regarding whether another department or agency of the Federal Government has identified a use for any portion of a military installation to be closed or realigned under this part, or will accept transfer of any portion of such installation, are made not later than 6 months after the date of approval of closure or realignment of that installation.

(B) The Secretary may, in consultation with the redevelopment authority with respect to an installation, postpone making the final determinations referred to in subparagraph (A) with respect to the installation for such period as the Secretary determines appropriate if the Secretary determines that such postponement is in the best interests of the communities affected by the closure or realignment of the installation.

(C)(i) Before acquiring non-Federal real property as the location for a new or replacement Federal facility of any type, the head of the Federal agency acquiring the property shall consult with the Secretary regarding the feasibility and cost advantages of using Federal property or facilities at a military installation closed or realigned or to be closed or realigned under this part as the location for the new or replacement facility. In considering the availability and suitability of a specific military installation, the Secretary and the head of the Federal agency involved shall obtain the concurrence of the redevelopment authority with respect to the installation and comply with the redevelopment plan for the installation.

(ii) Not later than 30 days after acquiring non-Federal real property as the location for a new or replacement Federal facility, the head of the Federal agency acquiring the property shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the consultation under clause (i) and the reasons why military installations referred to in such clause that are located within the area to be served by the new or replacement Federal facility or within a 200-mile radius of the new or replacement facility, whichever area is greater, were considered to be unsuitable or unavailable for the site of the new or replacement facility.

(iii) This subparagraph shall apply during the period beginning on the date of the

enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 and ending on July 31, 2001.

(6)(A) Except as provided in this paragraph, nothing in this section shall limit or otherwise affect the application of the provisions of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.) to military installations closed under this part. For procedures relating to the use to assist the homeless of buildings and property at installations closed under this part after the date of the enactment of this sentence, see paragraph (7).

(B)(i) Not later than the date on which the Secretary of Defense completes the determination under paragraph (5) of the transferability of any portion of an installation to be closed under this part, the Secretary shall—

(I) complete any determinations or surveys necessary to determine whether any building or property referred to in clause (ii) is excess property, surplus property, or unutilized or underutilized property for the purpose of the information referred to in section 501(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 11411(a)); and

(II) submit to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development information on any building or property that is so determined.

(ii) The buildings and property referred to in clause (i) are any buildings or property located at an installation referred to in that clause for which no use is identified, or of which no Federal department or agency will accept transfer, pursuant to the determination of transferability referred to in that clause.

(C) Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits information to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under subparagraph (B)(ii), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall--

(i) identify the buildings and property described in such information that are suitable for use to assist the homeless;

(ii) notify the Secretary of Defense of the buildings and property that are so identified;

(iii) publish in the *Federal Register* a list of the buildings and property that are so identified, including with respect to each building or property the information referred to in section 501(c)(1)(B) of such Act; and

(iv) make available with respect to each building and property the information referred to in section 501(c)(1)(C) of such Act in accordance with such section 501(c)(1)(C).

(D) Any buildings and property included in a list published under subparagraph (C)(iii) shall be treated as property available for application for use to assist the homeless under section 501(d) of such Act.

(E) The Secretary of Defense shall make available in accordance with section 501(f) of such Act any buildings or property referred to in subparagraph (D) for which--

(i) a written notice of an intent to use such buildings or property to assist the homeless is received by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in accordance with section 501(d)(2) of such Act;

(ii) an application for use of such buildings or property for such purpose is submitted to the Secretary of Health and Human Services in accordance with section 501(e)(2) of such Act; and

(iii) the Secretary of Health and Human Services—

(I) completes all actions on the application in accordance with section 501(e)(3) of such Act; and

(II) approves the application under section 501(e) of such Act.

(F)(i) Subject to clause (ii), a redevelopment authority may express in writing an interest in using buildings and property referred to subparagraph (D), and buildings and property referred to in subparagraph (B)(ii) which have not been identified as suitable for use to assist the homeless under subparagraph (C), or use such buildings and property, in accordance with the redevelopment plan with respect to the installation at which such buildings and property are located as follows:

(I) If no written notice of an intent to use such buildings or property to assist the homeless is received by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in accordance with section 501(d)(2) of such Act during the 60-day period beginning on the date of the publication of the buildings and property under subparagraph (C)(iii).

(II) In the case of buildings and property for which such notice is so received, if no completed application for use of the buildings or property for such purpose is received by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in accordance with section 501(e)(2) of such Act during the 90-day period beginning on the date of the receipt of such notice.

(III) In the case of buildings and property for which such application is so received, if the Secretary of Health and Human Services rejects the application under section 501(e) of such Act.

(ii) Buildings and property shall be available only for the purpose of permitting a redevelopment authority to express in writing an interest in the use of such buildings and property, or to use such buildings and property, under clause (i) as follows:

(I) In the case of buildings and property referred to in clause (i)(I), during the one-year period beginning on the first day after the 60-day period referred to in that clause.

(II) In the case of buildings and property referred to in clause (i)(II), during the one-year period beginning on the first day after the 90-day period referred to in that clause.

(III) In the case of buildings and property referred to in clause (i)(III), during the one-year period beginning on the date of the rejection of the application referred to in that clause.

(iii) A redevelopment authority shall express an interest in the use of buildings and property under this subparagraph by notifying the Secretary of Defense, in writing, of such an interest.

(G)(i) Buildings and property available for a redevelopment authority under subparagraph (F) shall not be available for use to assist the homeless under section 501 of such Act while so available for a redevelopment authority.

(ii) If a redevelopment authority does not express an interest in the use of buildings or property, or commence the use of buildings or property, under subparagraph (F) within the applicable time periods specified in clause (ii) of such subparagraph, such buildings or property shall be treated as property available for use to assist the homeless under section 501(a) of such Act.

(7)(A) The disposal of buildings and property located at installations approved for closure

or realignment under this part after October 25, 1994, shall be carried out in accordance with this paragraph rather than paragraph (6).

(B)(i) Not later than the date on which the Secretary of Defense completes the final determinations referred to in paragraph (5) relating to the use or transferability of any portion of an installation covered by this paragraph, the Secretary shall--

(I) identify the buildings and property at the installation for which the Department of Defense has a use, for which another department or agency of the Federal Government has identified a use, or of which another department or agency will accept a transfer;

(II) take such actions as are necessary to identify any building or property at the installation not identified under subclause (I) that is excess property or surplus property;

(III) submit to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and to the redevelopment authority for the installation (or the chief executive officer of the State in which the installation is located if there is no redevelopment authority for the installation at the completion of the determination described in the stem of this sentence) information on any building or property that is identified under subclause (II); and

(IV) publish in the Federal Register and in a newspaper of general circulation in the communities in the vicinity of the installation information on the buildings and property identified under subclause (II).

(ii) Upon the recognition of a redevelopment authority for an installation covered by this paragraph, the Secretary of Defense shall publish in the Federal Register and in a newspaper of general circulation in the communities in the vicinity of the installation information on the redevelopment authority.

(C)(i) State and local governments, representatives of the homeless, and other interested parties located in the communities in the vicinity of an installation covered by this paragraph shall submit to the redevelopment authority for the installation a notice of the interest, if any, of such governments, representatives, and parties in the buildings or property, or any portion thereof, at the installation that are identified under subparagraph (B)(i)(II). A notice of interest under this clause shall describe the need of the government, representative, or party concerned for the buildings or property covered by the notice.

(ii) The redevelopment authority for an installation shall assist the governments, representatives, and parties referred to in clause (i) in evaluating buildings and property at the installation for purposes of this subparagraph.

(iii) In providing assistance under clause (ii), a redevelopment authority shall—

(I) consult with representatives of the homeless in the communities in the vicinity of the installation concerned; and

(II) undertake outreach efforts to provide information on the buildings and property to representatives of the homeless, and to other persons or entities interested in assisting the homeless, in such communities.

(iv) It is the sense of Congress that redevelopment authorities should begin to conduct outreach efforts under clause (iii)(II) with respect to an installation as soon as is practicable after the date of approval of closure or realignment of the installation.

(D)(i) State and local governments, representatives of the homeless, and other interested parties shall submit a notice of interest to a redevelopment authority under subparagraph (C) not later than the date specified for such notice by the redevelopment authority.

(ii) The date specified under clause (i) shall be-

(I) in the case of an installation for which a redevelopment authority has been recognized as of the date of the completion of the determinations referred to in paragraph (5), not earlier than 3 months and not later than 6 months after the date of publication of such determination in a newspaper of general circulation in the communities in the vicinity of the installation under subparagraph (B)(i)(IV); and

(II) in the case of an installation for which a redevelopment authority is not recognized as of such date, not earlier than 3 months and not later than 6 months after the date of the recognition of a redevelopment authority for the installation.

(iii) Upon specifying a date for an installation under this subparagraph, the redevelopment authority for the installation shall--

(I) publish the date specified in a newspaper of general circulation in the communities in the vicinity of the installation concerned; and

(II) notify the Secretary of Defense of the date.

(E)(i) In submitting to a redevelopment authority under subparagraph (C) a notice of interest in the use of buildings or property at an installation to assist the homeless, a representative of the homeless shall submit the following:

(I) A description of the homeless assistance program that the representative proposes to carry out at the installation.

(II) An assessment of the need for the program.

(III) A description of the extent to which the program is or will be coordinated with other homeless assistance programs in the communities in the vicinity of the installation.

(IV) A description of the buildings and property at the installation that are necessary in order to carry out the program.

(V) A description of the financial plan, the organization, and the organizational capacity of the representative to carry out the program.

(VI) An assessment of the time required in order to commence carrying out the program.

(ii) A redevelopment authority may not release to the public any information submitted to the redevelopment authority under clause (i)(V) without the consent of the representative of the homeless concerned unless such release is authorized under Federal law and under the law of the State and communities in which the installation concerned is located.

(F)(i) The redevelopment authority for each installation covered by this paragraph shall prepare a redevelopment plan for the installation. The redevelopment authority shall, in preparing the plan, consider the interests in the use to assist the homeless of the buildings and property at the installation that are expressed in the notices submitted to the redevelopment authority under subparagraph (C).

(ii)(I) In connection with a redevelopment plan for an installation, a redevelopment authority and representatives of the homeless shall prepare legally binding agreements that provide for the use to assist the homeless of buildings and property, resources, and assistance on or off the installation. The implementation of such agreements shall be contingent upon the decision regarding the disposal of the buildings and property covered by the agreements by the Secretary of Defense under subparagraph (K) or (L).

(II) Agreements under this clause shall provide for the reversion to the redevelopment authority concerned, or to such other entity or entities as the agreements shall provide, of buildings and property that are made available under this paragraph for use to assist the homeless in the event that such buildings and property cease being used for that purpose.

(iii) A redevelopment authority shall provide opportunity for public comment on a redevelopment plan before submission of the plan to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under subparagraph (G).

(iv) A redevelopment authority shall complete preparation of a redevelopment plan for an installation and submit the plan under subparagraph (G) not later than 9 months after the date specified by the redevelopment authority for the installation under subparagraph (D).

(G)(i) Upon completion of a redevelopment plan under subparagraph (F), a redevelopment authority shall submit an application containing the plan to the Secretary of Defense and to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(ii) A redevelopment authority shall include in an application under clause (i) the following:

(I) A copy of the redevelopment plan, including a summary of any public comments on the plan received by the redevelopment authority under subparagraph (F)(iii).

(II) A copy of each notice of interest of use of buildings and property to assist the homeless that was submitted to the redevelopment authority under subparagraph (C), together with a description of the manner, if any, in which the plan addresses the interest expressed in each such notice and, if the plan does not address such an interest, an explanation why the plan does not address the interest.

(III) A summary of the outreach undertaken by the redevelopment authority under subparagraph (C)(iii)(II) in preparing the plan.

(IV) A statement identifying the representatives of the homeless and the homeless assistance planning boards, if any, with which the redevelopment authority consulted in preparing the plan, and the results of such consultations.

(V) An assessment of the manner in which the redevelopment plan balances the expressed needs of the homeless and the need of the communities in the vicinity of the installation for economic redevelopment and other development.

(VI) Copies of the agreements that the redevelopment authority proposes to enter into under subparagraph (F)(ii).

(H)(i) Not later than 60 days after receiving a redevelopment plan under subparagraph (G), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall complete a review of the plan. The purpose of the review is to determine whether the plan, with respect to the expressed interest and requests of representatives of the homeless--

(I) takes into consideration the size and nature of the homeless population in the communities in the vicinity of the installation, the availability of existing services in such communities to meet the needs of the homeless in such communities, and the suitability of the buildings and property covered by the plan for the use and needs of the homeless in such communities;

(II) takes into consideration any economic impact of the homeless assistance under the plan on the communities in the vicinity of the installation;

(III) balances in an appropriate manner the needs of the communities in the vicinity of the installation for economic redevelopment and other development with the needs of the homeless in such communities;

(IV) was developed in consultation with representatives of the homeless and the homeless assistance planning boards, if any, in the communities in the vicinity of the installation; and

(V) specifies the manner in which buildings and property, resources, and assistance on or off the installation will be made available for homeless assistance purposes.

(ii) It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, in completing the review of a plan under this subparagraph, take into consideration and be receptive to the predominant views on the plan of the communities in the vicinity of the installation covered by the plan.

(iii) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may engage in negotiations and consultations with a redevelopment authority before or during the course of a review under clause (i) with a view toward resolving any preliminary determination of the Secretary that a redevelopment plan does not meet a requirement set forth in that clause. The redevelopment authority may modify the redevelopment plan as a result of such negotiations and consultations.

(iv) Upon completion of a review of a redevelopment plan under clause (i), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall notify the Secretary of Defense and the redevelopment authority concerned of the determination of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under that clause.

(v) If the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines as a result of such a review that a redevelopment plan does not meet the requirements set forth in clause (i), a notice under clause (iv) shall include--

(I) an explanation of that determination; and

(II) a statement of the actions that the redevelopment authority must undertake in order to address that determination.

(I)(i) Upon receipt of a notice under subparagraph (H)(iv) of a determination that a redevelopment plan does not meet a requirement set forth in subparagraph (H)(i), a redevelopment authority shall have the opportunity to--

(I) revise the plan in order to address the determination; and

(II) submit the revised plan to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(ii) A redevelopment authority shall submit a revised plan under this subparagraph to such Secretaries, if at all, not later than 90 days after the date on which the redevelopment authority receives the notice referred to in clause (i).

(J)(i) Not later than 30 days after receiving a revised redevelopment plan under subparagraph (I), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall review the revised plan and determine if the plan meets the requirements set forth in subparagraph (H)(i).

(ii) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall notify the Secretary of Defense and the redevelopment authority concerned of the determination of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under this subparagraph.

(K)(i) Upon receipt of a notice under subparagraph (H)(iv) or (J)(ii) of the determination of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development that a redevelopment plan for an installation

meets the requirements set forth in subparagraph (H)(i), the Secretary of Defense shall dispose of the buildings and property at the installation.

(ii) For purposes of carrying out an environmental assessment of the closure or realignment of an installation, the Secretary of Defense shall treat the redevelopment plan for the installation (including the aspects of the plan providing for disposal to State or local governments, representatives of the homeless, and other interested parties) as part of the proposed Federal action for the installation.

(iii) The Secretary of Defense shall dispose of buildings and property under clause (i) in accordance with the record of decision or other decision document prepared by the Secretary in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). In preparing the record of decision or other decision document, the Secretary shall give substantial deference to the redevelopment plan concerned.

(iv) The disposal under clause (i) of buildings and property to assist the homeless shall be without consideration.

(v) In the case of a request for a conveyance under clause (i) of buildings and property for public benefit under section 550 of title 40, United States Code, or sections 47151 through 47153 of title 49, United States Code, the sponsoring Federal agency shall use the eligibility criteria set forth in such section or such subchapter (as the case may be) to determine the eligibility of the applicant and use proposed in the request for the public benefit conveyance. The determination of such eligibility should be made before submission of the redevelopment plan concerned under subparagraph (G).

(L)(i) If the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines under subparagraph (J) that a revised redevelopment plan for an installation does not meet the requirements set forth in subparagraph (H)(i), or if no revised plan is so submitted, that Secretary shall--

(I) review the original redevelopment plan submitted to that Secretary under subparagraph (G), including the notice or notices of representatives of the homeless referred to in clause (ii)(II) of that subparagraph;

(II) consult with the representatives referred to in subclause (I), if any, for purposes of evaluating the continuing interest of such representatives in the use of buildings or property at the installation to assist the homeless;

(III) request that each such representative submit to that Secretary the items described in clause (ii); and

(IV) based on the actions of that Secretary under subclauses (I) and (II), and on any information obtained by that Secretary as a result of such actions, indicate to the Secretary of Defense the buildings and property at the installation that meet the requirements set forth in subparagraph (H)(i).

(ii) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may request under clause (i)(III) that a representative of the homeless submit to that Secretary the following:

(I) A description of the program of such representative to assist the homeless.

(II) A description of the manner in which the buildings and property that the representative proposes to use for such purpose will assist the homeless.

(III) Such information as that Secretary requires in order to determine the financial capacity of the representative to carry out the program and to ensure that the program will be carried out in compliance with Federal environmental law and Federal law against

discrimination.

(IV) A certification that police services, fire protection services, and water and sewer services available in the communities in the vicinity of the installation concerned are adequate for the program.

(iii) Not later than 90 days after the date of the receipt of a revised plan for an installation under subparagraph (J), the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall--

(I) notify the Secretary of Defense and the redevelopment authority concerned of the buildings and property at an installation under clause (i)(IV) that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines are suitable for use to assist the homeless; and

(II) notify the Secretary of Defense of the extent to which the revised plan meets the criteria set forth in subparagraph (H)(i).

(iv)(I) Upon notice from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to an installation under clause (iii), the Secretary of Defense shall dispose of buildings and property at the installation in consultation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the redevelopment authority concerned.

(II) For purposes of carrying out an environmental assessment of the closure or realignment of an installation, the Secretary of Defense shall treat the redevelopment plan submitted by the redevelopment authority for the installation (including the aspects of the plan providing for disposal to State or local governments, representatives of the homeless, and other interested parties) as part of the proposed Federal action for the installation. The Secretary of Defense shall incorporate the notification of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under clause (iii)(I) as part of the proposed Federal action for the installation only to the extent, if any, that the Secretary of Defense considers such incorporation to be appropriate and consistent with the best and highest use of the installation as a whole, taking into consideration the redevelopment plan submitted by the redevelopment authority.

(III) The Secretary of Defense shall dispose of buildings and property under subclause (I) in accordance with the record of decision or other decision document prepared by the Secretary in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). In preparing the record of decision or other decision document, the Secretary shall give deference to the redevelopment plan submitted by the redevelopment authority for the installation.

(IV) The disposal under subclause (I) of buildings and property to assist the homeless shall be without consideration.

(V) In the case of a request for a conveyance under subclause (I) of buildings and property for public benefit under section 550 of title 40, United States Code, or sections 47151 through 47153 of title 49, United States Code, the sponsoring Federal agency shall use the eligibility criteria set forth in such section or such subchapter (as the case may be) to determine the eligibility of the applicant and use proposed in the request for the public benefit conveyance. The determination of such eligibility should be made before submission of the redevelopment plan concerned under subparagraph (G).

(M)(i) In the event of the disposal of buildings and property of an installation pursuant to subparagraph (K) or (L), the redevelopment authority for the installation shall be responsible for the implementation of and compliance with agreements under the redevelopment plan described in that subparagraph for the installation.

(ii) If a building or property reverts to a redevelopment authority under such an agreement, the redevelopment authority shall take appropriate actions to secure, to the maximum extent practicable, the utilization of the building or property by other homeless representatives to assist the homeless. A redevelopment authority may not be required to utilize the building or property to assist the homeless.

(N) The Secretary of Defense may postpone or extend any deadline provided for under this paragraph in the case of an installation covered by this paragraph for such period as the Secretary considers appropriate if the Secretary determines that such postponement is in the interests of the communities affected by the closure or realignment of the installation. The Secretary shall make such determinations in consultation with the redevelopment authority concerned and, in the case of deadlines provided for under this paragraph with respect to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, in consultation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(O) For purposes of this paragraph, the term "communities in the vicinity of the installation", in the case of an installation, means the communities that constitute the political jurisdictions (other than the State in which the installation is located) that comprise the redevelopment authority for the installation.

(P) For purposes of this paragraph, the term "other interested parties", in the case of an installation, includes any parties eligible for the conveyance of property of the installation under section 550 of title 40, United States Code, or sections 47151 through 47153 of title 49, United States Code, whether or not the parties assist the homeless.

(8)(A) Subject to subparagraph (C), the Secretary may enter into agreements (including contracts, cooperative agreements, or other arrangements for reimbursement) with local governments for the provision of police or security services, fire protection services, airfield operation services, or other community services by such governments at military installations to be closed under this part, or at facilities not yet transferred or otherwise disposed of in the case of installations closed under this part, if the Secretary determines that the provision of such services under such agreements is in the best interests of the Department of Defense.

(B) The Secretary may exercise the authority provided under this paragraph without regard to the provisions of chapter 146 of title 10, United States Code.

(C) The Secretary may not exercise the authority under subparagraph (A) with respect to an installation earlier than 180 days before the date on which the installation is to be closed.

(D) The Secretary shall include in a contract for services entered into with a local government under this paragraph a clause that requires the use of professionals to furnish the services to the extent that professionals are available in the area under the jurisdiction of such government.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.--(1) The provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall not apply to the actions of the President, the Commission, and, except as provided in paragraph (2), the Department of Defense in carrying out this part.

(2)(A) The provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 shall apply to actions of the Department of Defense under this part (i) during the process of property disposal, and (ii) during the process of relocating functions from a military installation being closed or

realigned to another military installation after the receiving installation has been selected but before the functions are relocated.

(B) In applying the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to the processes referred to in subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the military departments concerned shall not have to consider--

(i) the need for closing or realigning the military installation which has been recommended for closure or realignment by the Commission;

(ii) the need for transferring functions to any military installation which has been selected as the receiving installation; or

(iii) military installations alternative to those recommended or selected.

(3) A civil action for judicial review, with respect to any requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to the extent such Act is applicable under paragraph (2), of any act or failure to act by the Department of Defense during the closing, realigning, or relocating of functions referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (2)(A), may not be brought more than 60 days after the date of such act or failure to act.

(d) WAIVER.--The Secretary of Defense may close or realign military installations under this part without regard to--

(1) any provision of law restricting the use of funds for closing or realigning military installations included in any appropriations or authorization Act; and

(2) sections 2662 and 2687 of title 10, United States Code.

(e) TRANSFER AUTHORITY IN CONNECTION WITH PAYMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION COSTS.--(1)(A) Subject to paragraph (2) of this subsection and section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)), the Secretary may enter into an agreement to transfer by deed real property or facilities referred to in subparagraph (B) with any person who agrees to perform all environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities that are required for the property or facilities under Federal and State laws, administrative decisions, agreements (including schedules and milestones), and concurrences.

(B) The real property and facilities referred to in subparagraph (A) are the real property and facilities located at an installation closed or to be closed, or realigned or to be realigned, under this part that are available exclusively for the use, or expression of an interest in a use, of a redevelopment authority under subsection (b)(6)(F) during the period provided for that use, or expression of interest in use, under that subsection. The real property and facilities referred to in subparagraph (A) are also the real property and facilities located at an installation approved for closure or realignment under this part after 2001 that are available for purposes other than to assist the homeless.

(C) The Secretary may require any additional terms and conditions in connection with an agreement authorized by subparagraph (A) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(2) A transfer of real property or facilities may be made under paragraph (1) only if the Secretary certifies to Congress that--

(A) the costs of all environmental restoration, waste management, and

environmental compliance activities otherwise to be paid by the Secretary with respect to the property or facilities are equal to or greater than the fair market value of the property or facilities to be transferred, as determined by the Secretary; or

(B) if such costs are lower than the fair market value of the property or facilities, the recipient of the property or facilities agrees to pay the difference between the fair market value and such costs.

(3) In the case of property or facilities covered by a certification under paragraph (2)(A), the Secretary may pay the recipient of such property or facilities an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) the amount by which the costs incurred by the recipient of such property or facilities for all environmental restoration, waste, management, and environmental compliance activities with respect to such property or facilities exceed the fair market value of such property or facilities as specified in such certification; or

(B) the amount by which the costs (as determined by the Secretary) that would otherwise have been incurred by the Secretary for such restoration, management, and activities with respect to such property or facilities exceed the fair market value of such property or facilities as so specified

(4) As part of an agreement under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall disclose to the person to whom the property or facilities will be transferred any information of the Secretary regarding the environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities described in paragraph (1) that relate to the property or facilities. The Secretary shall provide such information before entering into the agreement.

(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to modify, alter, or amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) or the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.).

(6) Section 330 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall not apply to any transfer under this subsection to persons or entities described in subsection (a)(2) of such section 330, except in the case of releases or threatened releases not disclosed pursuant to paragraph (4).

SEC. 2906. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 1990

(a) IN GENERAL.--(1) There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury an account to be known as the "Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990" which shall be administered by the Secretary as a single account.

(2) There shall be deposited into the Account--

(A) funds authorized for and appropriated to the Account;

(B) any funds that the Secretary may, subject to approval in an appropriation Act, transfer to the Account from funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for any purpose, except that such funds may be transferred only after the date on which the Secretary transmits written notice of, and justification for, such transfer to the congressional defense committees;

(C) except as provided in subsection (d), proceeds received from the lease, transfer, or disposal of any property at a military installation closed or realigned under this

part the date of approval of closure or realignment of which is before January 1, 2005; and

(D) proceeds received after September 30, 1995, from the lease, transfer, or disposal of any property at a military installation closed or realigned under title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(3) The Account shall be closed at the time and in the manner provided for appropriation accounts under section 1555 of title 31, United States Code. Unobligated funds which remain in the Account upon closure shall be held by the Secretary of the Treasury until transferred by law after the congressional defense committees receive the final report transmitted under subsection (c)(2).

(b) USE OF FUNDS.--(1) The Secretary may use the funds in the Account only for the purposes described in section 2905 with respect to military installations the date of approval of closure or realignment of which is before January 1, 2005, or, after September 30, 1995, for environmental restoration and property management and disposal at installations closed or realigned under title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note). After July 13, 2001, the Account shall be the sole source of Federal funds for environmental restoration, property management, and other caretaker costs associated with any real property at military installations closed or realigned under this part or such title II.

(2) When a decision is made to use funds in the Account to carry out a construction project under section 2905(a) and the cost of the project will exceed the maximum amount authorized by law for a minor military construction project, the Secretary shall notify in writing the congressional defense committees of the nature of, and justification for, the project and the amount of expenditures for such project. Any such construction project may be carried out without regard to section 2802(a) of title 10, United States Code.

(c) REPORTS.--(1)(A) No later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year in which the Secretary carries out activities under this part, the Secretary shall transmit a report to the congressional defense committees of the amount and nature of the deposits into, and the expenditures from, the Account during such fiscal year and of the amount and nature of other expenditures made pursuant to section 2905(a) during such fiscal year.

(B) The report for a fiscal year shall include the following:

(i) The obligations and expenditures from the Account during the fiscal year, identified by subaccount, for each military department and Defense Agency.

(ii) The fiscal year in which appropriations for such expenditures were made and the fiscal year in which funds were obligated for such expenditures.

(iii) Each military construction project for which such obligations and expenditures were made, identified by installation and project title.

(iv) A description and explanation of the extent, if any, to which expenditures for military construction projects for the fiscal year differed from proposals for projects and funding levels that were included in the justification transmitted to Congress under section 2907(1), or otherwise, for the funding proposals for the Account for such fiscal year, including an explanation of--

(I) any failure to carry out military construction projects that were so proposed; and

(II) any expenditures for military construction projects that were not so proposed.

(2) No later than 60 days after the termination of the authority of the Secretary to carry out a closure or realignment under this part with respect to military installations the date of approval of closure or realignment of which is before January 1, 2005, and no later than 60 days after the closure of the Account under subsection (a)(3), the Secretary shall transmit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an accounting of--

(A) all the funds deposited into and expended from the Account or otherwise expended under this part with respect to such installations; and

(B) any amount remaining in the Account.

(d) DISPOSAL OR TRANSFER OF COMMISSARY STORES AND PROPERTY PURCHASED WITH NONAPPROPRIATED FUNDS.--(1) If any real property or facility acquired, constructed, or improved (in whole or in part) with commissary store funds or nonappropriated funds is transferred or disposed of in connection with the closure or realignment of a military installation under this part the date of approval of closure or realignment of which is before January 1, 2005, a portion of the proceeds of the transfer or other disposal of property on that installation shall be deposited in the reserve account established under section 204(b)(7)(C) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(2) The amount so deposited shall be equal to the depreciated value of the investment made with such funds in the acquisition, construction, or improvement of that particular real property or facility. The depreciated value of the investment shall be computed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(3) The Secretary may use amounts in the account (in such an aggregate amount as is provided in advance in appropriation Acts) for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, and improving--

(A) commissary stores; and

(B) real property and facilities for nonappropriated fund instrumentalities.

(4) As used in this subsection:

(A) The term "commissary store funds" means funds received from the adjustment of, or surcharge on, selling prices at commissary stores fixed under section 2685 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) The term "nonappropriated funds" means funds received from a nonappropriated fund instrumentality.

(C) The term "nonappropriated fund instrumentality" means an instrumentality of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces (including the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, the Navy Resale and Services Support Office, and the Marine Corps exchanges) which is conducted for the comfort, pleasure, contentment, or physical or mental improvement of members of the Armed Forces.

(e) ACCOUNT EXCLUSIVE SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.—Except as provided in section 2906A(e) with respect to funds in the Department of

Defense Base Closure Account 2005 under section 2906A and except for funds deposited into the Account under subsection (a), funds appropriated to the Department of Defense may not be used for purposes described in section 2905 (a)(1)(C). The prohibition in this subsection shall expire upon the closure of the Account under subsection (a)(3).

SEC. 2906A. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE ACCOUNT 2005.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) If the Secretary makes the certifications required under section 2912(b), there shall be established on the books of the Treasury an account to be known as the "Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005" (in this section referred to as the "Account"). The Account shall be administered by the Secretary as a single account.

(2) There shall be deposited into the Account—

(A) funds authorized for and appropriated to the Account;

(B) any funds that the Secretary may, subject to approval in an appropriation Act, transfer to the Account from funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for any purpose, except that such funds may be transferred only after the date on which the Secretary transmits written notice of, and justification for, such transfer to the congressional defense committees; and

(C) except as provided in subsection (d), proceeds received from the lease, transfer, or disposal of any property at a military installation that is closed or realigned under this part pursuant to a closure or realignment the date of approval of which is after January 1, 2005.

(3) The Account shall be closed at the time and in the manner provided for appropriation accounts under section 1555 of title 31, United States Code. Unobligated funds which remain in the Account upon closure shall be held by the Secretary of the Treasury until transferred by law after the congressional defense committees receive the final report transmitted under subsection (c)(2),

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—(1) The Secretary may use the funds in the Account only for the purposes described in section 2905 with respect to military installations the date of approval of closure or realignment of which is after January 1, 2005.

(2) When a decision is made to use funds in the Account to carry out a construction project under section 2905(a) and the cost of the project will exceed the maximum amount authorized by law for a minor military construction project, the Secretary shall notify in writing the congressional defense committees of the nature of, and justification for, the project and the amount of expenditures for' such project. Any such construction project may be carried out without regard to section 2802(a) of title 10, United States Code.

(c) REPORTS.—(1)(A) No later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year in which the Secretary carries out activities under this part using amounts in the Account, the Secretary shall transmit a report to the congressional defense committees of the amount and nature of the deposits into, and the expenditures from, the Account during such fiscal year and of the amount and nature of other expenditures made pursuant to section 2905(a) during such fiscal year.

(B) The report for a fiscal year shall include the following:

(i) The obligations and expenditures from the Account during the fiscal year, identified by subaccount, for each military department and Defense Agency.

(ii) The fiscal year in which appropriations for such expenditures were made and the fiscal year in which finds were obligated for such expenditures.

(iii) Each military construction project for which such obligations and expenditures were made, identified by installation and project title.

(iv) A description and explanation of the extent, if any, to which expenditures for military construction projects for the fiscal year differed from proposals for projects and funding levels that were included in the justification transmitted to Congress under section 2907(1), or otherwise, for the funding proposals for the Account for such fiscal year, including an explanation of—

(I) any failure to carry out military construction projects that were so proposed; and

(II) any expenditures for military construction projects that were not so proposed.

(2) No later than 60 days after the termination of the authority of the Secretary to carry out a closure or realignment under this part with respect to military installations the date of approval of closure or realignment of which is after January 1, 2005, and no later than 60 days after the closure of the Account under subsection (a)(3), the Secretary shall transmit to the congressional defense committees a report containing an accounting of—

(A) all the funds deposited into and expended from the Account or otherwise expended under this part with respect to such installations; and

(B) any amount remaining in the Account.

(d) DISPOSAL OR TRANSFER OF COMMISSARY STORES AND PROPERTY PURCHASED WITH NONAPPROPRIATED FUNDS.—(1) If any real property or facility acquired, constructed, or improved (in whole or in part) with commissary store funds or nonappropriated funds is transferred or disposed of in connection with the closure or realignment of a military installation under this part the date of approval of closure or realignment of which is after January 1, 2005, a portion of the proceeds of the transfer or other disposal of property on that installation shall be deposited in the reserve account established under section 204(b)(7)(C) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(2) The amount so deposited shall be equal to the depreciated value of the investment made with such funds in the acquisition, construction, or improvement of that particular real property or facility. The depreciated value of the investment shall be computed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(3) The Secretary may use amounts in the reserve account, without further appropriation, for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, and improving—

(A) commissary stores; and

(B) real property and facilities for nonappropriated fund instrumentalities.

(4) In this subsection, the terms commissary store funds", "nonappropriated funds", and "nonappropriated fund instrumentality" shall have the meaning given those terms in section 2906(d)(4).

(e) ACCOUNT EXCLUSIVE SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION PROJECTS.—Except as provided in section 2906(e) with respect to funds in the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 under section 2906 and except for funds deposited into the Account under subsection (a), funds appropriated to the Department of Defense may not he used for purposes described in section 2905(a)(1)(C). The prohibition in this subsection shall expire upon the closure of the Account under subsection (a)(3).

SEC. 2907. REPORTS

As part of the budget request for fiscal year 1993 and for each fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense, the Secretary shall transmit to the congressional defense committees of Congress--

(1) a schedule of the closure and realignment actions to be carried out under this part in the fiscal year for which the request is made and an estimate of the total expenditures required and cost savings to be achieved by each such closure and realignment and of the time period in which these savings are to be achieved in each case, together with the Secretary's assessment of the environmental effects of such actions; and

(2) a description of the military installations, including those under construction and those planned for construction, to which functions are to be transferred as a result of such closures and realignments, together with the Secretary's assessment of the environmental effects of such transfers.

SEC. 2908. CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF COMMISSION REPORT

(a) TERMS OF THE RESOLUTION.--For purposes of section 2904(b), the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution which is introduced within the 10-day period beginning on the date on which the President transmits the report to the Congress under section 2903(e), and--

(1) which does not have a preamble;

(2) the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That Congress disapproves the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission as submitted by the President on ", the blank space being filled in with the appropriate date; and

(3) the title of which is as follows: "Joint resolution disapproving the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.".

(b) REFERRAL.--A resolution described in subsection (a) that is introduced in the House of Representatives shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. A resolution described in subsection (a) introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(c) DISCHARGE.--If the committee to which a resolution described in subsection (a) is referred has not reported such a resolution (or an identical resolution) by the end of the 20-day

period beginning on the date on which the President transmits the report to the Congress under section 2903(e), such committee shall be, at the end of such period, discharged from further consideration of such resolution, and such resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House involved.

(d) CONSIDERATION.--(1) On or after the third day after the date on which the committee to which such a resolution is referred has reported, or has been discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of, such a resolution, it is in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for any Member of the respective House to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. A member may make the motion only on the day after the calendar day on which the Member announces to the House concerned the Member's intention to make the motion, except that, in the case of the House of Representatives, the motion may be made without such prior announcement if the motion is made by direction of the committee to which the resolution was referred. The motion is highly privileged in the House of Representatives and is privileged in the Senate and is not debatable. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the respective House shall immediately proceed to consideration of the joint resolution without intervening motion, order, or other business, and the resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the respective House until disposed of.

(2) Debate on the resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the resolution is not in order. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. A motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the resolution is not in order. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to is not in order.

(3) Immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a resolution described in subsection (a) and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the appropriate House, the vote on final passage of the resolution shall occur.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(e) CONSIDERATION BY OTHER HOUSE.--(1) If, before the passage by one House of a resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

(A) The resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee and may not be considered in the House receiving it except in the case of final passage as provided in subparagraph (B)(ii).

(B) With respect to a resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the resolution--

(i) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no resolution had

been received from the other House; but

(ii) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(2) Upon disposition of the resolution received from the other House, it shall no longer be in order to consider the resolution that originated in the receiving House.

(f) RULES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE.--This section is enacted by Congress--

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a resolution described in subsection (a), and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 2909. RESTRICTION ON OTHER BASE CLOSURE AUTHORITY

(a) IN GENERAL.--Except as provided in subsection (c), during the period beginning on November 5, 1990, and ending on April 15, 2006, this part shall be the exclusive authority for selecting for closure or realignment, or for carrying out any closure or realignment of, a military installation inside the United States.

(b) RESTRICTION.--Except as provided in subsection (c), none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used, other than under this part, during the period specified in subsection (a)

(1) to identify, through any transmittal to the Congress or through any other public announcement or notification, any military installation inside the United States as an installation to be closed or realigned or as an installation under consideration for closure or realignment; or

(2) to carry out any closure or realignment of a military installation inside the United States.

(c) EXCEPTION.--Nothing in this part affects the authority of the Secretary to carry out

(1) closures and realignments under title II of Public Law 100-526; and

(2) closures and realignments to which section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, is not applicable, including closures and realignments carried out for reasons of national security or a military emergency referred to in subsection (c) of such section.

SEC. 2910. DEFINITIONS

As used in this part:

(1) The term "Account" means the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1).

(2) The term "congressional defense committees" means the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(3) The term "Commission" means the Commission established by section 2902.

(4) The term "military installation" means a base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility for any ship, or other activity under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, including any leased facility. Such term does not include any facility used primarily for civil works, rivers and harbors projects, flood control, or other projects not under the primary jurisdiction or control of the Department of Defense. [*The preceding sentence shall take effect as of November 5, 1990, and shall apply as if it had been included in section 2910(4) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 on that date.*]

(5) The term "realignment" includes any action which both reduces and relocates functions and civilian personnel positions but does not include a reduction in force resulting from workload adjustments, reduced personnel or funding levels, or skill imbalances.

(6) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Defense.

(7) The term "United States" means the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

(8) The term "date of approval", with respect to a closure or realignment of an installation, means the date on which the authority of Congress to disapprove a recommendation of closure or realignment, as the case may be, of such installation under this part expires. [*The date of approval of closure of any installation approved for closure before November 30, 1993 shall be deemed to be November 30, 1993.*]

(9) The term "redevelopment authority", in the case of an installation to be closed or realigned under this part, means any entity (including an entity established by a State or local government) recognized by the Secretary of Defense as the entity responsible for developing the redevelopment plan with respect to the installation or for directing the implementation of such plan. [*The above revision shall take effect as if included in the amendments made by section 2918 of Pub. L. 103-160.*]

(10) The term "redevelopment plan" in the case of an installation to be closed or realigned under this part, means a plan that--

(A) is agreed to by the local redevelopment authority with respect to the installation; and

(B) provides for the reuse or redevelopment of the real property and personal property of the installation that is available for such reuse and redevelopment as a result of the closure or realignment of the installation.

(11) The term "representative of the homeless" has the meaning given such term in section 501(i)(4) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411(i)(4)).

SEC. 2911. CLARIFYING AMENDMENT

Section 2687(e)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended--

(1) by inserting "homeport facility for any ship," after "center,"; and

(2) by striking out "under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of a military department" and inserting in lieu thereof "under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, including any leased facility,".

SEC. 2912. 2005 ROUND OF REALIGNMENTS AND CLOSURES OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) FORCE-STRUCTURE PLAN AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVENTORY.—

(1) PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION.—As part of the budget justification documents submitted to Congress in support of the budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005, the Secretary shall include the following:

(A) A force-structure plan for the Armed Forces based on an assessment by the Secretary of the probable threats to the national security during the 20-year period beginning with fiscal year 2005, the probable end-strength levels and major military force units (including land force divisions, carrier and other major combatant vessels, air wings, and other comparable units) needed to meet these threats, and the anticipated levels of funding that will be available for national defense purposes during such period.

(B) A comprehensive inventory of military installations world-wide for each military department, with specifications of the number and type of facilities in the active and reserve forces of each military department.

(2) RELATIONSHIP OF PLAN AND INVENTORY.— Using the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory prepared under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall prepare (and include as part of the submission of such plan and inventory) the following:

(A) A description of the infrastructure necessary to support the force structure described in the force-structure plan.

(B) A discussion of categories of excess infrastructure and infrastructure capacity.

(C) An economic analysis of the effect of the closure or realignment of military installations to reduce excess infrastructure.

(3) SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining the level of necessary versus excess infrastructure under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall consider the following:

(A) The anticipated continuing need for and availability of military installations outside the United States, taking into account current restrictions on the use of military installations outside the United States and the potential for future prohibitions or restrictions on the use of such military installations.

(B) Any efficiencies that may be gained from joint tenancy by more than one branch of the Armed Forces at a military installation.

(4) REVISION.—The Secretary may revise the force-structure plan and

infrastructure inventory; If the Secretary makes such a revision, the Secretary shall submit the revised plan or inventory to Congress not later than March 15, 2005. For purposes of selecting military installations for closure or realignment under this part in 2005, no revision of the force-structure plan or infrastructure inventory is authorized after that date.

(b) CERTIFICATION OF NEED FOR FURTHER CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS.—

(1) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED—On the basis of the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory prepared under subsection (a) and the descriptions and economic analysis prepared under such subsection, the Secretary shall include as part of the submission of the plan and inventory—

(A) a certification regarding whether the need exists for the closure or realignment of additional military installations; and

(B) if such need exists, a certification that the additional round of closures and realignments would result in annual net savings for each of the military departments beginning not later than fiscal year 2011.

(2) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO CERTIFY.—If the Secretary does not include the certifications referred to in paragraph (1), the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this part in 2005 shall be terminated.

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL EVALUATION.—

(1) EVALUATION REQUIRED.—If the certification is provided under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall prepare an evaluation of the following:

(A) The force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory prepared under subsection (a) and the final selection criteria specified in section 2913, including an evaluation of the accuracy and analytical sufficiency of such plan, inventory, and criteria.

(B) The need for the closure or realignment of additional military installations.

(2) SUBMISSION.—The Comptroller General shall submit the evaluation to Congress not later than 60 days after the date on which the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory are submitted to Congress.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL ROUND; COMMISSION.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION.—Subject to the certifications required under subsection (b), the President may commence an additional round for the selection of military installations for closure and realignment under this part in 2005 by transmitting to the Senate, not later than March 15, 2005, nominations pursuant to section 2902(c) for the appointment of new members to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

(2) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO NOMINATE.—If the President does not transmit to the Senate the nominations for the Commission by March 15, 2005, the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this part in 2005 shall be terminated.

(3) MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding section 2902(c)(1), the Commission appointed

under the authority of this subsection shall consist of nine members.

(4) TERMS; MEETINGS; TERMINATION.—Notwithstanding subsections (d), (e)(1), and (1) of section 2902, the Commission appointed under the authority of this subsection shall meet during calendar year 2005 and shall terminate on April 15, 2006.

(5) FUNDING.—If no funds are appropriated to the Commission by the end of the second session of the 108th Congress for the activities of the Commission in 2005, the Secretary may transfer to the Commission for purposes of its activities under this part in that year such funds as the Commission may require to carry out such activities. The Secretary may transfer funds under the preceding sentence from any funds available to the Secretary. Funds so transferred shall remain available to the Commission for such purposes until expended.

SEC. 2913. SELECTION CRITERIA FOR 2005 ROUND.

(a) FINAL SELECTION CRITERIA.—The final criteria to be used by the Secretary in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part in 2005 shall be the military value and other criteria specified in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) MILITARY VALUE CRITERIA.— The military value criteria are as follows:

(1) The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness o the total force of the Department of Defense, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.

(2) The availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.

(3) The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training.

(4) The cost of operations and the manpower implications.

(c) OTHER CRITERIA.—The other criteria that the Secretary shall use in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part in 2005 are as follows:

(1) The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.

(2) The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.

(3) The ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel.

(4) The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities.

(d) PRIORITY GIVEN TO MILITARY VALUE.—The Secretary shall give priority consideration tot he military value criteria specified in subsection (b) in the making of recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations.

(e) EFFECT ON DEPARTMENT AND OTHER AGENCY COSTS.—The selection criteria relating to the cost savings or return on investment from the proposed closure or realignment of military installations shall take into account the effect of the proposed closure or realignment on the costs of any other activity of the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency that may be required to assume responsibility for activities at the military installations.

(f) RELATION TO OTHER MATERIALS.—The final selection criteria specified in this section shall be the only criteria to be used, along with the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory referred to in section 2912, in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the Untied States under this part in 2005.

(g) RELATION TO CRITERIA FOR EARLIER ROUNDS.—Section 2903(b), and the selection criteria prepared under such section, shall not apply with respect to the process of making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations in 2005.

SEC. 2914. SPECIAL PROCEDURES FOR MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REALIGNMENTS AND CLOSURES FOR 2005 ROUND; COMMISSION CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—If the Secretary makes the certifications required under section 2912(b), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register and transmit to the congressional defense committees and the Commission, not later than May 16, 2005, a list of the military installations inside the United States that the Secretary recommends for closure or realignment on the basis of the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory prepared by the Secretary under section 2912 and the final selection criteria specified in section 2913.

(b) PREPARATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall comply with paragraphs (2) through (6) of section 2903(c) in preparing and transmitting the recommendations under this section. However, paragraph (6) of section 2903(e) relating to submission of information to Congress shall be deemed to require such submission within 48 hours.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT VIEWS.—(A) In making recommendations to the Commission in 2005, the Secretary shall consider any notice received from a local government in the vicinity of a military installation that the government would approve of the closure or realignment of the installation,

(B) Notwithstanding the requirement in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall make the recommendations referred to in that subparagraph based on the force-structure plan, infrastructure inventory, and final selection criteria otherwise applicable to such

recommendations.

(C) The recommendations shall include a statement of the result of the consideration of any notice described in subparagraph (A) that is received with respect to a military installation covered by such recommendations. The statement shall set forth the reasons for the result.

(d) COMMISSION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this subsection, section 2903(d) shall apply to the consideration by the Commission of the recommendations transmitted by the Secretary in 2005. The Commission's report containing its findings and conclusions, based on a review and analysis of the Secretary's recommendations, shall be transmitted to the President not later than September 8, 2005.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS.—After September 8, 2005, the Commission shall promptly provide, upon request, to any Member of Congress information used by the Commission in making its recommendations.

(3) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY TO CONSIDER ADDITIONS TO CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT LISTS.—The Commission may not consider making a change in the recommendations of the Secretary that would add a military installation to the Secretary's list of installations recommended for closure or realignment unless, in addition to the requirements of section 2903(d)(2)(C)—

(A) the Commission provides the Secretary with at least a 15-day period, before making the change, in which to submit an explanation of the reasons why the installation was not included on the closure or realignment list by the Secretary; and

(B) the decision to add the installation for Commission consideration is supported by at least seven members of the Commission.

(4) TESTIMONY BY SECRETARY.—The Commission shall invite the Secretary to testify at a public hearing, or a closed hearing if classified information is involved, on any proposed change by the Commission to the Secretary's recommendations.

(5) REQUIREMENTS TO EXPAND CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT RECOMMENDATIONS.—In the report required under section 2903(d)(2)(A) that is to be transmitted under paragraph (1), the Commission may not make a change in the recommendations of the Secretary that would close a military installation not recommended for closure by the Secretary, would realign a military installation not recommended for closure or realignment by the Secretary, or would expand the extent of the realignment of a military installation recommended for realignment by the Secretary unless—

(A) at least two members of the Commission visit the military installation before the date of the transmittal of the report; and

(B) the decision of the Commission to make the change to recommend the closure of the military installation, the realignment of the installation, or the expanded realignment of the installation is supported by at least seven members of the Commission.

(6) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—The Comptroller General report required

by section 2903(d)(5)(B) analyzing the recommendations of the Secretary and the selection process in 2005 shall be transmitted to the congressional defense committees not later than July 1, 2005.

(e) REVIEW BY THE PRESIDENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this subsection, section 2903(e) shall apply to the review by the President of the recommendations of the Commission under this section, and the actions, if any, of the Commission in response to such review, in 2005. The President shall review the recommendations of the Secretary and the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission under subsection (d) and prepare a report, not later than September '23, 2005, containing the President's approval or disapproval of the Commission's recommendations.

(2) COMMISSION RECONSIDERATION.—If the Commission prepares a revised list of recommendations under section 2903(e)(3) in 2005 in response to the review of the President in that year under paragraph (1), the Commission shall transmit the revised list to the President not later than October 20, 2005.

(3) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO TRANSMIT.—If the President does not transmit to Congress an approval and certification described in paragraph (2) or (4) of section 2903(e) by November 7, 2005, the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this part in 2005 shall he terminated.

(4) EFFECT OF TRANSMITTAL.—A report of the President under this subsection containing the President's approval of the Commission's recommendations is deemed to be a report under section 2903(e) for purposes of sections 2904 and 2908.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX D
FORCE STRUCTURE PLAN

This appendix is taken verbatim from the Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Report, May 13, 2005 (Volume 1, Part 1 of 2, Chapter 2), with the exception of the "Battle Force Ships" statistics, which were subsequently revised by DoD.

INTRODUCTION

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff provided a long-term force structure plan for the Defense Department based on analysis of current and future threats, challenges, and opportunities and on the President's national strategy to meet such circumstances. In accordance with Section 2912 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Public Law 101-510, as amended, the force structure plan for Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 is based on the probable threats to national security for a 20-year period, from 2005 to 2024. In previous BRAC rounds, a similar requirement provided an assessment and projection of force structure for only 6 years into the future. It is important to note that this report focuses on a snapshot of force structure through Fiscal Years 2011 due to security classifications.

An unclassified portion of the force structure plan is included in this report. The entire plan is classified and available through restricted distribution. The force structure plan does not reflect temporary adjustments to the force structure of one or another military service that the Secretary of Defense may make from time to time in response to unique but transient conditions. The Secretary of Defense submitted the force structure plan to Congress in March 2004 and provided a revised submission in March 2005 per Public Law 101-510.

STRATEGY AND FORCE DEVELOPMENT

The President's National Security Strategy and the Secretary of Defense's Strategy provide a new focus for U.S. military forces. These strategies require that U.S. forces, by their presence and activities, assure friends and allies of the United States resolve and the ability to fulfill commitments. Military forces must dissuade adversaries from developing dangerous capabilities. In addition, forces must provide the President with a wide range of options to deter aggression and coercion, and if deterrence fails, forces must have the ability to defeat any adversary at the time, place, and in the manner of U.S. choosing.

Based on detailed analysis since the Secretary's 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review, the Department of Defense has updated its strategic thinking, incorporating lessons learned from recent military operations.

The Department's planning has informed decisions to date on the force's overall mix of capabilities, size, posture, patterns of activity, readiness, and capacity to surge globally.

Just as strategy is constantly updated to incorporate and account for a changing global security environment, force planning standards also are adaptive and dynamic over time.

The Department's force planning framework does not focus on specific conflicts. It helps determine capabilities required for a range of scenarios. The Department analyzes the force requirements for the most likely, the most dangerous, and the most demanding circumstances. Assessments of U.S. capabilities will examine the breadth and depth of this construct, not seek to optimize in a single area. Doing so allows decision makers to identify areas where prudent risk could be accepted and areas where risk should be reduced or mitigated.

The defense strategy requires the creation of new forms of security cooperation to support U.S. efforts to swiftly defeat an adversary with modest reinforcement. Specifically, security cooperation will underpin diversified, operational basing access and training opportunities for forward stationed forces, and strengthen U.S. influence with potential partners that could provide coalition capabilities for future contingencies. Security cooperation efforts will focus on activities to build defense relationships that promote U.S. and allied security interests, develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and coalition operations, and provide U.S. forces with peacetime and contingency access and en route infrastructure.

Transformation To A Capabilities-Based Approach

Continuous defense transformation is part of a wider governmental effort to transform America's national security institutions to meet 21st-century challenges and opportunities. Just as our challenges change continuously, so too must our military capabilities.

The purpose of transformation is to extend key advantages and reduce vulnerabilities. We are now in a long-term struggle against persistent, adaptive adversaries, and we must transform to prevail.

Transformation is not only about technology. It is also about:

- Changing the way we think about challenges and opportunities;
- Adapting the defense establishment to that new perspective; and
- Refocusing capabilities to meet future challenges, not those we are already most prepared to meet.

Transformation requires difficult programmatic and organizational choices. We will need to divest in some areas and invest in others.

Transformational change is not limited to operational forces. We also want to change longstanding business processes within the Department to take advantage of information technology. We also are working to transform our international partnerships, including the capabilities that our partners and we can use collectively.

Derivative of a transformational mindset is adoption of a capabilities-based planning methodology. Capabilities-based planning focuses more on how adversaries may challenge us than on whom those adversaries might be or where we might face them. It focuses the Department on the growing range of capabilities and methods we must possess to contend with an uncertain future. It recognizes the limits of intelligence and the impossibility of predicting complex events with precision. Our planning aims to link capabilities to joint operating concepts across a broad range of scenarios.

The Department is adopting a new approach for planning to implement our strategy. The defense strategy will drive this top-down, competitive process. Operating within fiscal constraints, our new approach enables the Secretary of Defense and Joint Force Commanders to balance risk across a range of areas.

We seek to foster a culture of innovation. The War on Terrorism imparts an urgency to defense transformation; we must transform to win the war.

Addressing Capabilities Through Force Transformation

The Department's transformation strategy will balance near-term operational risk with future risk in investment decisions. It will invest now in specific technologies and concepts that are transformational, while remaining open to other paths toward transformation. Capabilities will be developed, supported by force transformation, which will allow us to meet the defense strategy while remaining open to explore new and essential capabilities. This force transformation will allow us to create a new/future force structure, which will move from its current platform-centric condition to a more capabilities-based and network-centric philosophy that addresses the full spectrum of conflict. It will allow the U.S. military to create conditions for increased speed of command and opportunities for coordination across the battlespace.

Probable Threats To National Security

Range of Challenges

Uncertainty is the defining characteristic of today's strategic environment. We can identify trends but cannot predict specific events with precision. While we work to avoid being surprised, we must posture ourselves to handle unanticipated problems—we must plan with surprise in mind.

We contend with uncertainty by adapting to circumstances and influencing events. It is not enough to react to change. We must safeguard U.S. freedoms and interests while working actively to forestall the emergence of new challenges.

The U.S. military predominates in the world in traditional forms of warfare. Potential adversaries accordingly shift away from challenging the United States through traditional military action and adopt asymmetric capabilities and methods. An array of traditional, irregular, catastrophic, and disruptive capabilities and methods threaten U.S. interests.

These categories overlap. Actors proficient in one can be expected to try to reinforce their position with methods and capabilities drawn from others.

Indeed, recent experience indicates that the most dangerous circumstances arise when we face a complex of such challenges. For example, our adversaries in Iraq and Afghanistan presented both traditional and irregular challenges. Terrorist groups like al Qaida pose irregular threats but also actively seek catastrophic capabilities. The government of North Korea at once poses traditional, irregular, and catastrophic challenges. In the future, the most capable opponents may seek to combine truly disruptive capacity with traditional, irregular, and catastrophic forms of warfare.

Traditional challenges come largely from states employing recognized military capabilities and forces in well-known forms of military competition and conflict. While traditional forms of military competition remain important, trends suggest that these challenges will receive lesser priority in the planning of adversaries vis-à-vis the United States. This can be attributed, in part, to U.S. and allied superiority in traditional forms of warfare and the enormous cost to develop, acquire, and maintain conventional capabilities. But it is also explained by the increasing attractiveness of irregular methods, as well as the increasing availability of catastrophic capabilities. Even where adversaries possess considerable capacity in traditional domains, they often seek to reinforce their position with catastrophic, irregular, and disruptive methods and capabilities. Therefore, some strictly traditional or hybrid challenges require the active maintenance of sufficient combat overmatch in key areas of traditional military competition.

Irregular challenges are characterized as "unconventional" methods employed by state and non-state actors to counter the traditional advantages of stronger opponents. Irregular methods of increasing sophistication—including terrorism, insurgency, civil war, and third-party coercion—will challenge U.S. security interests to a greater degree than they have in the past. Our adversaries are likely to exploit a host of irregular methods in an attempt to erode U.S. influence, power, and national will over time.

Two factors in particular have intensified the rapid growth and potential danger of irregular challenges: the rise of extremist ideologies and the erosion of traditional sovereignty. Worldwide political, religious, and ethnic extremism continue to fuel deadly and destabilizing conflicts. Particularly threatening are those extremist ideologies that sanction horrific violence targeted at civilians and noncombatants. Areas in Central and South America, Africa, the Middle East, and South, Central, and Southeast Asia have provided havens for terrorists, criminals, insurgents, and other groups that threaten global security. Many governments in these areas are unable or unwilling to extend effective control over their territory, thus increasing the area available to hostile exploitation. Irregular challenges in and from these areas will grow more intense over time and are likely to challenge the security of the United States and its partners for the indefinite future.

Our ongoing War on Terrorism and our resulting operational experience call for a reorientation of our military capabilities to contend with these challenges more effectively.

Catastrophic challenges involve the acquisition, possession, and use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) or methods producing WMD-like effects. A number of state and non-state actors are vigorously seeking to acquire dangerous and destabilizing catastrophic capabilities. States seek these capabilities to offset perceived regional imbalances or to hedge against U.S. military superiority. Terrorists seek them because of the potential they hold for greater physical and psychological impact on targeted audiences.

Porous international borders, weak controls over weapons-related materials and expertise, and ongoing revolutions in information technology are increasingly enabling this trend. Particularly troublesome is the nexus of transnational terrorists, WMD proliferation, and rogue states. Unchecked, this confluence raises the prospect of direct WMD employment against the United States or our allies and partners. Indeed, many would-be adversaries likely believe the best war to check American reach and influence is to develop the capability to threaten the U.S. homeland directly. Catastrophic attacks could arrive via a number of delivery means ranging from rogue use of WMD-armed ballistic missiles to surreptitious delivery through routine commercial channels to innovative attacks like those undertaken on 9/11.

Elements of the U.S. national infrastructure are vulnerable to catastrophic attack. The interdependent nature of the infrastructure crests more vulnerability because attacks against one sector—the electric power grid for instance—would impact other sectors as well. Parts of the defense-related critical infrastructure are vulnerable to a wide range of attacks, especially those that rely on commercial sector elements with multiple single points of failure.

The continuing illicit proliferation of WMD technology and expertise makes contending with catastrophic challenges an enduring necessity. A single catastrophic attack against the United States is an unacceptable prospect. The strategic effect of such an attack transcends the mere economic and social costs. It represents a more fundamental, existential threat to our nation, our institutions, and our free society. Thus, we must apply new emphasis to capabilities that enable us to dissuade acquisition of catastrophic capabilities, deter their use, and finally, when necessary, defeat them prior to their posing direct threats to us and our partners.

Disruptive challenges are those posed by competitors employing breakthrough technology that might counter or negate our current advantages in key operational domains. In doing so, competitors seek to provide new military options that offset our advantages in niche areas and threaten our ability to operate from the strategic commons—space, international waters and airspace, and cyberspace. Such developments will afford opponents only temporary advantage. In a few instances, however, the United States could confront technological breakthroughs that would fundamentally alter our approach to security. These might include, but are not limited to, breakthroughs in biotechnology, cyber operations, space, directed energy, and other emerging fields. Although such developments are unpredictable, we must be attentive to the consequences that such possibilities hold, and plan and invest accordingly.

The goal of our transformation is to contend effectively with these challenges and channel future security competition in ways favorable to the United States and its international partners. We accomplish this by assuring our allies and friends—demonstrating our resolve to fulfill defense commitments and protect common interests; dissuading potential adversaries from adopting threatening capabilities and ambitions; and deterring aggression and coercion by maintaining capable and rapidly deployable military forces. Finally, at the direction of the President, we will defeat adversaries at the time, place, and in the manner of our choosing—setting the conditions for future security.

The Unclassified Force Structure Plan

The following table shows the programmed force structure, manning, and funding for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force for Fiscal Years 2005, 2007, 2009, and 2011. When reviewing this plan, it should be noted that it depicts only Service force units; that is, not all of the force structure is identified. For example, the unclassified version does not account for Army non-divisional units including its associated assets like aviation and special operations; Navy non-carrier-based aircraft and construction battalions; and Air Force airlift, special operation, tankers, and missiles.

Service Force Units

	FY 2005	FY 2007	FY 2009	FY 2011
Army Units of Employment				
Active	6	11	13	13
Reserve	1	5	8	8
Army Divisions				
Active	5			
Reserve	7	3		
Aircraft Carriers	12	11	11	11
Carrier Air Wings				
Active	10	10	10	10
Reserve	1	1	1	1
Battle Force Ships	324	324	336	341
Air Force AEFs				
	10	10	10	10
USMC Divisions				
Active	3	3	3	3
Reserve	1	1	1	1

END STRENGTH (K)

		FY05	FY07	FY09	FY11
USA*	AC	482	482	482	482
	RC	555	555	555	555
USN	AC	366	345	345	345
	RC	83	71	70	70
USMC*	AC	175	175	175	175
	RC	40	40	40	40
USAF	AC	360	356	350	350
	RC	183	182	182	183

** The Army projects it will end FY05 with end strength of 511,800 or 29,400 above the baseline of 482,400. The Marine Corps projects it will end FY05 with end strength of 177,675 or 2,675 above the baseline of 175,000. The FY05 Supplemental request includes $1.7 billion to support these overstrengths. In FY06, the Army and Marine Corps plan to exceed the funded end strength levels by at least 30,000 and 3,000 end strength, respectively. Both Services plan to seek Supplemental funding for any additional end strength above the baseline in support of the Global War on Terrorism.*

ANTICIPATED LEVEL OF FUNDING ($B)

	FY05	FY07	FY09	FY11
USA	115.0	110.1	120.3	125.6
USN	103.7	110.5	122.7	131.5
USMC	18.9	18.5	20.6	21.9
USAF	119.6	133.3	138.7	146.8

APPENDIX E

FINAL SELECTION CRITERIA FOR 2005

The final selection criteria for the 2005 round of base closures and realignment were originally published by the Department of Defense in the Federal Register on December 23, 2003. They were adopted as final criteria on February 12, 2004, unless Congress passed a resolution of disapproval by March 1, 2004. Congress's decision not to do so meant the criteria went into effect. Congress later enshrined the final selection criteria into law as Subtitle C of P.L. 108-375 (which amended Section 2913 of P.L. 101-510).

The final criteria to be used by the Secretary in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part in 2005 shall be the military value and other criteria specified [below]:

MILITARY VALUE (GIVEN PRIORITY CONSIDERATION)

1. The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department of Defense, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.

2. The availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.

3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training.

4. The cost of operations and the manpower implications.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

5. The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.

6. The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.

7. The ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel.

8. The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance.

FINAL SELECTION CRITERIA

1995 VS. 2005

MILITARY VALUE CRITERIA (GIVEN PRIORITY IN BOTH ROUNDS)

Note: Text in *italics* represents the new text in the 2005 final selection criteria that was not present in the 1995 final selection criteria. Text from the 1995 final selection criteria which was dropped or not included in the 2005 criteria is marked in a different font.

1995	2005
1. The current and future mission requirements and the impact on operational readiness of the Department of Defense's total force.	1. The current and future mission *capabilities* and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department of Defense, *including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.*
2. The availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace at both the existing and potential receiving locations.	2. The availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace *(including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions)* at both existing and potential receiving locations.
3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at both the existing and potential receiving locations.	3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, *surge*, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations *to support operations and training.*
4. The cost and manpower implications.	4. The cost *of operations* and *the* manpower implications.

FINAL SELECTION CRITERIA

1995 vs. 2005

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Note: Text in *italics* represents the new text in the 2005 final selection criteria that was not present in the 1995 final selection criteria. Text from the 1995 final selection criteria which was dropped or not included in the 2005 criteria is marked in a different font.

1995	2005
RETURN ON INVESTMENT	OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
5. The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs. *[note: identical to 2005]*	5. The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs. *[note: identical to 1995]*
IMPACTS	
6. The economic impact on communities.	6. The economic impact on *existing* communities *in the vicinity of military installations.*
7. The ability of both the existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions, and personnel.	7. The ability of *the infrastructure of* both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel.
8. The environmental impact.	8. The environmental impact, *including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities.*

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX F

BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS BY STATE: 1995, 1993, 1991, AND 1988

ALABAMA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Alabama Army Ammunition Plant	CLOSE
1988	Coosa River Storage Annex	CLOSE
1991	Fort Rucker	REALIGN
1993	Naval Station Mobile	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Gadsden	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Montgomery	CLOSE
1993	Anniston Army Depot	REALIGN
1995	Fort McClellan	CLOSE
1995	Naval Reserve Center Huntsville	CLOSE

ALASKA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1995	Fort Greely	REALIGN
1995	Naval Air Facility Adak	CLOSE

ARIZONA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Navajo Army Depot Activity	CLOSE
1991	Williams Air Force Base	CLOSE
1995	Williams Air Force Base	REDIRECT

ARKANSAS

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1991	Eaker Air Force Base	CLOSE
1991	Fort Chaffee	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Fayetteville	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Fort Smith	CLOSE
1995	Fort Chaffee	CLOSE

CALIFORNIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	George Air Force Base	CLOSE
1988	Hamilton Army Airfield	CLOSE
1988	Mather Air Force Base	CLOSE
1988	Naval Station San Francisco (Hunters Point)	REALIGN
1988	Norton Air Force Base	CLOSE
1988	Presidio of San Francisco	CLOSE
1988	Salton Sea Test Base, Imperial County	CLOSE
1991	Beale Air Force Base	REALIGN
1991	Castle Air Force Base	CLOSE
1991	Fort Ord	CLOSE
1991	Hunters Point Annex, San Francisco	CLOSE
1991	Integrated Combat Systems Test Facility San Diego	CLOSE
1991	Letterman Army Institute of Research, Presidio of San Francisco	DISESTAB
1991	Fleet Combat Direction Systems Support Activity San Diego	REALIGN
1991	March Air Force Base	REALIGN
1991	Mather Air Force Base	REDIRECT
1991	Naval Air Station Moffett Field	CLOSE
1991	Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center San Diego	CLOSE
1991	Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center Vallejo	CLOSE
1991	Naval Space Systems Activity Los Angeles	CLOSE
1991	Naval Station Long Beach	CLOSE
1991	Naval Weapons Center China Lake	REALIGN
1991	Pacific Missile Test Center Point Mugu	REALIGN
1991	Sacramento Army Depot	CLOSE
1991	Marine Corps Air Station Tustin	CLOSE
1993	Castle Air Force Base (B-52 Combat Crew Training redirected from Fairchild AFB to Barksdale AFB and KC-135 Combat Crew Training from Fairchild AFB to Altus AFB)	REDIRECT
1993	Data Processing Center Marine Corps Air Station El Toro	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division China Lake	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division Point Mugu	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Command Control & Ocean Surveillance Center San Diego	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Navy Regional Data Automation Center San Francisco	CLOSE

CALIFORNIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Defense Contract Management District West El Segundo	RELOCATE
1993	Defense Distribution Depot Oakland	DISESTAB
1993	Hunters Point Annex to Naval Station Treasure Island (Redirect to dispose of all property in any lawful manner, including outlease)	REDIRECT
1993	March Air Force Base	REALIGN
1993	Mare Island Naval Shipyard	CLOSE
1993	Marine Corps Air Station El Toro	CLOSE
1993	Marine Corps Air Station Tustin (Relocate MCAS Tustin helicopter assets to NAS North Island, NAS Miramar, or MCAS Camp Pendleton)	REDIRECT
1993	Marine Corps Data Processing Center Regional Automated Services Center Camp Pendleton	CLOSE
1993	Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow	REALIGN
1993	Mather Air Force Base (940th Air Refueling Group redirected from McClellan AFB to Beale AFB)	REDIRECT
1993	Naval Air Station Alameda	CLOSE
1993	Naval Aviation Depot Alameda	CLOSE
1993	Naval Electronics Systems Engineering Center San Diego (Consolidate with Naval Electronics Systems Engineering Center Vallejo into available space in Air Force Plant #19, San Diego, vice new construction)	REDIRECT
1993	Naval Electronics Systems Engineering Center Vallajo (Consolidate with Naval Electronics Systems Center San Diego into available space in Air Force Plant #19, San Diego, vice new construction)	REDIRECT
1993	Naval Hospital Oakland	CLOSE
1993	Naval Station Treasure Island, San Francisco	CLOSE
1993	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach	REALIGN
1993	Navy Data Processing Center Facilities Systems Office, Port Hueneme	CLOSE
1993	Navy Data Processing Center Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, San Diego	CLOSE
1993	Presidio of Monterey Annex	REALIGN
1993	Presidio of San Francisco (6th Army remains at the Presidio of San Francisco, CA, instead of moving to Fort Carson, CO)	REDIRECT
1993	Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Port Hueneme	CLOSE
1993	Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Western Engineering Field Division, San Bruno	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Pacific Grove	CLOSE
1993	Naval Training Center San Diego	CLOSE
1993	Planning, Estimating, Repair, and Alterations Center (Surface) Pacific San Francisco	DISESTAB

CALIFORNIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Naval Public Works Center San Francisco	DISESTAB
1995	Oakland Army Base	CLOSE
1995	Naval Shipyard Long Beach	CLOSE
1995	McClellan Air Force Base	CLOSE
1995	Ontario International Airport Air Guard Station	CLOSE
1995	Defense Distribution Depot McClellan	DISESTAB
1995	Fort Hunter Liggett	REALIGN
1995	Sierra Army Depot	REALIGN
1995	Onizuka Air Station	REALIGN
1995	Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks	CLOSE
1995	East Fort Baker	CLOSE
1995	Rio Vista Army Reserve Center	CLOSE
1995	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Oakland	CLOSE
1995	Naval Command, Control, and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering West Coast Division San Diego	DISESTAB
1995	Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion, and Repair, USN, Long Beach	DISESTAB
1995	Naval Reserve Center Stockton	CLOSE
1995	Naval Reserve Center Santa Ana	CLOSE
1995	Naval Reserve Center Pomona	CLOSE
1995	Marine Corps Air Station El Toro	REDIRECT
1995	Marine Corps Air Station Tustin	REDIRECT
1995	Naval Air Station Alameda	REDIRECT
1995	Naval Recruiting District San Diego	REDIRECT
1995	Naval Training Center San Diego	REDIRECT
1995	Defense Contract Management District West, El Segundo	REDIRECT

COLORADO

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Bennett Army National Guard Facility, Arapahoe County	CLOSE
1988	Pueblo Army Depot	REALIGN
1991	Lowry Air Force Base	CLOSE
1993	Pueblo Army Depot (Redirects supply mission from Defense Distribution Depot Tooele, UT, to new location within the Defense Distribution Depot System.)	REDIRECT
1995	Fitzsimons Army Medical Center	CLOSE

COLORADO

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1995	Lowry Air Force Base	REDIRECT

CONNECTICUT

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Family Housing Ansonia 04	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing East Windsor 08	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Fairfield 65	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Manchester 25	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Middletown 48	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Milford 17	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing New Britain 74	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Orange 15	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Plainville 67	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Portland 36	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Westport 73	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Shelton 74	CLOSE
1995	Stratford Army Engine Plant	CLOSE
1991	Naval Underwater Systems Center Detachment, New London	REALIGN

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1991	U S Army Institute of Dental Research	DISESTAB
1991	Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (Microwave Bioeffects Research)	REALIGN
1993	Data Processing Center Bureau of Naval Personnel	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Computer & Telecommunications Station	CLOSE
1993	Naval Security Group Command (including Security Group Station and Security Group Detachment) Potomac	REALIGN
1993	Naval Electronic Security Systems Engineering Center	CLOSE
1995	Naval Recruiting Command Washington	REDIRECT
1995	Naval Security Group Detachment Potomac Washington	REDIRECT

FLORIDA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Cape St. George	CLOSE
1988	Naval Reserve Center (Coconut Grove) Miami	CLOSE

FLORIDA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1991	MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa	REALIGN
1991	Naval Coastal Systems Center, Panama City	REALIGN
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Air Station Key West	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Air Station Mayport	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Computer & Telecommunications Station, Pensacola	CLOSE
1993	Homestead Air Force Base	REALIGN
1993	MacDill Air Force Base (Airfield to be operated by the Department of Commerce or another federal agency. Joint Communications Support Element stays at MacDill vice relocating to Charleston AFB)	REDIRECT
1993	Naval Air Station Cecil Field	CLOSE
1993	Naval Aviation Depot Pensacola	CLOSE
1993	Naval Hospital Orlando	CLOSE
1993	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center (Naval Supply Center) Pensacola	DISESTAB
1993	Defense Distribution Depot Pensacola	DISESTAB
1993	Naval Training Center Orlando	CLOSE
1993	Naval Air Station Key West	REALIGN
1995	Eglin Air Force Base	REALIGN
1995	Big Coppett Key	CLOSE
1995	Naval Research Laboratory, Underwater Sound Reference Detachment, Orlando	DISESTAB
1995	Naval Air Station Cecil Field	REDIRECT
1995	Naval Aviation Depot Pensacola	REDIRECT
1995	Navy Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center, Naval Training Center, Orlando	REDIRECT
1995	Naval Training Center Orlando	REDIRECT
1995	Homestead Air Force Base (301st Rescue Squadron)	REDIRECT
1995	Homestead Air Force Base (726th Air Control Squadron)	REDIRECT
1995	MacDill Air Force Base	REDIRECT
1995	Naval Research Laboratory, Underwater Sound Reference Detachment, Orlando	CLOSE

GEORGIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Navy Data Processing Center Trident Refit Facility Kings Bay	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Macon	CLOSE
1995	Defense Contract Management District South, Marietta	DISESTAB

GUAM

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Naval Air Station Agana	CLOSE
1995	Ship Repair Facility	CLOSE
1995	Naval Activities	REALIGN
1995	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center	REALIGN
1995	Public Works	REALIGN
1995	Naval Air Station Agana	REDIRECT

HAWAII

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Kapalama Military Reservation Phase III	CLOSE
1991	Naval Air Facility Midway Island	REALIGN
1991	Naval Ocean Systems Center Detachment, Kanaohe	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Computer & Telecommunications Area Master Station, EASTPAC, Pearl Harbor	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Supply Center Pearl Harbor	CLOSE
1993	Naval Air Station Barbers Point	CLOSE
1993	Naval Air Facility Midway Island	CLOSE
1995	Naval Air Station Barbers Point	REDIRECT

IDAHO

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1991	Mountain Home Air Force Base	REALIGN

ILLINOIS

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Chanute Air Force Base	CLOSE
1988	Fort Sheridan	CLOSE
1988	USARC Addison Housing	CLOSE
1988	Worth Family Housing	CLOSE
1991	Armament, Munitions, and Chemical Command Rock Island Arsenal	REALIGN
1993	Chanute Air Force Base (Metals Technology and Aircraft Structural Maintenance training courses from Chanute AFB to Sheppard AFB redirected to NAS Memphis)	REDIRECT
1993	Defense Contract Management District Northcentral, Chicago	DISESTAB
1993	Naval Air Station Glenview	CLOSE
1993	O'Hare International Airport Air Force Reserve Station	CLOSE

ILLINOIS

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Rock Island Arsenal (AMCCOM remains at Rock Island, IL instead of moving to Redstone Arsenal, AL)	REDIRECT
1995	Savanna Army Depot Activity	CLOSE
1995	Chicago O'Hare International Airport Air Reserve Station	CLOSE

INDIANA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Indiana Army Ammunition Plant	CLOSE
1988	Jefferson Proving Ground	CLOSE
1991	Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indianapolis	CLOSE
1991	Grissom Air Force Base, Peru	CLOSE
1991	Naval Avionics Center, Indianapolis	REALIGN
1991	Naval Weapons Support Center, Crane	REALIGN
1993	Defense Information Technology Service Organization, Indianapolis Information Processing Center	CLOSE
1993	Navy/Marine Corps Reserve Center Fort Wayne	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Terre Haute	CLOSE
1995	Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis	CLOSE

IOWA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Fort Des Moines	CLOSE

KANSAS

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Readiness Command Region Olathe (Region 18)	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Hutchinson	CLOSE
1995	Naval Air Reserve Olathe	CLOSE

KENTUCKY

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Lexington-Bluegrass Army Depot	CLOSE
1991	Naval Ordnance Station Louisville	REALIGN
1995	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division Detachment, Louisville	CLOSE

LOUISIANA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Naval Station Lake Charles	CLOSE
1988	New Orleans Military Ocean Terminal	CLOSE
1991	England Air Force Base	CLOSE
1991	Fort Polk	REALIGN
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Computer & Telecommunications Station, New Orleans	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Monroe	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Facility Alexandria	CLOSE
1993	Navy Data Processing Center Enlisted Personnel Management Center New Orleans	CLOSE
1995	Naval Biodynamics Laboratory New Orleans	CLOSE
1995	Naval Reserve Readiness Command New Orleans (Region 10)	CLOSE

MAINE

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1991	Loring Air Force Base, Caribou	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Air Station Brunswick	CLOSE

MARYLAND

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Army Reserve Center Gaithersburg	CLOSE
1988	Former Nike site at Aberdeen Proving Ground	CLOSE
1988	Fort Detrick	REALIGN
1988	Fort Holabird	REALIGN
1988	Fort Meade	REALIGN
1988	Nike Washington-Baltimore	CLOSE
1991	U.S. Army Biomedical Research Development Laboratory, Fort Detrick	DISESTAB
1991	David Taylor Research Center Detachment Annapolis	REALIGN
1991	Fuze Development and Production (armament and missile-related) Harry Diamond Laboratories, Adelphi	REALIGN
1991	Naval Ordnance Station Indian Head	REALIGN
1991	Naval Surface Warfare Center Detachment, White Oak	REALIGN
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Patuxent River	CLOSE
1993	Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center St. Inigoes	CLOSE
1993	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren White Oak Detachment, White Oak	DISESTAB
1993	Navy Radio Transmission Facility Annapolis	DISESTAB

MARYLAND

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Sea Automated Data Systems Activity Indian Head	DISESTAB
1995	Fort Ritchie	CLOSE
1995	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division Detachment, White Oak	CLOSE
1995	Fort Meade	REALIGN
1995	Concepts Analysis Agency	CLOSE
1995	Fort Holabird	CLOSE
1995	Publications Distribution Center, Baltimore	CLOSE
1995	Naval Medical Research Institute Bethesda	CLOSE
1995	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Detachment, Annapolis	CLOSE
1995	Tri-Service Project Reliance, Army Bio-Medical Research Laboratory, Fort Detrick	REDIRECT
1995	Investigations Control and Automation Directorate, Fort Holabird	RELOCATE

MASSACHUSETTS

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Family Housing Bedford 85	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Beverly 15	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Burlington 84	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Hull 36	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Nahant 17	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Randolph 55	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Swansea 29	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Topsfield 05	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing Wakefield 03	CLOSE
1988	Fort Devens	REALIGN
1988	Army Materials Technology Laboratory, Watertown	CLOSE
1991	Army Materials Technology Laboratory, Watertown	REDIRECT
1991	Fort Devens	CLOSE
1991	Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station Keyport	REALIGN
1993	Naval Reserve Center Chicopee	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center New Bedford	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Pittsfield	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Quincy	CLOSE
1993	Navy/Marine Corps Reserve Center Lawrence	CLOSE

MASSACHUSETTS

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1995	Naval Air Station South Weymouth	CLOSE
1995	Hingham Cohasset, Fort Devens	CLOSE
1995	Sudbury Training Annex	CLOSE

MICHIGAN

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Pontiac Storage Facility	CLOSE
1991	Ground Vehicle Propulsion Basic and Applied Research, Warren	REALIGN
1991	Wurtsmith Air Force Base	CLOSE
1993	Naval Air Facility Detroit	CLOSE
1993	Defense Logistics Agency Information Processing Center, Battle Creek	CLOSE
1993	K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base	CLOSE
1995	Detroit Arsenal	REALIGN
1995	Naval Reserve Center Cadillac	CLOSE
1995	Naval Air Facility Detroit	REDIRECT

MISSOURI

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Nike Kansas City 30	CLOSE
1988	St. Louis Area Support Center Wherry Housing	CLOSE
1991	Aviation Systems Command and Troop Command	REALIGN
1991	Richard-Gebaur Air Reserve Station	CLOSE
1993	Defense Information Technology Service Organization, Kansas City Information Processing Center	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Joplin	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center St. Joseph	CLOSE
1995	Aviation-Troop Support Command	DISESTAB

MONTANA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Naval Reserve Center Great Falls	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Missoula	CLOSE
1995	Malmstrom Air Force Base	REALIGN
1995	Fort Missoula	CLOSE

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Pease Air Force Base	CLOSE
1993	Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning, and Procurement Portsmouth	DISESTAB

NEW JERSEY

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Fort Dix	REALIGN
1988	Fort Monmouth	REALIGN
1988	Nike NY 54 Housing	CLOSE
1988	Nike NY 60 Housing	CLOSE
1988	Nike NY 79/80 Housing	CLOSE
1988	Nike NY 93/94	CLOSE
1988	Nike Philadelphia 41/43	CLOSE
1991	Electronic Technology Device Laboratory, Fort Monmouth	REALIGN
1991	Fort Dix	REALIGN
1991	Naval Air Engineering Center, Lakehurst	REALIGN
1991	Naval Air Propulsion Center, Trenton	REALIGN
1993	Fort Monmouth	REALIGN
1993	Naval Reserve Center Atlantic City	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Perth Amboy	CLOSE
1993	Naval Air Warfare Center - Aircraft Division, Trenton	CLOSE
1995	Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal	CLOSE
1995	Fort Dix	REALIGN
1995	Camp Kilmer	CLOSE
1995	Camp Pedricktown	CLOSE

NEW MEXICO

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Fort Wingate Ammunition Storage Depot	CLOSE
1991	Battlefield Environmental Effects Element of the Atmospheric Science Laboratory, White Sands Missile Range	REALIGN
1991	Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility Albuquerque	CLOSE
1993	Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility Albuquerque (retain as a tenant of the Air Force)	REDIRECT

NEW YORK

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Dry Hill Family Housing	CLOSE
1988	Manhattan Beach Housing	CLOSE
1988	Naval Station New York (Brooklyn)	CLOSE
1988	Nike NY 01 Housing	CLOSE
1988	Nike NY 25 Housing	CLOSE
1988	Nike NY 99 Housing	CLOSE
1993	Griffiss Air Force Base	REALIGN
1993	Naval Reserve Center Jamestown	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Poughkeepsie	CLOSE
1993	Naval Station Staten Island	CLOSE
1993	Plattsburgh Air Force Base	CLOSE
1993	Readiness Command Region Scotia (Region 2)	CLOSE
1993	Department of Defense Family Housing and Family Housing Office, Niagara Falls	CLOSE
1995	Seneca Army Depot	CLOSE
1995	Roslyn Air Guard Station	CLOSE
1995	Griffiss Air Force Base (Airfield Support for 10th Infantry [Light] Division)	REDIRECT
1995	Griffiss Air Force Base (485th Engineering Installation Group)	REDIRECT
1995	Bellmore Logistics Activity	CLOSE
1995	Fort Totten	CLOSE
1995	Naval Reserve Center Staten Island	CLOSE
1995	Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor Activity, Buffalo	CLOSE

NORTH CAROLINA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Data Processing Center Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point	CLOSE
1993	Marine Corps Data Processing Center, Regional Automated Services Center, Camp Lejeune	CLOSE
1995	Recreation Center #2, Fayetteville	CLOSE

NORTH DAKOTA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1995	Grand Forks Air Force Base	REALIGN

OHIO

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1991	Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base	CLOSE
1993	Defense Information Technology Service Organization, Columbus Annex Dayton	CLOSE
1993	Defense Information Technology Services Organization, Cleveland	CLOSE
1993	Gentile Air Force Station (Defense Electronics Supply Center), Dayton	CLOSE
1993	Newark Air Force Base	CLOSE
1993	Readiness Command Region Ravenna (Region 5)	CLOSE
1993	Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base (Retain 121st Air Refueling Wing and the 160th Air Refueling Group in a cantonment area at Rickenbacker ANGB instead of Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, and operate as tenants of the Rickenbacker Port Authority [RPA] on the RPA's airport)	REDIRECT
1995	Defense Contract Management Command International, Dayton	REALIGN
1995	Defense Distribution Depot Columbus	REALIGN

OREGON

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Umatilla Army Depot	REALIGN

PENNSYLVANIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Coraopolis Family Housing Site 71	CLOSE
1988	Coraopolis Family Housing Site 72	CLOSE
1988	Irwin Support Detachment Annex	CLOSE
1988	Naval Hospital Philadelphia	CLOSE
1988	Pitt 02 Family Housing	CLOSE
1988	Pitt 03 Family Housing	CLOSE
1988	Pitt 25 Family Housing	CLOSE
1988	Pitt 37 Family Housing	CLOSE
1988	Pitt 42 Family Housing	CLOSE
1988	Pitt 43 Family Housing	CLOSE
1988	Pitt 52 Family Housing	CLOSE
1988	Tacony Warehouse	CLOSE
1991	Letterkenny Army Depot	REALIGN
1991	Naval Air Development Center Warminster	REALIGN
1991	Naval Station Philadelphia	CLOSE
1991	Philadelphia Naval Shipyard	CLOSE

PENNSYLVANIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia	RELOCATE
1993	Defense Contract Management District Midatlantic, Philadelphia	DISESTAB
1993	Defense Logistics Agency Clothing Factory, Philadelphia	CLOSE
1993	Defense Logistics Agency Information Processing Center, Philadelphia	CLOSE
1993	Naval/Marine Corps Air Facility (Joint Aviation Facility) Johnstown	CLOSE
1993	Letterkenny Army Depot (Systems Integration Management Activity-East remains at Letterkenny Army Depot vice Rock Island, IL)	REDIRECT
1993	Naval Reserve Center Altoona	CLOSE
1993	Navy Data Processing Center Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia	CLOSE
1993	Planning, Estimating, Repair, and Alterations Center (Surface) Atlantic (HQ), Philadelphia	CLOSE
1995	Fort Indiantown Gap	CLOSE
1995	Charles E. Kelly Support Center	REALIGN
1995	Letterkenny Army Depot	CLOSE
1995	Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny	DISESTAB
1995	Defense Industrial Supply Center Philadelphia	DISESTAB
1995	Naval Shipyard, Norfolk Detachment, Philadelphia	REDIRECT
1995	Naval Aviation Engineering Support Unit Philadelphia	CLOSE
1995	Naval Air Technical Services Facility Philadelphia	CLOSE
1995	Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Open Water Test Facility, Oreland	CLOSE
1995	Naval Command, Control, and Ocean Surveillance RDT8rE Division Detachment, Warminster	CLOSE
1995	Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Warminister	CLOSE

PUERTO RICO

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1995	Fort Buchanan	REALIGN

RHODE ISLAND

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Family Housing Davisville	CLOSE
1988	Family Housing North Smithfield 99	CLOSE
1991	Construction Battalion Center Davisville	CLOSE
1991	Trident Command and Control Systems Maintenance Activity, Newport	REALIGN
1993	Naval Education and Training Center, Newport	REALIGN

SOUTH CAROLINA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1991	Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach	CLOSE
1993	Charleston Naval Shipyard	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Supply Center, Charleston	CLOSE
1993	Defense Distribution Depot Charleston	DISESTAB
1993	Naval Station Charleston	CLOSE
1993	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center (Naval Supply Center) Charleston	DISESTAB
1995	Naval Reserve Readiness Command Charleston	CLOSE
1995	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Charleston	CLOSE

TENNESSEE

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Naval Air Station Memphis	REALIGN
1993	Naval Reserve Center Kingsport	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Memphis	CLOSE
1995	Defense Distribution Depot Memphis	CLOSE

TEXAS

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Fort Bliss	REALIGN
1988	Naval Station Galveston	CLOSE
1991	Bergstrom Air Force Base	CLOSE
1991	Carswell Air Force Base	CLOSE
1991	Goodfellow Air Force Base	REALIGN
1991	Naval Air Station Chase Field	CLOSE
1993	Air Force Data Processing Center Computer Service Center, San Antonio	CLOSE
1993	Carswell Air Force Base (Fabrication function of the 436th Training Squadron redirected from Dyess AFB to Luke AFB; maintenance training function redirected from Dyess AFB to Hill AFB)	REDIRECT
1993	Data Processing Center Air Force Military Personnel Center, Randolph AFB	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Navy Data Automation Facility, Corpus Christi	CLOSE
1993	Naval Air Station Dallas	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Facility Midland	CLOSE
1993	Navy/Marine Corps Reserve Center Abilene	CLOSE

TEXAS

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Red River Army Depot	REALIGN
1995	Naval Reserve Center Laredo	CLOSE
1995	Bergstrom Air Reserve Base	CLOSE
1995	Reese Air Force Base	CLOSE
1995	Kelly Air Force Base	REALIGN
1995	Defense Distribution Depot San Antonio	DISESTAB
1995	Red River Army Depot	REALIGN
1995	Naval Air Station Corpus Christi	REALIGN

UTAH

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Fort Douglas	CLOSE
1993	Defense Distribution Depot Tooele	DISESTAB
1993	Defense Logistics Agency Information Processing Center, Ogden	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Ogden	CLOSE
1993	Tooele Army Depot	REALIGN
1995	Hill Air Force Base (Utah Training and Test Range)	REALIGN
1995	Defense Distribution Depot Ogden	CLOSE

VIRGINIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Cameron Station	CLOSE
1988	Defense Mapping Agency (DMA) site, Herndon	CLOSE
1988	Manassas Family Housing	CLOSE
1988	Nike Norfolk 85 Housing	CLOSE
1988	Woodbridge Housing Site	CLOSE
1991	Army Research Institute, Alexandria	REALIGN
1991	Belvoir Research and Development Center, Fort Belvoir	REALIGN
1991	Directed Energy and Sensors Basic and Applied Research Element of the Center for Night Vision and Electro-Optics, Ft. Belvoir	REALIGN
1991	Harry Diamond Laboratory, Woodbridge	CLOSE
1991	Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity, Yorktown	CLOSE
1991	Naval Sea Combat Systems Engineering Station Norfolk	REALIGN
1993	Air Force Data Processing Center 7th Communications Group, Pentagon, Arlington	CLOSE

VIRGINIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Bureau of Navy Personnel, Arlington (Including the Office of Military Manpower Management, Arlington)	REALIGN
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Air Station Oceana	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Supply Center Norfolk	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Navy Recruiting Command, Arlington	CLOSE
1993	Defense Logistics Agency Information Processing Center, Richmond	CLOSE
1993	Fort Belvoir	REALIGN
1993	Naval Air Systems Command, Arlington	REALIGN
1993	Naval Aviation Depot Norfolk	CLOSE
1993	Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Portsmouth	CLOSE
1993	Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Alexandria	REALIGN
1993	Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity, Yorktown (Realign to Panama City, FL vice Dam Neck, VA)	REDIRECT
1993	Naval Recruiting Command, Arlington	REALIGN
1993	Naval Reserve Center, Staunton	CLOSE
1993	Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington	REALIGN
1993	Naval Supply Systems Command, Arlington (Including Defense Printing Office, Alexandria, VA, and Food Systems Office, Arlington, VA)	REALIGN
1993	Naval Surface Warfare Center - Port Hueneme, Yorktown Detachment, Virginia Beach (Naval Mine Warfare Activity)	REALIGN
1993	Naval Undersea Warfare Center - Norfolk Detachment	DISESTAB
1993	Navy Data Processing Center Naval Computer & Telecommunications Area Master Station, Atlantic, Norfolk	CLOSE
1993	Navy Radio Transmission Facility, Driver	CLOSE
1993	Tactical Support Office, Arlington	REALIGN
1993	Vint Hill Farms	CLOSE
1993	Planning, Estimating, Repair, and Alterations Center (Surface) Atlantic, Norfolk	DISESTAB
1993	Naval Electronics Systems Engineering Center Portsmouth	CLOSE
1993	Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command	REALIGN
1993	Office of the General Counsel (Navy)	REALIGN
1993	Office of the Judge Advocate General (Navy)	REALIGN
1993	Office of the Secretary of the Navy (Legislative Affairs, Program Appraisal, Comptroller, Inspector General, and Information)	REALIGN
1993	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations	REALIGN

VIRGINIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Office of Civilian Manpower Management (Navy)	REALIGN
1993	International Programs Office (Navy)	REALIGN
1993	Combined Civilian Personnel Office (Navy)	REALIGN
1993	Navy Regional Contracting Center	REALIGN
1993	Naval Criminal Investigative Service	REALIGN
1993	Naval Audit Agency	REALIGN
1993	Strategic Systems Programs Office (Navy)	REALIGN
1993	Office of Naval Research	REALIGN
1993	Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff (Installations & Logistics), U.S. Marine Corps	REALIGN
1993	Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff (Manpower & Reserve Affairs), U.S. Marine Corps	REALIGN
1993	Marine Corps Systems Command (Clarendon Office)	REALIGN
1995	Fort Pickett	CLOSE
1995	Naval Command, Control, and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering East Coast Detachment, Norfolk	CLOSE
1995	Naval Information Systems Management Center, Arlington	REALIGN
1995	Naval Management Systems Support Office, Chesapeake	DISESTAB
1995	Fort Lee	REALIGN
1995	Information Systems Software Center (ISSC)	CLOSE

WASHINGTON

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Midway Housing Site	CLOSE
1988	Naval Station Puget Sound (Sand Point)	CLOSE
1988	Youngs Lake Housing Site	CLOSE
1991	Naval Station Puget Sound (Sand Point)	CLOSE
1991	Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station Keyport	REALIGN
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Air Station Whidbey Island	CLOSE
1993	Data Processing Center Naval Supply Center Puget Sound	CLOSE
1993	Navy Data Processing Center Trident Refit Facility Bangor	CLOSE
1993	Planning, Estimating, Repair, and Alterations Center (CV), Bremerton	DISESTAB
1995	Naval Undersea Warfare Center Keyport	REALIGN
1995	Camp Bonneville	CLOSE
1995	Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington	REDIRECT

WASHINGTON

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1995	Office of Naval Research	REDIRECT
1995	Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Arlington	REDIRECT

WEST VIRGINIA

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1993	Naval Air Facility Martinsburg	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Parkersburg	CLOSE

WISCONSIN

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1988	Sun Prairie Family Housing	CLOSE
1995	Naval Reserve Center Sheboygan	CLOSE

OTHER CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS

Year	Name of Installation	Final BRAC Decision
1991	Army Corps of Engineers	REALIGN

APPENDIX G

COMMISSIONER BIOGRAPHIES

ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI—CHAIRMAN



Nominated by President George W. Bush. Recently served as Vice President of the Pfizer Corporation and is a decorated Vietnam War veteran. Mr. Principi was nominated to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs by President Bush on December 29, 2000, and was confirmed by the Senate on January 23, 2001. He once served as a Republican chief counsel for the Senate Armed Services Committee and Senate Veterans Affairs Committee. He also has been a top official with defense contractor Lockheed Martin. Mr. Principi is a 1967 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland, and first saw active duty aboard the destroyer USS *Joseph P. Kennedy*. He later commanded a River Patrol Unit in Vietnam's Mekong Delta. Mr. Principi earned his law degree from Seton Hall University in 1975 and was assigned to the Navy's Judge Advocate General Corps in San Diego, California. In 1980, he was transferred to Washington as a legislative counsel for the Department of the Navy.

JAMES H. BILBRAY

Nominated by President George W. Bush following consultation with Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV). Primary area of practice is government relations and administrative law. Former Congressman Bilbray received his bachelor of arts degree in government and public administration from the American University in Washington, DC, in 1962, and his J.D. from the Washington College of Law in 1964. He is a Nevada native, and prior to being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1987, he was a Nevada State Senator, serving as Chairman on the Taxation Committee and as a member of the Judiciary Committee. During his four terms in the U.S. Congress, he served as Chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee on Taxation, Tourism and Procurement. He was also a member of the Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and Intelligence Committees. He joined the firm of Kummer, Kaempfer, Bonner & Renshaw as Of Counsel in 1996, where he specialized in dealing with local, state, and Federal issues. In 2001, he received an honorary doctorate of laws from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, for his extensive contributions to the State and U.S. government.

PHILIP COYLE

Nominated by President George W. Bush following consultation with House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (CA-8). Mr. Coyle is a Senior Advisor to the President of the Center for Defense Information and a defense consultant. Formerly the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Test and Evaluation (1994–2001), Mr. Coyle is a recognized expert on worldwide and U.S. military research, development and testing. During the 1995 BRAC, he served as the Co-Chairman of the DoD Joint Cross-Service Group for Test and Evaluation. Prior to serving at the Pentagon, Mr. Coyle served as Laboratory Associate Director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in Livermore, California, and as Deputy to the Laboratory Director. During the Carter Administration, Mr. Coyle served as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs in the Department of Energy. With more than 40 years of experience in testing and test-related matters, he was selected by *Aviation Week* magazine as one of its "Laurels" honorees for 2000—a select group of people recognized for outstanding contributions in the aerospace field.

Admiral Harold W. (Hal) Gehman, Jr. (USN, Ret)



Nominated by President George W. Bush following consultation with Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, M.D. (R-TN). Retired after 35 years of service on active duty in the U.S. Navy in October 2000, with his last assignment as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, and as the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Joint Forces Command—one of the five U.S. Unified Commands. Immediately after retiring, Admiral Gehman served as Co-Chairman of the Department of Defense review of the terrorist attack on the USS *Cole*. In 2003, he served as Chairman of the Columbia Accident Investigation Board. He graduated from Pennsylvania State University with a bachelor of science degree in industrial engineering and received a commission in the Navy from the NROTC program. He served at all levels of leadership and command before being promoted to four-star admiral in 1996. He became the 29th Vice Chief of Naval Operations in September 1996. As Vice Chief, he was a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, formulated the Navy's $70 billion budget, and developed and implemented policies governing the Navy's 375,000 personnel.

James V. Hansen

Nominated by President George W. Bush following consultation with House Speaker Dennis Hastert (IL-14). Congressman Hansen was elected to the 97th Congress and to the 10 succeeding terms (January 3, 1981, to January 3, 2003). He did not seek re-election to the 108th Congress in 2002. During the 105th Congress, he served as Chairman of the Standards and Official Conduct Committee. During the 107th Congress, he served as Chairman of the Committee of Resources. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955. He also served as a member of the Farmington, Utah, City Council from 1960 to 1972. He then was elected to the Utah State House of Representatives from 1973 to 1980 and served as Speaker of the House from 1979 to 1980.

General James T. Hill (USA, Ret)



Nominated by President George W. Bush. Former Commander of the U.S. Southern Command. General Hill previously served as the Commanding General, I Corps, and Fort Lewis. He is from El Paso, Texas, and was commissioned into the infantry following graduation from Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas, in 1968. He also graduated from the Command and General Staff College and the National War College. In addition, he holds a master's degree in personnel management from Central Michigan University. General Hill's other key assignments include Commanding General 25th Infantry Division and Deputy Commander U.S. Forces UN Mission Haiti.

General Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton (USAF, Ret)



Nominated by President George W. Bush following consultation with Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, M.D. (R-TN). Currently serves as Executive Vice President of Pratt & Whitney, Military Engines. Former Commander of Air Education and Training Command, headquartered at Randolph Air Force Base, Texas. He was responsible for the recruiting, training, and education of Air Force personnel. His command included the Air Force Recruiting Service, two numbered air forces, and Air University. He was also commander of three wings and an air division and held numerous staff positions. From 1993 to 1995, he was Director of Operations, J-3, U.S. Special Operations Command. General Newton is a command pilot with more than 4,000 flying hours in the T-37, T-38, F-4, F-15, C-12, and F-117 stealth fighter. He earned a bachelor of science degree in aviation education from Tennessee State University and a master of arts degree in public administration from George Washington University.

Samuel K. Skinner

Nominated by President George W. Bush following consultation with House Speaker Dennis Hastert (IL-14). Mr. Skinner is the retired Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer of USF Corporation, one of the nation's leading transportation and logistics companies. He also served from 1993-1998 as President of Commonwealth Edison Company and its holding company, Unicom Corporation. Prior to joining Commonwealth Edison, Mr. Skinner served as Chief of Staff to President George H.W. Bush. Prior to his White House service, he served in the President's Cabinet for nearly three years as Secretary of Transportation. As Secretary, Mr. Skinner was credited with numerous successes, including the development of the President's National Transportation Policy and the development and passage of landmark aviation and surface transportation legislation. Mr. Skinner is currently an Adjunct Professor of Management and Strategy at the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University. He served as a member of the Illinois National Guard and the U.S. Army reserve from 1957-1968.

Brigadier General Sue E. Turner (USAF, Ret)

Appointed by President George W. Bush. General Turner retired in 1995, following 30 years of active duty. Her key assignments included Director, Nursing Services, Office of the USAF Surgeon General; Chief Nurse, Wilford Hall Medical Center; and the Medical Inspection Team, USAF Inspector General. General Turner joined the Air Force Nurse Corps in 1965 and went on to earn a bachelor of science degree in nursing from Incarnate Word College and a master of science degree in nursing from the University of Alabama in Birmingham. She also completed Squadron Officer School, Air Command and Staff College, Air War College, and National Security Management. In recent years, General Turner has served on the American Battle Monuments Commission and on the board of directors of a large credit union.

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

Left to Right Commissioner James V. Hansen; Commissioner Samuel K. Skinner; Commissioner Philip E. Coyle III; Commissioner Sue Ellen Turner; Chairman Anthony J. Principi; Commissioner James T. Hill; Commissioner James H. Bilbray; Commissioner Harold W. (Hal) Gehman; Commissioner Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton.

Photo by: U.S. Senate Photo Studio

APPENDIX H

COMMISSION STAFF

CHARLES BATTAGLIA
Executive Director

DIANE CARNEVALE
Director, Administration and Operations Division

FRANK A. CIRILLO, JR.[†*]
Director, Review and Analysis (R&A) Division

BOB COOK[†*]
Deputy Director, Review and Analysis (R&A) Division, Team Leader—Interagency Issues Team

R. GARY DINSICK
Team Leader—Army Team

DAVID C. HAGUE
General Counsel

JAMES S. HANNA
Team Leader—Navy/Marine Corps Team

COL MARTIN E. HEIGH, USAFR[1]
Military Assistant

CHRISTINE O. HILL
Director, Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs Division

C. JAMES SCHAEFER IV
Director, Communications Division

KENNETH L. SMALL
Team Leader—Air Force Team

DAVE VAN SAUN
Team Leader—Joint Cross-Service Team

PROFESSIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

JAMES E. AARNIO[5]
Interagency Issues Team—
FAA Airspace Senior Analyst

MAJ TIM ABRELL, USA[1]
Joint Cross-Service Team—
DoD Senior Analyst

MAGDA ANGULO
Administration and Operations—
Deputy Director

MIKE AVENICK[2]
Army Team—GAO Senior Analyst

JOE N. BARRETT[1]
Navy Team—DoD Senior Analyst

KRISTEN G. BAXTER
Administration and Operations—
Executive Assistant to the Commissioners

LT COL ART BEAUCHAMP, USAF[1]
Air Force Team—DoD Senior Analyst

HEATHER BENCE
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

ELIZABETH C. BIERI[1]
Army Team—DoD Senior Analyst

MIKE BLASINSKY
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

CATIE BORKLUND
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

JUSTIN B. BREITSCHOPF
Air Force Team—Analyst

SHAREE BRENT
Administration and Operations—Executive Assistant

EDWARD A. BROWN III[†]
Review and Analysis—Consultant

AARON BUTLER
Army Team—Analyst

ASHLEY BUZZELL
Joint Cross-Service Team—Analyst

SYD CARROLL
Joint Cross-Service Team—Senior Analyst

Nicole Chung
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

Christopher Cole
Site Manager—Contractor Support
(Analytic Services Inc.)

Jason R. Cole
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs—Commission Advance

David Combs[†]
Air Force Team—Senior Analyst

Rory S. Cooper
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs—
State and Local Communities Liaison

MAJ Dan Cowhig, USA[1]
Deputy General Counsel and
Designated Federal Officer

SGT Sue Cruz, USA
Administration and Operations—Security Assistant

Tanya Cruz[2]
Air Force Team—GAO Senior Analyst

David Dante
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

Ryan O. Dean
Joint Cross-Service Team—Analyst

Michael Delaney
Joint Cross-Service Team—Senior Analyst

George M. Delgado[2]
Joint Cross-Service Team—GAO Senior Analyst

Paul Dresser
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

James O. Durso
Joint Cross-Service Team—Senior Analyst

Ashley Dyer
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs—Commission Advance

David Epstein[†*2]
Navy Team—GAO Senior Analyst

Christina M. Estrada
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs—Commission Advance

Lester C. Farrington[*]
Joint Cross-Service Team—Senior Analyst

James Faulkner
Contractor Support
(Analytic Services Inc.)

LTC Kevin Felix, USA[1]
Army Team—DoD Senior Analyst

Bill Fetzer
Navy Team—Senior Analyst

Michael H. Flinn, Ph.D.
Air Force Team—Senior Analyst

Doug Fravel[1]
Administration and Operations—
Travel Office Team Leader

Clarenton ("C. W.") Furlow[1]
Navy Team—DoD Senior Analyst

Jason Gallick
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

MAJ (P) Karl H. Gingrich, USA[1]
Interagency Issues Team—
DoD Senior Analyst (COBRA)

Shannon Katherine Graves
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs—Commission Advance

Craig A. Hall[*]
Air Force Team—Senior Analyst

Nicole Halling
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

Wes Hood
Army Team—Senior Analyst

Audrey C. Jones
Communications—Associate Director

Michael A. Kessler
Navy Team—Analyst

M. Glenn Knoepfle[†*]
Joint Cross-Service Team—Senior Analyst

Shirley Lai
Administration and Operations—Consultant

Rama Germilus Latin
Administration and Operations—Administrative Assistant

Kathryn T. Long
Administration and Operations—Executive Assistant

Maj Tim MacGregor, USAF[1]
Air Force Team—DoD Senior Analyst

Lesia Mandzia[2]
Joint Cross-Service Team—GAO Senior Analyst

Don Manuel
Army Team—Senior Analyst

Robert McCreary
Communications—Deputy Director

Brian McDaniel[6]
Navy Team—Senior Analyst

Lt Col Bradley N. McRee, USAF[1]
Joint Cross-Service Team—DoD Senior Analyst

Javier Medina
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

Lucie Melahn
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

Jennifer Meyer
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs—
Senate Liaison

Gary Miller[4]
Interagency Issues Team—
Senior Environmental Analyst

Valerie Mills[1]
Joint Cross-Service Team—DoD Senior Analyst

Jennifer Moustgaard
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

Grant E. Mulkey
Administration and Operations—Security Assistant

Andrew V. Napoli
Administration and Operations—Editor in Chief

J. Tyler Oborn
Interagency Issues Team—COBRA Analyst

Tom Pantelides
Joint Cross-Service Team—Senior Analyst

Mike Perlowski
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

Tiffany Perry
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs—Executive Assistant

Philip J. Plack
Interagency Issues Team—Cartographer

Jack Ray
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

Marcy R. Reborchick
Administration and Operations—
Chief Librarian, Document Control Manager

C. Dean Rhody
Army Team—Senior Analyst

Tiffany Richardson
Administration and Operations—
Administrative Assistant

Megan Riffle
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

Matt Robinson
Administration and Operations—
Travel Office Deputy Team Leader

Selena Robinson
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel

Ethan Saxon
Interagency Issues Team—Executive Analyst

Carol Schmidt
Joint Cross-Service Team—Senior Analyst

Nathaniel B. Sillin
Review and Analysis Division—Executive Analyst

Cynthia Simmons
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs—Commission Advance

Daniel Teczar
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

HAL TICKLE
Navy Team—Senior Analyst

DUKE TRAN[3]
Interagency Issues Team—
Senior Economic Analyst

COLLEEN TURNER, PH.D.
Joint Cross-Service Team—
Senior Analyst and Deputy Team Leader

JAMES TYLL
Contractor Support (Analytic Services Inc.)

JOSEPH T. VARALLO, JR.[*]
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs—Commission Advance

DEIRDRE M. WALSH
Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs—
House Liaison

MARILYN WASLESKI[*2]
Interagency Issues Team—Deputy Team Leader

CHARLES C. YODER
Special Assistant to the Chairman

NOTES:

†	Served on 1993 BRAC Commission
*	Served on 1995 BRAC Commission
1	Detailee from the Department of Defense (DoD)
2	Detailee from the Government Accountability Office (GAO)
3	Detailee from the Department of Commerce (DoC)
4	Detailee from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
5	Detailee from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
6	Detailee from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

2005 STAFF ORGANIZATION CHART

COMMISSIONERS

SENIOR ADVISOR
Charles C. Yoder

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Charles Battaglia

MILITARY ASSISTANT
Col Marty Heigh, USAFR

ADMIN/OPERATIONS

DIRECTOR
Diane Carnevale

HR/BUDGET
Magda Angulo

REPORT EDITOR
Andrew V. Napoli

DOCUMENT CONTROL MANAGER/LIBRARIAN
Marcy R. Reborchick

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
Kristin G. Baxter
Sharee Brent
Kathyrn T. Long
Shirley Lai

TRAVEL
Doug Fravel
Matt Robinson

SECURITY
Grant E. Mulkey
SGT Sue Cruz

RECEPTIONISTS
Rama Germilus Latin
Tiffany Richardson

LEGAL

GENERAL COUNSEL
David C. Hague

DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL
MAJ Dan Cowhig, USA

ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL
Rumu Sarkar

REVIEW & ANALYSIS

DIRECTOR
Frank A. Cirillo, Jr

DEPUTY DIRECTOR & INTERAGENCY ISSUES TEAM LEADER
Bob Cook

ARMY TEAM LEADER
R. Gary Dinsick

NAVY TEAM LEADER
James S. Hanna

AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER
Kenneth L. Small

JOINT CROSS SERVICE TEAM LEADER
Dave Van Saun

COMMUNICATIONS

DIRECTOR
C. James Schaefer IV

DEPUTY DIRECTOR
Robert McCreary

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
Audrey C. Jones

ASSISTANT
Meg Riffle

LEGISLATIVE & INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

DIRECTOR
Christine O. Hill

SENATE
Jennifer Meyer

HOUSE
Deirdre M. Walsh

STATES/COMMUNITIES
Rory S. Cooper

ADVANCE TEAM
Jason R. Cole
Ashley M. Dyer
Christina M. Estrada
Shannon Katherine Graves
Cynthia Simmons
Joseph T. Varallo

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

Bottom Row, Left to Right Charles Battaglia, Commissioner James V. Hansen; Commissioner Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton; Commissioner Samuel K. Skinner; Commissioner Philip E. Coyle III; Chairman Anthony J. Principi; Commissioner Sue Ellen Turner; Commissioner James H. Bilbray; Commissioner Harold W. (Hal) Gehman; Commissioner James T. Hill. **2nd Row, Left to Right** C. James Schaefer IV; Tom Pantelides; Javier Medina; Matt Robinson; Nicole Halling; Marcy R. Reborchick; James Tyll; Shannon Graves; Rory S. Cooper; Robert McCreary; Syd E. Carroll; Grant M. Mulkey; Christina M. Estrada; Rumu Sarkar; Jennifer Meyer; Deirdre M. Walsh; Tim Abrell; Dan Cowhig **3rd Row, Left to Right** Jack Ray; Daniel Teczar; Paul Dresser; Nicole Chung; Jason R. Cole; Ashley Buzzell; Jim D. Durso; David Dante; Gary Miller; Diane Carnevale; Bob Cook; Frank A. Cirillo, Jr.; Tim MacGregor; David C. Hague; Dave Van Saun; Audrey C. Jones; Joseph T. Varallo, Jr.; Ashley Dyer; Sue Cruz; Kenneth L. Small **4th Row, Left to Right** Christopher Cole; Valerie Mills; Michael Delaney; J. Tyler Oborn; Nathaniel B. Sillin; Michael A. Kessler; Andrew V. Napoli; Charles C. Yoder; R. Gary Dinsick; Don Manuel; Mike Avenick; Wes Hood; Liz Bieri; C. Dean Rhody; Kevin Felix; Rama Germilus Latin; Colleen Turner; Ethan Saxon; Carol Jo Schmidt; Lesia Mandzia **Top Row, Left to Right** Bill Fetzer; Hal Tickle; Doug Fravel; Karl H. Gingrich; Catie Borklund; Craig A. Hall; Tanya Cruz; James S. Hanna; Aaron Butler; Martin E. Heigh; C.W. Furlow; Joe N. Barrett; Lucie Melahn; Justin Breitschopf **Missing From Photo** James E. Aarino; Magda Angulo; Kristen G. Baxter; Heather Bence; Art Beauchamp; Mike Blasinsky; Edward A. Brown III; David Comns; Paul Dresser; David Epstein; James Faulkner; Michael H. Flinn, Ph.D.; Jason Gallick; Christine O. Hill; M. Glenn Knoepfle; Shirley Lai; Kathryn Long; Brian McDaniel; Bradley N. McRee; Jennifer Moustgaard; Mike Perlowski; Tiffany Perry; Philip Plack; Tiffany Richardson; Megan Riffle; Selena Robinson; Cynthia Simmons; Duke Tran; Marilyn Wasleski

Photo by: U.S. Senate Photo Studio

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

2005 REVIEW & ANALYSIS ORGANIZATION CHART

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
CHARLES BATTAGLIA

DIRECTOR, REVIEW & ANALYSIS
FRANK A. CIRILLO, JR.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR, REVIEW & ANALYSIS
BOB COOK

SENIOR ADVISOR
EDWARD A. BROWN III

ANALYST
NATHANIEL B. SILLIN

ARMY TEAM	NAVY/MARINE CORPS TEAM	AIR FORCE TEAM	INTERAGENCY ISSUES TEAM	JOINT CROSS SERVICE TEAM
TEAM LEADER R. Gary Dinsick	TEAM LEADER James S. Hanna	TEAM LEADER Kenneth L. Small	TEAM LEADER Bob Cook	TEAM LEADER Dave Van Saun
SENIOR ANALYST C. Dean Rhody	SENIOR ANALYST Hal Tickle	SENIOR ANALYST David Combs	DEPUTY TEAM LEADER Marilyn Wasleski	DEPUTY TEAM LEADER Colleen Turner, PhD.
SENIOR ANALYST Don Manuel	SENIOR ANALYST Bill Fetzer	SENIOR ANALYST Craig Hall	DOD ANALYST (COBRA) Karl H. Gingrich	SENIOR ANALYST Tom Pantelides
SENIOR ANALYST Wes Hood	SENIOR ANALYST Brian McDaniel	SENIOR ANALYST Michael Flinn, Ph.D.	ASSOC. COBRA ANALYST J. Tyler Oborn	SENIOR ANALYST Lester C. Farrington
DOD ANALYST Elizabeth C. Bieri	DOD ANALYST C.W. Furlow	DOD ANALYST Tim MacGregor	ECONOMIC ANALYST Duke Tran	SENIOR ANALYST Michael Delaney
DOD ANALYST Kevin Felix	DOD ANALYST Joe N. Barrett	DOD ANALYST Art Beauchamp	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYST Gary Miller	SENIOR ANALYST Syd Carroll
GAO ANALYST Mike Avenick	GAO ANALYST David Epstein	GAO SENIOR ANALYST Tanya Cruz	FAA ANALYST James E Aarnio	SENIOR ANALYST Carol Jo Schmidt
ANALYST Aaron Butler	ANALYST Michael A. Kessler	ANALYST Justin B. Breitschopf	CARTOGRAPHER Philip J. Plack	SENIOR ANALYST James Durso

ARMY TEAM	NAVY/MARINE CORPS TEAM	AIR FORCE TEAM	INTERAGENCY ISSUES TEAM	JOINT CROSS SERVICE TEAM
			ANALYST Ethan Saxon	SENIOR ANALYST M. Glenn Knoepfle DOD ANALYST Bradley N. McRee DOD ANALYST Tim Abrell DOD ANALYST Valerie Mills GAO ANALYST Lesia Mandzia GAO ANALYST George M. Delgado ANALYST Ashley Buzzell ANALYST Ryan O. Dean

APPENDIX I

HEARINGS HELD BY THE COMMISSION, 2005

Note: All Commissioners in attendance unless listed otherwise. A total of 20 legislative and deliberative hearings were held, as well as 20 regional hearings.

MAY 3, 2005 (9:30 AM)

Topic: Lessons Learned from Prior BRAC Rounds

Witnesses: Daniel Else, Specialist in National Defense, Congressional Research Service; Barry Holman, Director of Defense Capabilities and Management, Government Accountability Office.

Location: 334 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MAY 3, 2005 (1:30 PM)

Topic: Current and Long-Term Threats Confronting U.S. National Security

Witnesses: David Gordon, Chairman, National Intelligence Committee, Office of the Director of National Intelligence; Earl Scheck, Director, Analysis and Production, Defense Intelligence Agency; Carol Rodley, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Department of State.

Location: 334 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MAY 4, 2005 (9:30 AM)

Topic: Force Structure Plan, Global Posture Review and the Secretary of Defense Guidance on the Quadrennial Defense Review

Witnesses: Ryan Henry, Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Defense Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Vice Admiral Martin Chanik, Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessments on the Joint Staff.

Location: 334 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MAY 16, 2005 (1:30 PM)

Topic: Presentation of Recommendations and Methodology for the Department of Defense

Witness Panel #1: The Honorable Donald H. Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense; General Richard B. Myers, USAF, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Witness Panel #2: The Honorable Michael W. Wynne, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics; the Honorable Philip Grone, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment.

Location: 216 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MAY 17, 2005 (9:30 AM)

Topic: Presentation of Recommendations and Methodology for the Air Force

Witnesses: The Honorable Michael L. Dominguez, Acting Secretary of the Air Force; General John P. Jumper, USAF, Chief of Staff; other designated Department of the Air Force officials.

Location: G50 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

May 17, 2005 (1:30 PM)

Topic: Presentation of Recommendations and Methodology for the Navy and Marine Corps

Witnesses: The Honorable Gordon England, Secretary of the Navy; Admiral Vern Clark, Chief of Naval Operations; General Michael W. Hagee, Commandant of the Marine Corps; other designated officials of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Location: 216 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

May 18, 2005 (9:30 AM)

Topic: Presentation of Recommendations and Methodology for the Army

Witnesses: The Honorable Francis J. Harvey, Secretary of the Army; General Peter J. Schoomaker, Army Chief of Staff; Dr. Craig College, Deputy Secretary for Infrastructure Analysis; Other designated officials of the Department of the Army.

Location: 106 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

May 18, 2005 (1:30 PM)

Topic: Presentation of Recommendations and Methodology, Department of Defense, Joint Cross-Service Groups

Witnesses: The Honorable Michael W. Wynne, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (Industrial JCSG); Vice Admiral Keith W. Lippert, Director, Defense Logistics Agency (Supply and Storage JCSG); The Honorable Charles S. Abell, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (Education and Training JCSG); Carol A. Haave, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Counterintelligence and Security (Intelligence JCSG).

Location: 106 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

May 19, 2005 (9:30 AM)

Topic: Presentation of Recommendations and Methodology, Department of Defense, Joint Cross-Service Groups (continued)

Commissioners: Bilbray, Coyle, Hansen, Hill, Gehman, Newton, Skinner, and Turner.

Witnesses: The Honorable Dr. Ronald M. Sega, Director of Defense Research and Engineering (Technical JCSG); Lieutenant General (Dr.) George Peach Taylor, Jr., Surgeon General of the Air Force (Medical JCSG); Donald C. Tison, Deputy G-8, U.S. Army (H&SA JCSG).

Location: 216 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

June 15, 2005 (1:00 PM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–Alaska

Commissioners: Principi, Bilbray, Coyle, Hansen.

Location: Carlson Center, Fairbanks, Alaska

June 17, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–Oregon, Montana, Washington, and Idaho

Commissioners: Principi, Bilbray, Coyle, Hansen.

Location: Eastside Federal Complex, Portland, Oregon

June 20, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin

Commissioners: Gehman, Hansen, Turner.

Location: St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri

June 21, 2005 (1:00 PM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–South Dakota, Wyoming

Commissioners: Skinner, Coyle, Bilbray

Location: Rushmore Plaza Civic Center, Rapid City, South Dakota

June 23, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–North Dakota, Minnesota

Commissioners: Skinner, Coyle, Bilbray

Location: Chester Fritz Auditorium/University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota

June 24, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada

Commissioners: Hansen, Turner, Hill, Coyle, Bilbray, Newton

Location: Marshall Junior High School, Clovis, New Mexico

June 27, 2005 (1:00 PM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–New York, Ohio

Commissioners: Principi, Newton, Turner, Bilbray

Location: Center for the Arts Mainstay Theater/University at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York

June 28, 2005 (1:00 PM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–North Carolina, South Carolina, West Virginia

Commissioners: Coyle, Hill, Skinner, Gehman

Location: Harris Conference Center/Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, North Carolina

June 30, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee

Commissioners: Coyle, Skinner, Bilbray, Gehman

Location: Georgia Tech Hotel and Conference Center, Atlanta, Georgia

June 30, 2005 (1:30 PM)

Topic: Adjutants General Air National Guard Hearing

Commissioners: Coyle, Skinner, Bilbray, Gehman

Witnesses: Rear Admiral Tim Sullivan, Special Advisor, Department of Homeland Security; Major General Roger P. Lempke, President, Adjutants General Association of the United States; Major General Bruce Tuxhill, the Adjutant General of Maryland; Major General Greg Wayt, the Adjutant General of Ohio; Major General Mike Haugen, the Adjutant General of North Dakota; Major General Allen Tackett, the Adjutant General of West Virginia; Major General Frank Vavala, the Adjutant General of Delaware; Major General Martha Rainville, the Adjutant General of Vermont.

Location: Georgia Tech Hotel and Conference Center, Atlanta, Georgia

July 6, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire

Commissioners: Principi, Newton, Bilbray, Turner, Skinner

Location: Boston Convention and Exhibition Center, Boston, Massachusetts

July 7, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–Washington, D.C., Pennsylvania

Commissioners: Principi, Newton, Bilbray, Turner

Location: Cannon House Office Building Caucus Room, Washington, D.C.

July 7, 2005 (1:30 PM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–Virginia

Commissioners: Principi, Newton, Bilbray, Turner, Coyle

Location: Sheraton National Hotel, Arlington, Virginia

July 8, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–Maryland, New Jersey, Delaware

Commissioners: Principi, Coyle, Newton, Turner

Location: Kraushaar Auditorium/Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland

July 11, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma

Commissioners: Principi, Hill, Newton, Turner

Location: San Antonio Convention Center, San Antonio, Texas

July 14, 2005 (1:00 PM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–California, Guam

Commissioners: Principi, Gehman, Turner, Bilbray, Coyle

Location: Westchester High School Auditorium, Los Angeles, California

July 18, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Informational Hearing–DoD, GAO, Overseas Basing Commission

Witness Panel #1: The Honorable Michael Wynne, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and Chairman of the Infrastructure Steering Group; General William Nyland, Assistant Commandant of the United States Marine Corps; General Michael Moseley, Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force; Admiral Robert Willard, Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

Witness Panel #2: The Honorable David Walker, Comptroller General; Barry Holman, Director of Defense Capabilities and Management, Government Accountability Office; Michael Kennedy, Assistant Director Defense Capabilities and Management, Government Accountability Office.

Commissioners: Principi, Hill, Gehman, Newton, Hansen, Skinner

Location: 106 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

July 18, 2005 (1:30 PM)

Topic: Informational Hearing–DoD, GAO, Overseas Basing Commission

Witness Panel #1: The Honorable Al Cornella, Chairman, Overseas Basing Commission; Vice Admiral Anthony Less, U.S. Navy, Ret., Overseas Basing Commission; Lieutenant General Pete Taylor, U.S. Army, Ret., Overseas Basing Commission; Brigadier General Keith Martin, U.S. Army, Ret., Overseas Basing Commission.

Commissioners: Principi, Hill, Gehman, Newton, Hansen, Skinner

Location: 106 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

July 19, 2005 (1:30 PM)

Topic: Commission Consideration of Closure and Realignment Additions (votes held)

Location: 106 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

July 22, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing–Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida

Commissioners: Coyle, Hill, Turner.

Location: Mahalia Jackson Theater of the Performing Arts, New Orleans, Louisiana

August 4, 2005 (1:00 PM)

Topic: Regional Hearing (adds)–Virginia (NAS Oceana)

Commissioners: Principi, Gehman

Location: 216 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

August 8, 2005 (1:00 PM)

Topic: Regional Hearing (adds)–Alaska, Colorado, California

Commissioners: Principi, Bilbray, Coyle, Gehman, Hansen

Location: Monterey Conference Center, Monterey, California

August 10, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Regional Hearing (adds)–Indiana, Ohio, Maine, North Carolina, Virginia, District of Columbia

Commissioners: Principi, Coyle, Newton, Skinner, Turner

Location: 216 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

August 11, 2005 (9:30 AM)

Topic: Environmental Stewardship of Installations Recommended for Closure or Realignment

Witness Panel #1: The Honorable Philip Grone, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Installations and Environment; James Woolford, Director, Federal Facilities Restoration and Reuse Office; Patrick J. O'Brien, Director, Office of Economic Adjustment.

Witness Panel #2: Miki Schneider, Board of Directors, Association of Defense Communities; Daniel J. Schnepf, Chairman and CEO, Matrix Design Group Inc.; David Knisely, Partner, Garrity & Knisely Law Firm.

Location: 216 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

August 11, 2005 (1:00 PM)

Topic: Department of Defense Closure and Realignment Recommendation Impacts on Homeland Security/Defense and on Units of the Air National Guard

Witness Panel #1: Peter F. Verga, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense; Admiral Timothy J. Keating, Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command and United States Northern Command.

Witness Panel #2: The Honorable Michael L. Dominguez, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; Lieutenant General H. Steven Blum, Chief, National Guard Bureau; Major General Gary W. Heckman, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force for Plans and Programs.

Witness Panel #3: Major General Roger P. Lempke, Adjutant General, Nebraska National Guard; Major General Harold A. Cross, Adjutant General, Mississippi National Guard; Major General Thomas P. Maguire, Jr., Adjutant General, New York National Guard.

Location: 216 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

August 20, 2005 (8:30 AM)

Topic: Department of Defense Views on Realignment and Closure

Witnesses: The Honorable Michael W. Wynne, Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group, Department of Defense; Vice Admiral Evan M. Chanik, Director, Force Structure, Resources & Assessment Directorate, Joint Staff; The Honorable Francis J. Harvey, Secretary of the Army; Admiral Robert F. Willard, Vice Chief of Naval Operations; General John P. Jumper, Chief of Staff of the Air Force; Lieutenant General Dave Barno, Assistant Chief of Staff of the Army for Installation Management.

Location: 216 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

August 20, 2005 (1:30 PM)

Topic: Regional Hearing (adds) – East Coast Master Jet Base/ Naval Air Station Oceana Virginia, Cecil Field Florida

Location: 216 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

August 24-27, 2005

Topic: Commission Final Deliberations

Location: Hyatt Regency Hotel, Arlington, Virginia

APPENDIX J

COMMISSIONER AND STAFF INSTALLATION SITE VISITS

During the 2005 BRAC process, the Commissioners and the staff of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission visited a total of 173 unique installations around the United States. By way of comparison, the 1995 BRAC Commission conducted 206 site visits, the 1993 Commission traveled to 138 bases and military activities, and the 1991 Commission toured just 47 installations.

Within the 182 total visits for 2005, 103 visits were conducted by Commissioners, while 79 visits were staff-only. Commissioner visits in virtually every case also involved one or more staff accompanying the Commissioner. The purposes of the site visits were to enable the Commissioners and staff to verify the accuracy of the certified data upon which the DoD recommendations were based, get a better understanding of the facilities' current and possible future missions, discuss with base and community personnel how DoD's assessment of military value was derived, as well as to learn about any facility-unique circumstances that might impact the Commission's review process.

The Commission felt it was very important to schedule and initiate the base visit process as soon as possible after receipt of the DoD May 13, 2005, list, due to the complexity and apparent large number of visits required. The Commission announced its base visit schedule within days of receiving OSD's recommendations. This turned out to be weeks before detailed military value data were available, so the Commission used the "BRAC 2005 Closure and Realignment Impacts by State" Appendix released by the Department at the outset and served as the Department's press release tool. As a rule, those installations suffering 300 or more net civilian job losses were put on the initial schedule. Although not hard and fast, this standard generally follows the BRAC threshold limits set in 10 USC 2687 and served as an excellent and supportable starting point. Obviously, where time and travel itineraries permitted, Commissioners conducted additional site visits when deemed necessary to assess military value and other BRAC criteria relationships. Additional visits were also often at the request of community representatives.

Staff also visited a select number of "receiver" installations to help determine whether large numbers of additional personnel could in fact be accommodated by receiver bases. The nominal statistical threshold used as guidance for receiver visits was an indication by the COBRA model that those facilities would see job growth gains of 1.5% or more of the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) in which the facility was located. This statistic was suggested as one used by the Department of Commerce as indicating substantial growth of an economic area.

In compliance with the relevant Base Closure Law, at least two Commissioners visited all facilities that the Commission formally added to the closure and realignment list.

The following facilities were visited by the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission:

COMMISSIONER VISITS

MAY 2005

DATE OF VISIT:	MAY 24, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA**
COMMISSIONER(S):	HAROLD W. GEHMAN

Date of Visit:	May 24, 2005
Installation:	**Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, Oregon**
Commissioner(s):	James H. Bilbray and Philip E. Coyle III
Date of Visit:	May 24, 2005
Installation:	**Navy Medical Center Portsmouth, Virginia**
Commissioner(s):	Anthony J. Principi
Date of Visit:	May 24, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia**
Commissioner(s):	Anthony J. Principi and Lloyd W. Newton
Date of Visit:	May 24, 2005
Installation:	**Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) Kansas City, Missouri**
Commissioner(s):	Sue Ellen Turner
Date of Visit:	May 25, 2005
Installation:	**Fort Monroe, Virginia**
Commissioner(s):	Anthony J. Principi and Lloyd W. Newton
Date of Visit:	May 25, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Air Station Atlanta, Georgia**
Commissioner(s):	Harold W. Gehman
Date of Visit:	May 25, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Supply Corps School Athens, Georgia**
Commissioner(s):	Harold W. Gehman
Date of Visit:	May 25, 2005
Installation:	**Fort Eustis, Virginia**
Commissioner(s):	Anthony J. Principi and Lloyd W. Newton
Date of Visit:	May 25, 2005
Installation:	**McChord Air Force Base, Washington**
Commissioner(s):	James H. Bilbray and Philip E. Coyle III

DATE OF VISIT:	MAY 25, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE (DFAS) ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI**
COMMISSIONER(S):	SUE ELLEN TURNER
DATE OF VISIT:	MAY 25, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**LEASED SPACE, ARMY HUMAN RESOURCES COMMAND ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI**
COMMISSIONER(S):	SUE ELLEN TURNER
DATE OF VISIT:	MAY 26, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER DAHLGREN, VIRGINIA**
COMMISSIONER(S):	ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI
DATE OF VISIT:	MAY 26, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA**
COMMISSIONERS:	HAROLD W. GEHMAN
DATE OF VISIT:	MAY 26, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**FORT KNOX, KENTUCKY**
COMMISSIONER(S):	SAMUEL K. SKINNER AND SUE ELLEN TURNER
DATE OF VISIT:	MAY 26, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, MARYLAND**
COMMISSIONER(S):	ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI
DATE OF VISIT:	MAY 26, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT, OREGON**
COMMISSIONER(S):	JAMES H. BILBRAY AND PHILIP E. COYLE, III
DATE OF VISIT:	MAY 27, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASE, IDAHO**
COMMISSIONER(S):	JAMES V. HANSEN
DATE OF VISIT:	MAY 27, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**LEASED SPACE, VIRGINIA**
COMMISSIONER(S):	ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI

DATE OF VISIT: MAY 27, 2005
INSTALLATION: **DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE (DFAS) ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA**
COMMISSIONERS: ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI

DATE OF VISIT: MAY 31, 2005
INSTALLATION: **OTIS AIR GUARD BASE, MASSACHUSETTS**
COMMISSIONER(S): ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; JAMES H. BILBRAY; PHILIP E. COYLE, III AND LLOYD W. NEWTON

DATE OF VISIT: MAY 31, 2005
INSTALLATION: **SUBMARINE BASE NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT**
COMMISSIONER(S): ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; JAMES H. BILBRAY; PHILIP E. COYLE, III AND LLOYD W. NEWTON

JUNE 2005

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 1, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NAVAL SHIP YARD PORTSMOUTH, MAINE**
COMMISSIONER(S): ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; JAMES H. BILBRAY; PHILIP E. COYLE, III AND LLOYD W. NEWTON

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 1, 2005
INSTALLATION: **ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL, ILLINOIS**
COMMISSIONER(S): SAMUEL K. SKINNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 2, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK, MAINE**
COMMISSIONERS: ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; JAMES H. BILBRAY; PHILIP E. COYLE, III AND LLOYD W. NEWTON

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 2, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NAVAL STATION GREAT LAKES, ILLINOIS**
COMMISSIONER(S): SAMUEL K. SKINNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 3, 2005
INSTALLATION: **FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY**
COMMISSIONER(S): ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI AND LLOYD W. NEWTON

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 6, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY CRANE, INDIANA**
COMMISSIONER(S): SAMUEL K. SKINNER

Date of Visit:	June 6, 2005
Installation:	**Newport Chemical Depot, Indiana**
Commissioner(s):	Samuel K. Skinner

Date of Visit:	June 6, 2005
Installation:	**Hill Air Force Base, Utah**
Commissioner(s):	Philip E. Coyle, III; James V. Hansen and Lloyd W. Newton

Date of Visit:	June 7, 2005
Installation:	**Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) Charleston, South Carolina**
Commissioner(s):	James T. Hill

Date of Visit:	June 7, 2005
Installation:	**South Naval Facilities Engineering Command, South Carolina**
Commissioner(s):	James T. Hill

Date of Visit:	June 8, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Medical Center San Diego, California**
Commissioner(s):	Anthony J. Principi

Date of Visit:	June 8, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Base Coronado, California**
Commissioners:	Anthony J. Principi

Date of Visit:	June 8, 2005
Installation:	**Fort McPherson, Georgia**
Commissioner(s):	James T. Hill

Date of Visit:	June 9, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Ordnance Test Unit Cape Canaveral, Florida**
Commissioner(s):	James H. Bilbray

Date of Visit:	June 10, 2005
Installation:	**Fort Gillem, Georgia**
Commissioner(s):	James H. Bilbray

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 10, 2005
INSTALLATION: **WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER, WASHINGTON, DC**
COMMISSIONER(S): LLOYD W. NEWTON

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 14, 2005
INSTALLATION: **ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA**
COMMISSIONER(S): ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; PHILIP E. COYLE, III AND JAMES V. HANSEN

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 14, 2005
INSTALLATION: **KULIS AIR GUARD STATION, ALASKA**
COMMISSIONER(S): ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; PHILIP E. COYLE, III AND JAMES V. HANSEN

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 15, 2005
INSTALLATION: **EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA**
COMMISSIONERS: ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; PHILIP E. COYLE, III AND JAMES V. HANSEN

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 15, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NAVAL AIR STATION PENSACOLA, FLORIDA**
COMMISSIONER(S): HAROLD W. GEHMAN

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 16, 2005
INSTALLATION: **GENERAL BILLY MITCHELL INT'L AIRPORT AIR RESERVE STATION, WISCONSIN**
COMMISSIONER(S): SAMUEL K. SKINNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 16, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NAVAL STATION PASCAGOULA, MISSISSIPPI**
COMMISSIONER(S): HAROLD W. GEHMAN

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 16, 2005
INSTALLATION: **KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE, MISSISSIPPI**
COMMISSIONER(S): HAROLD W. GEHMAN

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 17, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA**
COMMISSIONER(S): SUE ELLEN TURNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 20, 2005
INSTALLATION: **CAPITAL AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, ILLINOIS**
COMMISSIONER(S): SAMUEL K. SKINNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 21, 2005
INSTALLATION: **PITTSBURGH INT'L AIRPORT AIR RESERVE STATION, PENNSYLVANIA**
COMMISSIONER(S): LLOYD W. NEWTON

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 21, 2005
INSTALLATION: **ELLSWORTH AIR FORCE BASE, SOUTH DAKOTA**
COMMISSIONER(S): JAMES H. BILBRAY; PHILIP E. COYLE, III AND SAMUEL K. SKINNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 21, 2005
INSTALLATION: **RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT, TEXAS**
COMMISSIONER(S): JAMES T. HILL AND SUE ELLEN TURNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 22, 2005
INSTALLATION: **BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON, DC**
COMMISSIONER(S): ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 22, 2005
INSTALLATION: **GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH DAKOTA**
COMMISSIONER(S): JAMES H. BILBRAY; PHILIP E. COYLE, III AND SAMUEL K. SKINNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 22, 2005
INSTALLATION: **DEFENSE FINANCING AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE (DFAS) ROME, NEW YORK**
COMMISSIONER(S): LLOYD W. NEWTON

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 22, 2005
INSTALLATION: **FORT HOOD, TEXAS**
COMMISSIONER(S): JAMES T. HILL AND SUE ELLEN TURNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 23, 2005
INSTALLATION: **CANNON AIR FORCE BASE, NEW MEXICO**
COMMISSIONER(S): ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; JAMES V. HANSEN; JAMES T. HILL AND SUE ELLEN TURNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 23, 2005
INSTALLATION: **DEFENSE FINANCING AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE CLEVELAND, OHIO**
COMMISSIONER(S): LLOYD W. NEWTON

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 24, 2005
INSTALLATION: **YEAGER AIRPORT AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION, WEST VIRGINIA**
COMMISSIONER(S): ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 27, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NIAGARA FALLS INT'L AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, NEW YORK**
COMMISSIONER(S): ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; JAMES H. BILBRAY; LLOYD W. NEWTON AND SUE ELLEN TURNER

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 28, 2005
INSTALLATION: **DEFENSE FINANCING AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE (DFAS) LIMESTONE, MAINE**
COMMISSIONER(S): LLOYD W. NEWTON

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 28, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NASHVILLE INT'L AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, TENNESSEE**
COMMISSIONER(S): JAMES H. BILBRAY

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 29, 2005
INSTALLATION: **FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY (REVISIT)**
COMMISSIONER(S): PHILIP E. COYLE, III

JULY 2005

DATE OF VISIT: JULY 5, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NAVAL AIR STATION WILLOW GROVE, PENNSYLVANIA**
COMMISSIONERS: ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI

DATE OF VISIT: JULY 5, 2005
INSTALLATION: **BROOKS CITY BASE, TEXAS**
COMMISSIONERS: JAMES T. HILL

DATE OF VISIT: JULY 6, 2005
INSTALLATION: **LACKLAND AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS**
COMMISSIONERS: JAMES T. HILL

DATE OF VISIT: JULY 6, 2005
INSTALLATION: **DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE (DFAS) SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS**
COMMISSIONERS: JAMES T. HILL

DATE OF VISIT:	JULY 7, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**NAVAL AIR STATION CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS**
COMMISSIONERS:	JAMES T. HILL

DATE OF VISIT:	JULY 7, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**ELLINGTON FIELD AIR GUARD STATION, TEXAS**
COMMISSIONERS:	JAMES V. HANSEN

DATE OF VISIT:	JULY 7, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**FORT BELVOIR (NIGHT VISION LAB ONLY), VIRGINIA**
COMMISSIONERS:	PHILIP E. COYLE III

DATE OF VISIT:	JULY 8, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**NAVAL STATION INGLESIDE, TEXAS**
COMMISSIONERS:	JAMES T. HILL

DATE OF VISIT:	JULY 10, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT, TEXAS (REVISIT)**
COMMISSIONERS:	ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI

DATE OF VISIT:	JULY 10, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**NAVAL STATION INGLESIDE, TEXAS (REVISIT)**
COMMISSIONERS:	ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI

DATE OF VISIT:	JULY 11, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**RENO-TAHOE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, NEVADA**
COMMISSIONERS:	PHILIP E. COYLE, III

DATE OF VISIT:	JULY 11, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**HAWTHORNE ARMY DEPOT, NEVADA**
COMMISSIONERS:	PHILIP E. COYLE, III

DATE OF VISIT:	JULY 11, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**FORT SMITH AIR GUARD STATION, ARKANSAS**
COMMISSIONERS:	ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI

DATE OF VISIT:	JULY 11, 2005
INSTALLATION:	**MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE BARSTOW, CALIFORNIA**
COMMISSIONERS:	JAMES H. BILBRAY

Date of Visit:	July 12, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Support Activity Corona, California**
Commissioners:	James H. Bilbray and Philip E. Coyle, III
Date of Visit:	July 13, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Base Ventura County, California**
Commissioners:	James H. Bilbray and Philip E. Coyle, III
Date of Visit:	July 26, 2005
Installation:	**Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, Nevada (revisit)**
Commissioners:	Anthony J. Principi
Date of Visit:	July 26, 2005
Installation:	**Hawthorne Army Depot, Nevada (revisit)**
Commissioners:	Anthony J. Principi
Date of Visit:	July 26, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Air Station Brunswick, Maine (revisit)**
Commissioners:	Sue Ellen Turner and Samuel K. Skinner
Date of Visit:	July 26, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Ship Yard Portsmouth, Maine (revisit)**
Commissioners:	Sue Ellen Turner and Samuel K. Skinner
Date of Visit:	July 27, 2005
Installation:	**Red River Army Depot, Texas (revisit)**
Commissioners:	James H. Bilbray
Date of Visit:	July 27, 2005
Installation:	**Submarine Base New London, Connecticut (revisit)**
Commissioners:	Sue Ellen Turner
Date of Visit:	July 28, 2005
Installation:	**Navy Bureau of Medicine, Potomac Annex, Washington, DC**
Commissioners:	Anthony J. Principi and Sue Ellen Turner

DATE OF VISIT: JULY 28, 2005
INSTALLATION: **AIR FORCE SURGEON GENERAL, BOLLING AIR FORCE BASE, WASHINGTON, DC**
COMMISSIONERS: ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI AND SUE ELLEN TURNER

DATE OF VISIT: JULY 28, 2005
INSTALLATION: **TRICARE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY, LEASED SPACE, VIRGINIA**
COMMISSIONERS: ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI AND SUE ELLEN TURNER

DATE OF VISIT: JULY 28, 2005
INSTALLATION: **ARMY OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL AND OSD HEALTH AFFAIRS LEASED SPACE, VIRGINIA**
COMMISSIONERS: ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI AND SUE ELLEN TURNER

DATE OF VISIT: JULY 29, 2005
INSTALLATION: **GALENA FORWARD OPERATION LOCATION, ALASKA**
COMMISSIONERS: JAMES H. BILBRAY AND PHILIP E. COYLE, III

DATE OF VISIT: JULY 29, 2005
INSTALLATION: **DETROIT ARSENAL, MICHIGAN**
COMMISSIONERS: SAMUEL K. SKINNER

DATE OF VISIT: JULY 29, 2005
INSTALLATION: **W.K. KELLOGG AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, MICHIGAN**
COMMISSIONERS: SAMUEL K. SKINNER

AUGUST 2005

DATE OF VISIT: AUGUST 1, 2005
INSTALLATION: **SHEPPARD AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS**
COMMISSIONERS: SUE ELLEN TURNER

DATE OF VISIT: AUGUST 1, 2005
INSTALLATION: **NAVAL AIR STATION OCEANA, VIRGINIA**
COMMISSIONERS: ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI; HAROLD W. GEHMAN; JAMES T. HILL AND SAMUEL K. SKINNER

DATE OF VISIT: AUGUST 2, 2005
INSTALLATION: **POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NORTH CAROLINA**
COMMISSIONERS: HAROLD W. GEHMAN AND JAMES T. HILL

Date of Visit:	August 2, 2005
Installation:	**Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) Columbus, Ohio**
Commissioners:	Lloyd W. Newton and Samuel K. Skinner
Date of Visit:	August 2, 2005
Installation:	**Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio**
Commissioners:	Lloyd W. Newton and Samuel K. Skinner
Date of Visit:	August 3, 2005
Installation:	**Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) Indianapolis, Indiana**
Commissioners:	Lloyd W. Newton and Samuel K. Skinner
Date of Visit:	August 3, 2005
Installation:	**Anniston Army Depot, Alabama**
Commissioners:	James V. Hansen
Date of Visit:	August 4, 2005
Installation:	**Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) and Air Reserve Personnel Center Denver, Colorado**
Commissioners:	Philip E. Coyle, III and Lloyd W. Newton
Date of Visit:	August 5, 2005
Installation:	**Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, California**
Commissioners:	Anthony J. Principi; James H. Bilbray; Philip E. Coyle III and James V. Hansen
Date of Visit:	August 8, 2005
Installation:	**Defense Language Institute, Monterey, California**
Commissioners:	James H. Bilbray; Harold W. Gehman and James V. Hansen
Date of Visit:	August 8, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California**
Commissioners:	James H. Bilbray; Harold W. Gehman and James V. Hansen
Date of Visit:	August 17, 2005
Installation:	**Naval Station Ingleside, Texas**
Commissioners:	James H. Bilbray; James V. Hansen and Sue Ellen Turner

DATE OF VISIT: AUGUST 19, 2005
INSTALLATION: **CECIL FIELD, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA**
COMMISSIONERS: JAMES T. HILL; LLOYD W. NEWTON AND SAMUEL K. SKINNER

STAFF-ONLY VISITS

MAY 2005

DATE OF VISIT: MAY 22, 2005
INSTALLATION: **FORT BRAGG, NORTH CAROLINA**

DATE OF VISIT: MAY 24, 2005
INSTALLATION **MARINE CORPS AIR STATION CHERRY POINT, NORTH CAROLINA**

DATE OF VISIT: MAY 26, 2005
INSTALLATION **NAVAL SHIPYARD PUGET SOUND DETACHMENT, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS**

DATE OF VISIT: MAY 26, 2005
INSTALLATION **NAVAL AIR STATION JOINT RESERVE BASE, WILLOW GROVE, PENNSYLVANIA**

JUNE 2005

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 1, 2005
INSTALLATION **FORT BENNING, GEORGIA**

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 2, 2005
INSTALLATION **FORT RILEY, KANSAS**

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 2, 2005
INSTALLATION **GENERAL BILLY MITCHELL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIR RESERVE STATION, WISCONSIN**

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 6, 2005
INSTALLATION **BRADLEY INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, CONNECTICUT**

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 6, 2005
INSTALLATION **NAVAL WEAPONS STATION CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA**

DATE OF VISIT: JUNE 7, 2005
INSTALLATION **REDSTONE ARSENAL, ALABAMA**

Date of Visit:	June 7, 2005
Installation	**Fort Rucker, Alabama**
Date of Visit:	June 7, 2005
Installation	**Fort Sill, Oklahoma**
Date of Visit:	June 7, 2005
Installation	**Defense Intelligence Agency, Bolling AFB, Washington, DC**
Date of Visit:	June 8, 2005
Installation	**Will Rogers World Airport Air Guard Station, Oklahoma**
Date of Visit:	June 9, 2005
Installation	**Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Idaho**
Date of Visit:	June 9, 2005
Installation	**Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania**
Date of Visit:	June 10, 2005
Installation	**Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, Montana**
Date of Visit:	June 10, 2005
Installation	**Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania**
Date of Visit:	June 13, 2005
Installation	**Fort Carson, Colorado**
Date of Visit:	June 13, 2005
Installation	**New Castle County Airport Air Guard Station, Delaware**
Date of Visit:	June 13, 2005
Installation	**Yeager Airport Air Guard Station, West Virginia**
Date of Visit:	June 13, 2005
Installation	**Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, Nevada**
Date of Visit:	June 14, 2005
Installation	**Mansfield-Lahm M.A.P. Air Guard Station, Ohio**
Date of Visit:	June 14, 2005
Installation	**Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Maryland**

Date of Visit:	June 14, 2005
Installation	**Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio**
Date of Visit:	June 15, 2005
Installation	**Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio**
Date of Visit:	June 15, 2005
Installation	**Fort Bliss, Texas**
Date of Visit:	June 15, 2005
Installation	**Scott Air Force Base, Illinois**
Date of Visit:	June 16, 2005
Installation	**Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida**
Date of Visit:	June 16, 2005
Installation	**Dyess Air Force Base, Texas**
Date of Visit:	June 17, 2005
Installation	**Army National Guard Reserve Centers, Alabama**
Date of Visit:	June 17, 2005
Installation	**Beale Air Force Base, California**
Date of Visit:	June 17, 2005
Installation	**Submarine Base Kings Bay, Georgia**
Date of Visit:	June 17, 2005
Installation	**Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas**
Date of Visit:	June 17, 2005
Installation	**Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington**
Date of Visit:	June 19, 2005
Installation	**Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas**
Date of Visit:	June 20, 2005
Installation	**Naval Depot Jacksonville, Florida**

DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 20, 2005
INSTALLATION	NAVAL STATION MAYPORT, FLORIDA
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 20, 2005
INSTALLATION	HECTOR INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, NORTH DAKOTA
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 21, 2005
INSTALLATION	LAMBERT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 22, 2005
INSTALLATION	NATIONAL NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER BETHESDA, MARYLAND
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 23, 2005
INSTALLATION	LITTLE ROCK AIR FORCE BASE, ARKANSAS
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 23, 2005
INSTALLATION	ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT, ALABAMA
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 23, 2005
INSTALLATION	ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MARYLAND
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 24, 2005
INSTALLATION	LEASED SPACE, ARMY HUMAN RESOURCES COMMAND ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 27, 2005
INSTALLATION	FORT LEE, VIRGINIA
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 27 THROUGH 29, 2005
INSTALLATION	VARIOUS ARMY NATIONAL GUARD FACILITIES, TEXAS
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 27, 2005
INSTALLATION	NAVAL STATION NEWPORT, NAVAL OFFICER TRAINING COMMAND, RHODE ISLAND
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 27, 2005
INSTALLATION	MOODY AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 28, 2005
INSTALLATION	NAVAL STATION NEWPORT, NAVAL UNDERSEA WARFARE CENTER, RHODE ISLAND
DATE OF VISIT:	JUNE 29, 2005
INSTALLATION	ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE, GEORGIA

July 2005

Date of Visit:	July 5, 2005
Installation	Pitt U.S. Army Reserve Center, Coraopolis, Pennsylvania
Date of Visit:	July 5, 2005
Installation	Fort Sam Houston, Texas
Date of Visit:	July 6, 2005
Installation	Naval Support Activity Corona, California
Date of Visit:	July 6, 2005
Installation	Eglin Air Force Base, Florida
Date of Visit:	July 6, 2005
Installation	Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina
Date of Visit:	July 7, 2005
Installation	Naval Base Ventura County (Point Mugu), California
Date of Visit:	July 7, 2005
Installation	Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland
Date of Visit:	July 7, 2005
Installation	Marine Corps Support Center Kansas City, Missouri
Date of Visit:	July 7, 2005
Installation	Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) Charleston, South Carolina
Date of Visit:	July 8, 2005
Installation	Naval Base Ventura County (Port Hueneme), California
Date of Visit:	July 8, 2005
Installation	Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas
Date of Visit:	July 11, 2005
Installation	Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California
Date of Visit:	July 11, 2005
Installation	Naval Air Station New Orleans, Louisiana

Date of Visit:	July 11, 2005
Installation	**Navy Crane Center Lester, Pennsylvania**
Date of Visit:	July 11, 2005
Installation	**Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania**
Date of Visit:	July 14, 2005
Installation	**Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, California**
Date of Visit:	July 14, 2005
Installation	**Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head, Seal Beach, California, detachment**
Date of Visit:	July 15, 2005
Installation	**Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane, Fallbrook, California, detachment**
Date of Visit:	July 15, 2005
Installation	**Naval Base Point Loma, Naval Space and Warfare Command, San Diego, California**
Date of Visit:	July 15, 2005
Installation	**Navy Broadway Complex San Diego, California**
Date of Visit:	July 21, 2005
Installation	**Air Reserve Personnel Center, Denver, Colorado**
Date of Visit:	July 22, 2005
Installation	**Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head, Maryland**
Date of Visit:	July 28, 2005
Installation	**Norfolk Naval Shipyard Detachment, Naval Sea Systems Command Plant Equipment Support Office Annapolis, Maryland**
Date of Visit:	July 29, 2005
Installation	**Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts**
Date of Visit:	August 1, 2005
Installation	**Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio**

August 2005

Date of Visit:	August 4, 2005
Installation	**Defense Language Institute Monterey, California**
Date of Visit:	August 5, 2005
Installation	**Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California**
Date of Visit:	August 9, 2005
Installation	**Cecil Field, Florida**

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

Appendix K:

Department of Defense Proposed 2005 Realignment and Closure List

DoD Baseline	One Time Costs ($M)	6 Year Net ($M)	20-Year NPV ($M)
Army	$9,963.050	$8,225.430	$3,058.750
Navy	$2,281.000	($138.845)	($7,884.750)
Air Force	$1,883.145	($2,634.214)	($14,560.251)
JCSG	$10,465.723	($704.336)	($29,569.300)
Total Cost	**$24,592.918**	**$4,748.035**	**($48,955.551)**

Key: Recommendations that generate net costs are listed as positive, whole numbers.

Recommendations that generate net savings are listed in parenthesis

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
1	**Fort Wainwright, AK**	**Army - 5**	$0.05	2 yrs	($0.19)	($0.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Greely	AK	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Fort Wainwright	AK	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
2	**Fort Gillem, GA**	**Army - 6**	$56.80	1 yr	($85.46)	($421.50)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Fort Gillem	GA	-517	-570	0	-1,087	-736	-1,823
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	78	79	0	157	0	157
Gainer	Fort Benning	GA	0	93	0	93	51	144
Gainer	Fort Campbell	KY	73	10	0	83	60	143
Gainer	Pope Air Force Base	NC	8	0	0	8	5	13
Gainer	Redstone Arsenal	AL	104	63	0	167	93	260
Gainer	Rock Island Arsenal	IL	157	120	0	277	173	450
Gainer	Shaw Air Force Base	SC	26	0	0	26	18	44
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-71**	**-205**	**0**	**-276**	**-336**	**-612**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
3	**Fort McPherson, GA**	**Army - 8**	$197.80	2 yrs	($111.39)	($895.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Fort McPherson	GA	-2,260	-1,881	0	-4,141	-2,705	-6,846
Closure	Peachtree Leases Atlanta	GA	-65	-97	0	-162	-114	-276
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	190	102	0	292	0	292
Gainer	Fort Eustis	VA	2	64	0	66	90	156
Gainer	Fort Sam Houston	TX	1	36	0	37	40	77
Gainer	Pope Air Force Base	NC	1,096	1,115	0	2,211	1,604	3,815
Gainer	Shaw Air Force Base	SC	748	49	0	797	584	1,381
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-288**	**-612**	**0**	**-900**	**-501**	**-1,401**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
4	**Fort Bragg, NC**	**Army - 10**	$334.80	Never	$446.12	$639.25

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	GE	-716	0	0	-716	0	-716
Gainer	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	1,352	50	0	1,402	1,158	2,560
Gainer	Fort Bragg	NC	2,518	22	0	2,540	1,697	4,237
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**3,154**	**72**	**0**	**3,226**	**2,855**	**6,081**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
5	**Fort Monmouth, NJ**	**Army - 11**	$822.30	6 yrs	$395.61	($1,025.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Fort Monmouth	NJ	-620	-4,652	0	-5,272	-4,464	-9,736
Realign	Crystal City Lease, VA	VA	-3	-14	0	-17	-11	-28
Realign	Fort Belvoir	VA	-13	-681	0	-694	-523	-1,217
Realign	Fort Knox	KY	0	-11	0	-11	-9	-20
Realign	Redstone Arsenal	AL	-7	-30	0	-37	-26	-63
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	44	108	0	152	0	152
Gainer	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	188	4,853	0	5,041	4,789	9,830
Gainer	Defense Supply Center Columbus	OH	0	49	0	49	40	89
Gainer	Fort Meade	MD	0	2	0	2	1	3
Gainer	United States Military Academy	NY	226	38	0	264	157	421
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-185**	**-338**	**0**	**-523**	**-46**	**-569**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
6	**Fort Hood, TX**	**Army - 15**	$435.80	Never	$579.49	$980.40

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	GE	-62	0	0	-62	0	-62
Gainer	Fort Carson	CO	4,152	192	0	4,344	3,283	7,627
Gainer	Fort Hood	TX	4,998	-53	0	4,945	3,222	8,167
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**9,088**	**139**	**0**	**9,227**	**6,505**	**15,732**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
7	**Red River Army Depot**	**Army - 16**	$456.20	4 yrs	$216.64	($539.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Red River Army Depot	TX	-9	-2,491	0	-2,500	-1,675	-4,175
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	0	56	0	56	0	56
Gainer	Anniston Army Depot	AL	0	979	0	979	726	1,705
Gainer	Letterkenny Army Depot	PA	0	344	0	344	187	531
Gainer	Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany	GA	0	156	0	156	123	279
Gainer	Tinker Air Force Base	OK	0	440	0	440	557	997
Gainer	Tobyhanna Army Depot	PA	0	66	0	66	46	112
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-9**	**-450**	**0**	**-459**	**-36**	**-495**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
8	**Fort Monroe, VA**	**Army - 19**	$72.40	1 yr	($146.96)	($686.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Fort Monroe	VA	-1,393	-1,948	-223	-3,564	-4,418	-7,982
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	86	94	0	180	0	180
Gainer	Fort Eustis	VA	960	1,368	223	2,551	3,155	5,706
Gainer	Fort Knox	KY	90	185	0	275	202	477
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-257**	**-301**	**0**	**-558**	**-1,061**	**-1,619**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
9	**Maneuver Training**	**Army - 20**	$773.10	5 yrs	$244.05	($948.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Knox	KY	-5,479	-621	0	-6,100	-2,421	-8,521
Realign	Fort McCoy	WI	-382	-115	0	-497	-336	-833
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	KO	-166	0	0	-166	0	-166
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	GE	-1,563	0	0	-1,563	0	-1,563
Gainer	Fort Benning	GA	9,393	530	0	9,923	4,032	13,955
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**1,803**	**-206**	**0**	**1,597**	**1,275**	**2,872**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
10	**Operational Army (IGPBS)**	**Army - 22**	$3,946.00	Never	$5,229.01	$7,846.70

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Campbell	KY	-433	-1	0	-434	-313	-747
Realign	Fort Hood	TX	-5,071	-65	0	-5,136	-3,385	-8,521
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	KO	-16	0	0	-16	0	-16
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	GE	-12,364	0	0	-12,364	0	-12,364
Gainer	Fort Bliss	TX	14,388	482	0	14,870	11,533	26,403
Gainer	Fort Riley	KS	2,415	334	0	2,749	1,737	4,486
Gainer	Fort Sill	OK	1,055	44	0	1,099	730	1,829
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-26**	**794**	**0**	**768**	**10,302**	**11,070**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
11	**RC Transformation, AL**	**Army - 25**	$109.20	6 yrs	$31.09	($140.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Abbott U.S. Army Reserve Center Tuskegee	AL	-2	-1	0	-3	-1	-4
Closure	Anderson U.S. Army Reserve Center Troy	AL	-15	0	0	-15	-8	-23
Closure	BG William P. Screws U.S. Army Reserve Center Montgomery	AL	-15	-3	0	-18	-11	-29
Closure	Fort Ganey Army National Guard Reserve Center Mobile	AL	-13	0	0	-13	-5	-18
Closure	Fort Hanna Army National Guard Reserve Center Birmingham	AL	-28	0	0	-28	-12	-40
Closure	Gary U.S. Army Reserve Center Enterprise	AL	-9	-1	0	-10	-8	-18
Closure	The Adjutant General Bldg, AL Army National Guard Montgomery	AL	-85	0	0	-85	-56	-141
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Vicksburg	MS	-26	-2	0	-28	-14	-42
Closure	Wright U.S. Army Reserve Center	AL	-8	-1	0	-9	-3	-12
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-201**	**-8**	**0**	**-209**	**-118**	**-327**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
12	**RC Transformation, AZ**	**Army - 28**	$31.10	5 yrs	$5.32	($51.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Allen Hall Armed Forces Reserve Center, Tucson	AZ	-60	0	0	-60	-52	-112
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-60**	**0**	**0**	**-60**	**-52**	**-112**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
13	**RC Transformation, AR**	**Army - 30**	$118.90	31 yrs	$97.58	$38.20

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	El Dorado Armed Forces Reserve Center	AR	-24	0	0	-24	-12	-36
Closure	Stone U.S. Army Reserve Center Pine Bluff	AR	-30	-4	0	-34	-13	-47
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-54**	**-4**	**0**	**-58**	**-25**	**-83**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
14	**RC Transformation, CA**	**Army - 33**	$78.70	10 yrs	$41.34	($46.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Bell	CA	-72	0	0	-72	-34	-106
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Moffett Field	CA	-3	0	0	-3	0	-3
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-75**	**0**	**0**	**-75**	**-34**	**-109**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
15	**RC Transformation, CT**	**Army - 35**	$128.60	36 yrs	$107.03	$47.50

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	SGT Libby U.S. Army Reserve Center New Haven	CT	-14	-7	0	-21	-11	-32
Closure	Turner U.S. Army Reserve Center Fairfield	CT	-13	-4	0	-17	-9	-26
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Area Maintenance Support Facility Middletown	CT	-13	-5	0	-18	-7	-25
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-40**	**-16**	**0**	**-56**	**-27**	**-83**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
16	**RC Transformation, DE**	**Army - 37**	$13.60	19 yrs	$9.80	$0.90

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Kirkwood U.S. Army Reserve Center Newark	DE	-7	-2	0	-9	-3	-12
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-7**	**-2**	**0**	**-9**	**-3**	**-12**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
17	**RC Transformation, GA**	**Army - 39**	$21.40	5 yrs	$3.51	($44.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Fort Benning Bldg 15	GA	-53	-3	0	-56	-32	-88
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Columbus	GA	-9	0	0	-9	-5	-14
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-62**	**-3**	**0**	**-65**	**-37**	**-102**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
18	**RC Transformation, HI**	**Army - 40**	$56.60	7 yrs	$26.35	($62.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Honokaa	HI	-118	0	0	-118	-100	-218
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-118**	**0**	**0**	**-118**	**-100**	**-218**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
19	**RC Transformation, IL**	**Army - 42**	$42.60	14 yrs	$28.10	($6.50)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Carbondale	IL	-32	0	0	-32	-17	-49
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-32**	**0**	**0**	**-32**	**-17**	**-49**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
20	**RC Transformation, IN**	**Army - 44**	$47.60	22 yrs	$33.68	$6.10

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Lafayette	IN	-21	0	0	-21	-11	-32
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Seston	IN	-12	0	0	-12	-4	-16
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-33**	**0**	**0**	**-33**	**-15**	**-48**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
21	**RC Transformation, IA**	**Army - 46**	$68.90	3 yrs	($16.54)	($201.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Army National Guard Reserve Center Camp Dodge	IA	-217	-1	0	-218	-83	-301
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-217**	**-1**	**0**	**-218**	**-83**	**-301**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
22	**RC Transformation, KY**	**Army - 48**	$25.30	6 yrs	$6.89	($34.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Paducah	KY	-31	0	0	-31	-16	-47
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Maysville	KY	-16	-2	0	-18	-9	-27
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-47**	**-2**	**0**	**-49**	**-25**	**-74**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
23	**RC Transformation, LA**	**Army - 50**	$30.70	2 yrs	($17.67)	($147.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Baton Rouge Army National Guard Reserve Center	LA	-128	0	0	-128	-62	-190
Closure	Roberts U.S. Army Reserve Center, Baton Rouge	LA	-30	0	0	-30	-14	-44
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-158**	**0**	**0**	**-158**	**-76**	**-234**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
24	**RC Transformation, MD**	**Army - 52**	$6.30	3 yrs	($1.37)	($17.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	PFC Flair U.S. Army Reserve Center, Frederick	MD	-20	-2	0	-22	-15	-37
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-20**	**-2**	**0**	**-22**	**-15**	**-37**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
25	**RC Transformation, MA**	**Army - 54**	$85.50	100 yrs	$79.73	$60.40

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Combined Support Maintenance Shop Devens	MA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Ayer	MA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Fort Devens, 323d Maintenance Facility	MA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Regional Training Site Maintenance (98), U.S. Army Reserve Fort Devens	MA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Ayer Area 3713	MA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve ECS 65 Ayer	MA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Armed Forces Reserve Center Ayer	MA	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
26	**RC Transformation, MI**	**Army - 55**	$7.90	3 yrs	($1.44)	($21.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Parisan U.S. Army Reserve Center Lansing	MI	-25	0	0	-25	-11	-36
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-25**	**0**	**0**	**-25**	**-11**	**-36**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
27	**RC Transformation, MN**	**Army - 57**	$17.30	Never	$17.77	$17.10

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Cambridge	MN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Army National Guard Faribault	MN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Cambridge	MN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Faribault	MN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Armed Forces Reserve Center New Cambridge	MN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Armed Forces Reserve Center New Faribault	MN	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
28	**RC Transformation, MO**	**Army - 58**	$28.60	3 yrs	$0.90	($61.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Jefferson Barracks	MO	-67	0	0	-67	-54	-121
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-67**	**0**	**0**	**-67**	**-54**	**-121**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
29	**RC Transformation, MT**	**Army - 60**	$26.00	23 yrs	$19.75	$4.30

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Galt Hall U.S. Army Reserve Center, Great Falls	MT	-14	-3	0	-17	-8	-25
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-14**	**-3**	**0**	**-17**	**-8**	**-25**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
30	**RC Transformation, NE**	**Army - 62**	$33.10	5 yrs	$6.03	($53.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Columbus	NE	-31	0	0	-31	-16	-47
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Grand Island	NE	-31	0	0	-31	-16	-47
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Kearny	NE	-8	0	0	-8	-4	-12
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-70**	**0**	**0**	**-70**	**-36**	**-106**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
31	**RC Transformation, NH**	**Army - 65**	$54.20	26 yrs	$44.57	$12.90

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Doble U.S. Army Reserve Center Portsmouth	NH	-39	-5	0	-44	-29	-73
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-39**	**-5**	**0**	**-44**	**-29**	**-73**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
32	**RC Transformation, NJ**	**Army - 66**	$15.10	5 yrs	$2.03	($26.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	SFC Nelson V. Brittin U.S. Army Reserve Center	NJ	-34	-1	0	-35	-29	-64
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-34**	**-1**	**0**	**-35**	**-29**	**-64**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
33	**RC Transformation, NM**	**Army - 68**	$17.90	6 yrs	$4.64	($24.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Jenkins Armed Forces Reserve Center Albuquerque	NM	-35	-1	0	-36	-29	-65
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-35**	**-1**	**0**	**-36**	**-29**	**-65**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
34	**RC Transformation, NY**	**Army - 69**	$103.80	47 yrs	$88.49	$46.50

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Armed Forces Reserve Center Amityville	NY	-24	-4	0	-28	-8	-36
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Niagara Falls	NY	-1	0	0	-1	0	-1
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-25**	**-4**	**0**	**-29**	**-8**	**-37**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
35	**RC Transformation, NC**	**Army - 72**	$9.20	2 yrs	($5.11)	($30.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Niven U.S. Army Reserve Center, Albermarle	NC	-34	5	0	-29	-14	-43
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-34**	**5**	**0**	**-29**	**-14**	**-43**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
36	**RC Transformation, ND**	**Army - 73**	$7.90	Never	$8.11	$8.00

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Johnson U.S. Army Reserve Center Fargo	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Fargo, ND Armed Forces Reserve Center	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
37	**RC Transformation, OH**	**Army - 75**	$134.80	18 yrs	$93.62	$1.30

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Mansfield	OH	-37	0	0	-37	-34	-71
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Westerville	OH	-12	0	0	-12	-4	-16
Closure	Parrott U.S. Army Reserve Center Kenton	OH	-9	-1	0	-10	-4	-14
Closure	Scouten U.S. Army Reserve Center Mansfield	OH	-22	-2	0	-24	-22	-46
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Whitehall	OH	-25	0	0	-25	-9	-34
Realign	Rickenbacker Army National Guard Bldg 943 Columbus	OH	-4	0	0	-4	-1	-5
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-109**	**-3**	**0**	**-112**	**-74**	**-186**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
38	**RC Transformation, OK**	**Army - 77**	$168.70	11 yrs	$98.56	($63.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Broken Arrow RC	OK	-26	0	0	-26	-9	-35
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Tishomingo	OK	-30	0	0	-30	-16	-46
Closure	Ashworth U.S. Army Reserve Center Muskogee	OK	-14	-2	0	-16	-8	-24
Closure	Krowse U.S. Army Reserve Center Oklahoma City	OK	-78	-6	0	-84	-77	-161
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-148**	**-8**	**0**	**-156**	**-110**	**-266**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
39	**RC Transformation, OR**	**Army - 80**	$24.10	100 yrs	$23.49	$19.80

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Jackson Band	OR	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Lake Oswego	OR	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Sears U.S. Army Reserve Center, Portland	OR	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Sharff U.S. Army Reserve Center Portland	OR	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Armed Forces Reserve Center Camp With (New)	OR	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Army National Guard Reserve Center Camp Withycombe	OR	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Army National Guard Reserve Center Maison	OR	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
40	**RC Transformation, PA**	**Army - 82**	$142.70	10 yrs	$81.06	($58.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Bristol U.S. Army Reserve Center Philadelphia	PA	-9	-2	0	-11	-5	-16
Closure	North Penn U.S. Army Reserve Center, Norristown	PA	-22	-1	0	-23	-10	-33
Closure	Serrenti U.S. Army Reserve Center Scranton	PA	-47	-8	0	-55	-20	-75
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Bloomsburg	PA	-20	-2	0	-22	-11	-33
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Lewisburg	PA	-9	-2	0	-11	-5	-16
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Williamsport	PA	-25	-4	0	-29	-16	-45
Closure	W. Reese U.S. Army Reserve Center/OMS Chester	PA	-9	-1	0	-10	-4	-14
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-141**	**-20**	**0**	**-161**	**-71**	**-232**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
41	**RC Transformation, PR**	**Army - 85**	$87.00	15 yrs	$64.01	($8.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Humacao	PR	-26	0	0	-26	-18	-44
Closure	Lavergne U.S. Army Reserve Center Bayamon	PR	-25	-1	0	-26	-18	-44
Realign	Aguadillla-Ramey U.S. Army Reserve Center/BMA-126	PR	-10	0	0	-10	-5	-15
Realign	Camp Euripedes Rubio, Puerto Nuevo	PR	-43	0	0	-43	-29	-72
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-104**	**-1**	**0**	**-105**	**-70**	**-175**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
42	**RC Transformation, RI**	**Army - 87**	$32.40	6 yrs	$9.44	($35.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Bristol U.S. Army Reserve Center	RI	-24	0	0	-24	-28	-52
Closure	Harwood U.S. Army Reserve Center, Providence	RI	-20	-4	0	-24	-30	-54
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-44**	**-4**	**0**	**-48**	**-58**	**-106**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
43	**RC Transformation, TN**	**Army - 89**	$36.90	18 yrs	$28.17	$1.10

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Facility Kingsport	TN	-30	-2	0	-32	-6	-38
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-30**	**-2**	**0**	**-32**	**-6**	**-38**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
44	**RC Transformation, TX**	**Army - 91**	$375.60	12 yrs	$220.58	($133.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center # 2 Dallas	TX	-90	0	0	-90	-48	-138
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center (Hondo Pass) El Paso	TX	-106	0	0	-106	-81	-187
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center California Crossing	TX	-47	0	0	-47	-25	-72
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Ellington	TX	-14	-45	0	-59	-41	-100
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Marshall	TX	-15	-1	0	-16	-8	-24
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center New Braunfels	TX	-106	0	0	-106	-89	-195
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center # 2 Houston	TX	-2	0	0	-2	0	-2
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Lufkin	TX	-10	0	0	-10	-5	-15
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-390**	**-46**	**0**	**-436**	**-297**	**-733**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
45	**RC Transformation, VT**	**Army - 95**	$61.40	100 yrs	$57.17	$41.70

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Ludlow	VT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center North Springfield	VT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Rutland	VT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Windsor	VT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Courcelle Brothers U.S. Army Reserve Center, Rutland	VT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Facility #160, Rutland	VT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Berlin	VT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Chester	VT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Armed Forces Reserve Center New Rutland	VT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Armed Forces Reserve Center White River Jct	VT	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
46	**RC Transformation, WA**	**Army - 97**	$61.20	9 yrs	$33.27	($46.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	1LT Richard H. Walker U.S. Army Reserve Center	WA	-38	0	0	-38	-32	-70
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Everett	WA	-57	0	0	-57	-32	-89
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-95**	**0**	**0**	**-95**	**-64**	**-159**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
47	**RC Transformation, WV**	**Army - 99**	$29.50	3 yrs	($4.17)	($77.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Bias U.S. Army Reserve Center Huntington	WV	-1	0	0	-1	0	-1
Closure	Fairmont U.S. Army National Guard Reserve Center	WV	-88	0	0	-88	-47	-135
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-89**	**0**	**0**	**-89**	**-47**	**-136**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
48	**RC Transformation, WI**	**Army - 102**	$10.70	Immediate	($37.67)	($139.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Olson U.S. Army Reserve Center Madison	WI	-113	0	0	-113	-42	-155
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center O'Connell	WI	-11	-1	0	-12	-4	-16
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-124**	**-1**	**0**	**-125**	**-46**	**-171**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
49	**RC Transformation, WY**	**Army - 103**	$72.40	21 yrs	$53.80	$9.00

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Army Aviation Support Facility Cheyenne	WY	-23	0	0	-23	-10	-33
Closure	Army National Guard Reserve Center Thermopolis	WY	-19	0	0	-19	-10	-29
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-42**	**0**	**0**	**-42**	**-20**	**-62**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
50	**Single Drill Sergeant**	**Army - 105**	$1.80	1 yr	($7.57)	($31.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Benning	GA	-119	-2	0	-121	-49	-170
Realign	Fort Leonard Wood	MO	-181	-2	0	-183	-53	-236
Gainer	Fort Jackson	SC	268	11	0	279	120	399
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-32**	**7**	**0**	**-25**	**18**	**-7**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
51	**U.S. Army Garrison, MI**	**Army - 106**	$9.50	Immediate	($91.39)	($260.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Selfridge Army Activity	MI	-126	-174	-76	-376	-225	-601
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	113	37	0	150	0	150
Gainer	Detroit Arsenal	MI	1	5	0	6	3	9
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-12**	**-132**	**-76**	**-220**	**-222**	**-442**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
52	**USAR Command and Control New England**	**Army - 107**	$96.10	13 yrs	$61.19	($21.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Malony U.S. Army Reserve Center	MA	-100	-55	0	-155	-87	-242
Closure	Westover U.S. Army Reserve Center Chicopee	MA	-13	0	0	-13	-5	-18
Gainer	Armed Forces Reserve Center Westover (new)	MA	67	11	0	78	39	117
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-46**	**-44**	**0**	**-90**	**-53**	**-143**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
53	**USAR Command and Control Northeast**	**Army - 109**	$171.20	5 yrs	$44.32	($302.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Carpenter U.S. Army Reserve Center Poughkeepsie	NY	-8	-1	0	-9	-4	-13
Closure	Kelly Support Center	PA	-174	-136	0	-310	-183	-493
Closure	Kilmer U.S. Army Reserve Center Edison	NJ	-23	-21	0	-44	-31	-75
Realign	Fort Sheridan	IL	-17	-17	0	-34	-52	-86
Realign	Fort Totten / Pyle	NY	-75	-74	0	-149	-72	-221
Realign	Pitt U.S. Army Reserve Center Coraopolis	PA	-119	-101	0	-220	-132	-352
Gainer	Fort Dix	NJ	178	224	0	402	385	787
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-238**	**-126**	**0**	**-364**	**-89**	**-453**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
54	**USAR Command and Control Northwest**	**Army - 112**	$80.40	9 yrs	$43.37	($65.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Fort Lawton	WA	-53	-54	0	-107	-75	-182
Closure	Vancover Barracks	WA	-29	-16	0	-45	-27	-72
Realign	Fort Douglas	UT	-15	-38	0	-53	-41	-94
Realign	Fort Snelling	MN	-130	-124	0	-254	-155	-409
Realign	U.S. Army Reserve Center Wichita	KS	-22	-56	0	-78	-75	-153
Gainer	Fort Lewis	WA	63	33	0	96	81	177
Gainer	Fort McCoy	WI	100	166	0	266	202	468
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-86**	**-89**	**0**	**-175**	**-90**	**-265**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
55	**USAR Command and Control Southeast**	**Army - 115**	$29.90	16 yrs	$22.54	($1.50)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	U.S. Army Reserve Center Louisville	KY	-30	-13	0	-43	-21	-64
Realign	Birmingham Armed Forces Reserve Center	AL	-146	-159	0	-305	-192	-497
Gainer	Fort Jackson	SC	100	166	0	266	211	477
Gainer	Fort Knox	KY	30	13	0	43	27	70
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-46**	**7**	**0**	**-39**	**25**	**-14**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
56	**USAR Command and Control Southwest**	**Army - 117**	$55.50	23 yrs	$44.13	$9.80

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Oklahoma City (95th)	OK	-31	-22	0	-53	-55	-108
Realign	Camp Parks (91st)	CA	-25	-18	0	-43	-25	-68
Realign	Camp Pike (90th)	AR	-86	-91	0	-177	-158	-335
Realign	Los Alamitos (63rd)	CA	-92	-78	0	-170	-99	-269
Gainer	Armed Forces Reserve Center Moffett Field	CA	90	166	0	256	107	363
Gainer	Fort Hunter Liggett	CA	25	18	0	43	40	83
Gainer	Fort Sill	OK	31	22	0	53	41	94
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-88**	**-3**	**0**	**-91**	**-149**	**-240**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
57	**Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA**	**DoN - 6**	$26.00	Immediate	($56.49)	($230.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow	CA	-137	-323	51	-409	-387	-796
Gainer	Anniston Army Depot	AL	0	25	0	25	18	43
Gainer	Letterkenny Army Depot	PA	0	36	0	36	19	55
Gainer	Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany	GA	1	35	0	36	27	63
Gainer	Tobyhanna Army Depot	PA	3	123	0	126	87	213
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-133**	**-104**	**51**	**-186**	**-236**	**-422**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
58	**Naval Support Activity Corona, CA**	**DoN - 7**	$80.20	15 yrs	$65.47	($0.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Support Activity Corona	CA	-6	-886	0	-892	-903	-1,795
Gainer	Naval Base Ventura County	CA	5	849	0	854	1,108	1,962
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1**	**-37**	**0**	**-38**	**205**	**167**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
59	**Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, CA**	**DoN - 9**	$14.00	1 yr	($43.24)	($199.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Det Concord	CA	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
60	**Submarine Base New London, CT**	**DoN - 10**	$679.60	3 yrs	$345.44	($1,576.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Submarine Base New London	CT	-7,093	-952	-412	-8,457	-7,349	-15,806
Gainer	Fort Sam Houston	TX	23	2	0	25	20	45
Gainer	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	53	1	0	54	67	121
Gainer	Naval Medical Center Portsmouth	VA	28	0	0	28	29	57
Gainer	Naval Shipyard Norfolk	VA	0	106	85	191	239	430
Gainer	Naval Station Newport	RI	23	47	0	70	103	173
Gainer	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	2,983	100	0	3,083	3,280	6,363
Gainer	Naval Weapons Station Earle	NJ	2	0	0	2	1	3
Gainer	Submarine Base Kings Bay	GA	3,145	80	20	3,245	1,606	4,851
Gainer	Walter Reed Army Medical Center	DC	17	16	0	33	22	55
Gainer	Westover Air Force Base	MA	2	0	0	2	0	2
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-817**	**-600**	**-307**	**-1,724**	**-1,982**	**-3,706**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
61	**Officer Training Command, Pensacola, FL**	**DoN - 12**	$3.60	4 yrs	($1.38)	($10.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	-274	-21	0	-295	-379	-674
Gainer	Naval Station Newport	RI	265	14	-3	276	335	611
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-9**	**-7**	**-3**	**-19**	**-44**	**-63**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
62	**Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA**	**DoN - 13**	$40.41	Immediate	($128.70)	($445.95)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Air Station Atlanta	GA	-1,274	-156	-68	-1,498	-806	-2,304
Gainer	Dobbins Air Reserve Base	GA	64	8	0	72	37	109
Gainer	Fort Gillem	GA	6	0	0	6	2	8
Gainer	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Ft. Worth	TX	276	17	2	295	176	471
Gainer	Naval Air Station New Orleans	LA	50	3	0	53	35	88
Gainer	Robins Air Force Base	GA	327	23	0	350	240	590
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-551**	**-105**	**-66**	**-722**	**-316**	**-1,038**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
63	**Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA**	**DoN - 14**	$23.80	7 yrs	$13.56	($21.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Supply Corps School Athens	GA	-393	-108	-16	-517	-318	-835
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	4	0	0	4	2	6
Gainer	Naval Station Newport	RI	359	86	16	461	593	1,054
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-30**	**-22**	**0**	**-52**	**277**	**225**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
64	**Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA**	**DoN - 15**	$164.60	3 yrs	$86.12	($276.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Support Activity New Orleans	LA	-1,997	-652	-62	-2,711	-2,015	-4,726
Gainer	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Ft. Worth	TX	54	19	0	73	50	123
Gainer	Naval Air Station New Orleans	LA	1,181	335	3	1,519	1,111	2,630
Gainer	Naval Support Activity Mid South	TN	228	145	3	376	217	593
Gainer	Naval Support Activity Norfolk	VA	345	105	7	457	515	972
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-189**	**-48**	**-49**	**-286**	**-122**	**-408**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
65	**Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME**	**DoN - 18**	$147.20	4 yrs	$112.62	($238.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Air Station Brunswick	ME	-2,317	-61	-42	-2,420	-1,844	-4,264
Gainer	Naval Air Station Jacksonville	FL	1,971	4	46	2,021	2,350	4,371
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-346**	**-57**	**4**	**-399**	**506**	**107**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
66	**Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO**	**DoN - 19**	$23.30	3 yrs	$8.03	($49.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Marine Corps Support Center Kansas City	MO	-191	-139	-3	-333	-249	-582
Gainer	Naval Air Station New Orleans	LA	176	106	0	282	221	503
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-15**	**-33**	**-3**	**-51**	**-28**	**-79**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
67	**Naval Station Pascagoula, MS**	**DoN - 20**	$17.90	Immediate	($220.02)	($665.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Station Pascagoula	MS	-844	-112	-7	-963	-797	-1,760
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	12	0	0	12	0	12
Gainer	Naval Station Mayport	FL	403	2	0	405	470	875
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-429**	**-110**	**-7**	**-546**	**-327**	**-873**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
68	**Naval Air Station JRB Willow Grove, PA, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnston, PA**	**DoN - 21**	$126.30	2 yrs	($134.73)	($710.50)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Air Station Willow Grove	PA	-726	-357	-5	-1,088	-628	-1,716
Realign	Marine Corps Reserve Center Johnstown	PA	-86	0	0	-86	-52	-138
Gainer	Fort Dix	NJ	24	2	0	26	21	47
Gainer	Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point	NC	64	8	0	72	52	124
Gainer	McGuire Air Force Base	NJ	497	36	0	533	448	981
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-227**	**-311**	**-5**	**-543**	**-159**	**-702**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
69	**Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME**	**DoN - 23**	$448.40	4 yrs	($21.42)	($1,262.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Shipyard Portsmouth	ME	-201	-4,032	-277	-4,510	-4,655	-9,165
Gainer	Naval Shipyard Norfolk	VA	12	1,341	0	1,353	1,875	3,228
Gainer	Naval Station Bremerton	WA	0	1,358	0	1,358	1,430	2,788
Gainer	Naval Station Pearl Harbor	HI	0	357	0	357	357	714
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-189**	**-976**	**-277**	**-1,442**	**-993**	**-2,435**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
70	**Naval Station Newport, RI**	**DoN - 25**	$11.80	13 yrs	$8.33	($2.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Station Newport	RI	-53	-58	-89	-200	-288	-488
Gainer	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	53	58	89	200	232	432
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**-56**	**-56**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
71	**Naval Station Ingleside, TX, and Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX**	**DoN - 26**	$177.05	3 yrs	($44.33)	($614.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Station Ingleside	TX	-1,901	-260	-57	-2,218	-2,581	-4,799
Realign	Naval Air Station Corpus Christi	TX	-926	-30	-10	-966	-1,097	-2,063
Gainer	Naval Base Point Loma	CA	311	30	0	341	310	651
Gainer	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	741	2	0	743	782	1,525
Gainer	Naval Station San Diego	CA	1,085	86	2	1,173	1,069	2,242
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-690**	**-172**	**-65**	**-927**	**-1,517**	**-2,444**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
72	**Engineering Field Division/Activity**	**DoN - 28**	$37.90	4 yrs	$9.06	($81.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Engineering Field Activity Northeast	PA	-4	-188	0	-192	-154	-346
Closure	Navy Crane Center Lester	PA	-1	-54	0	-55	-44	-99
Closure	South Naval Facilities Engineering Command	SC	-6	-492	-45	-543	-890	-1,433
Gainer	Naval Air Station Jacksonville	FL	3	301	12	316	434	750
Gainer	Naval Shipyard Norfolk	VA	1	54	0	55	76	131
Gainer	Naval Station Great Lakes	IL	1	65	1	67	112	179
Gainer	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	1	156	0	157	217	374
Gainer	Naval Support Activity Norfolk	VA	0	78	9	87	117	204
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-5**	**-80**	**-23**	**-108**	**-132**	**-240**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
73	**Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers **(RollUp)**	**DoN - 29**	$62.35	Immediate	$17.09	($76.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Inspector/Instructor Center West Trenton	NJ	-11	-1	0	-12	-3	-15
Closure	Inspector/Instructor Rome	GA	-9	0	0	-9	-3	-12
Closure	Navy Reserve Center La Crosse	WI	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Akron	OH	-26	0	0	-26	-10	-36
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Baton Rouge	LA	-18	0	0	-18	-8	-26
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Cleveland	OH	-24	-1	0	-25	-7	-32
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Dubuque	IA	-19	-5	0	-24	-7	-31
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Encino	CA	-33	0	0	-33	-15	-48
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Los Angeles	CA	-48	0	0	-48	-22	-70
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Madison	WI	-23	-3	0	-26	-10	-36
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Mobile	AL	-27	0	0	-27	-11	-38
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Moundsville	WV	-16	0	0	-16	-5	-21
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Reading	PA	-18	0	0	-18	-6	-24
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Tulsa	OK	-32	0	0	-32	-11	-43
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	NJ	0	1	0	1	0	1
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	9	0	0	9	0	9
Gainer	Armed Forces Reserve Center Akron	OH	37	0	0	37	14	51
Gainer	Armed Forces Reserve Center Bell	CA	48	0	0	48	22	70
Gainer	Armed Forces Reserve Center Broken Arrow	OK	32	0	0	32	11	43
Gainer	Armed Forces Reserve Center Madison	WI	40	8	0	48	21	69
Gainer	Armed Forces Reserve Center Mobile	AL	22	0	0	22	9	31
Gainer	Baton Rouge Army National Guard Reserve Center	LA	11	0	0	11	5	16
Gainer	Dobbins Air Reserve Base	GA	9	0	0	9	4	13
Gainer	Fort Dix	NJ	11	0	0	11	9	20
Gainer	Marine Corps Reserve Center Pasadena	CA	25	0	0	25	11	36
Gainer	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Lehigh	PA	8	0	0	8	3	11
Gainer	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Pittsburgh	PA	7	0	0	7	2	9
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-52**	**-1**	**0**	**-53**	**-9**	**-62**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
74	**Navy Recruiting Districts**	**DoN - 34**	$2.40	Immediate	($78.27)	($214.50)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Recruiting District Headquarters Omaha	NE	-19	-7	-6	-32	-27	-59
Closure	Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Buffalo	NY	-25	-6	-6	-37	-14	-51
Closure	Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Indianapolis	IN	-27	-5	-6	-38	-14	-52
Closure	Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Kansas	MO	-21	-6	-6	-33	-22	-55
Closure	Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Montgomery	AL	-31	-5	-5	-41	-25	-66
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-123**	**-29**	**-29**	**-181**	**-102**	**-283**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
75	**Navy Regions**	**DoN - 35**	$3.20	1 yr	($8.88)	($34.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Air Station Corpus Christi	TX	0	-59	0	-59	-85	-144
Realign	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	0	-24	0	-24	-41	-65
Gainer	Naval Air Station Jacksonville	FL	0	5	0	5	6	11
Gainer	Naval Station Great Lakes	IL	0	33	0	33	56	89
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-45**	**0**	**-45**	**-64**	**-109**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
76	**Navy Reserve Centers** (Roll up)**	**DoN - 37**	$2.55	Immediate	($87.02)	($236.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Naval Reserve Center Bangor	ME	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9
Closure	Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Grissom Air Reserve Base, Bunker Hill	IN	-7	0	0	-7	-1	-8
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Adelphi	MD	-17	0	0	-17	-10	-27
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Asheville	NC	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Cape Girardeau	MO	-7	0	0	-7	-1	-8
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Cedar Rapids	IA	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Central Point	OR	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Duluth	MN	-8	0	0	-8	-2	-10
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Evansville	IN	-7	0	0	-7	-1	-8
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Forest Park	IL	-15	0	0	-15	-4	-19
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Glens Falls	NY	-7	0	0	-7	-1	-8
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Horseheads	NY	-7	0	0	-7	-6	-13
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Lexington	KY	-9	0	0	-9	-2	-11
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Lincoln	NE	-7	0	0	-7	-3	-10
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Lubbock	TX	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Marquette	MI	-7	0	0	-7	-1	-8
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Orange	TX	-11	0	0	-11	-6	-17
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Pocatello	ID	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Sioux City	IA	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9
Closure	Navy Reserve Center St Petersburg	FL	-12	0	0	-12	-10	-22
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Tuscaloosa	AL	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9
Closure	Navy Reserve Center Watertown	NY	-9	0	0	-9	-5	-14
Closure	Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Tacoma	WA	-20	0	0	-20	-15	-35
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	76	0	0	76	0	76
Gainer	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	MN	1	0	0	1	0	1
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-129**	**0**	**0**	**-129**	**-84**	**-213**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
77	**Navy Reserve Readiness Commands**	**DoN - 44**	$2.60	Immediate	($30.94)	($91.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Ft. Worth	TX	-54	-5	0	-59	-35	-94
Realign	Naval District Washington	DC	-26	-11	0	-37	-24	-61
Realign	Naval Station Newport	RI	-34	-15	0	-49	-64	-113
Gainer	Naval Station Great Lakes	IL	15	3	0	18	26	44
Gainer	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	42	17	0	59	67	126
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-57**	**-11**	**0**	**-68**	**-30**	**-98**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
78	**Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station, AL**	**Air Force - 5**	$11.00	18 yrs	$7.69	($0.50)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station	AL	-66	-117	0	-183	-123	-306
Gainer	Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station	ME	10	29	0	39	26	65
Gainer	Dannelly Field Air Guard Station	AL	0	1	0	1	0	1
Gainer	McGee Tyson APT Air Guard Station	TN	46	58	0	104	89	193
Gainer	Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport	AZ	10	29	0	39	39	78
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**31**	**31**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
79	**Eielson Air Force Base, AK, Moody Air Force Base, GA, and Shaw Airforce Base, SC**	**Air Force - 6**	$141.40	Immediate	($594.03)	($2,780.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Eielson Air Force Base	AK	-2,821	-319	200	-2,940	-1,770	-4,710
Realign	Shaw Air Force Base	SC	-23	0	0	-23	-16	-39
Gainer	Barksdale Air Force Base	LA	1	20	0	21	22	43
Gainer	Langley Air Force Base	VA	2	0	0	2	2	4
Gainer	Moody Air Force Base	GA	301	12	0	313	216	529
Gainer	Nellis Air Force Base	NV	607	20	0	627	405	1,032
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1,933**	**-267**	**200**	**-2,000**	**-1,141**	**-3,141**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
80	**Kulis Air Guard Station, AK, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK**	**Air Force - 7**	$81.40	4 yrs	$20.61	($146.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Kulis Air Guard Station	AK	-218	-241	0	-459	-376	-835
Realign	Elmendorf Air Force Base	AK	-580	191	0	-389	-246	-635
Gainer	Langley Air Force Base	VA	697	23	0	720	765	1,485
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-101**	**-27**	**0**	**-128**	**143**	**15**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
81	**Fort Smith Air Guard Station, AR, and Luke Air Force Base, AZ**	**Air Force - 8**	$17.60	16 yrs	$12.44	($2.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Smith Regional	AR	-19	-59	0	-78	-56	-134
Realign	Luke Air Force Base	AZ	-11	-173	0	-184	-202	-386
Gainer	Fresno Air Terminal	CA	43	204	0	247	164	411
Gainer	Savannah International Airport Air Guard Station	GA	4	0	0	4	3	7
Gainer	Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station	OK	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**17**	**-27**	**0**	**-10**	**-91**	**-101**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
82	**Beale Air Force Base, CA and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI**	**Air Force - 10**	$45.40	14 yrs	$34.62	($6.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Beale Air Force Base	CA	-8	-171	0	-179	-131	-310
Realign	Selfridge Air National Guard Base	MI	51	-69	0	-18	-35	-53
Gainer	MacDill Air Force Base	FL	11	77	0	88	96	184
Gainer	McGee Tyson APT Air Guard Station	TN	3	56	0	59	64	123
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**57**	**-107**	**0**	**-50**	**-6**	**-56**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
83	**March Air Force Base, CA**	**Air Force - 11**	$10.80	5 yrs	$1.91	($15.50)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	March Air Reserve Base	CA	-71	-40	0	-111	-89	-200
Gainer	Armed Forces Reserve Center Pease Air Force Base	NH	20	28	0	48	40	88
Gainer	McConnell Air Force Base	KS	34	1	0	35	24	59
Gainer	McGee Tyson APT Air Guard Station	TN	1	20	0	21	22	43
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-16**	**9**	**0**	**-7**	**-3**	**-10**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
84	**Onizuka Air Force Station, CA**	**Air Force - 12**	$123.70	5 yrs	$45.33	($211.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Onizuka Air Force Station	CA	-107	-171	0	-278	-114	-392
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	91	7	0	98	0	98
Gainer	Vandenberg Air Force Base	CA	35	23	0	58	42	100
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**19**	**-141**	**0**	**-122**	**-72**	**-194**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
85	**Bradley International Airport AGS, CT, Barnes AGS, MA, Selfridge ANGB, MI, Shaw AB, SC, and Martine State AGS, MD**	**Air Force - 14**	$3.20	2 yrs	($6.12)	($25.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station	CT	-17	-75	0	-92	-61	-153
Realign	Martin State Airport Air Guard Station	MD	0	-4	0	-4	-3	-7
Realign	Selfridge Air National Guard Base	MI	0	-4	0	-4	-3	-7
Realign	Shaw Air Force Base	SC	-24	-1	0	-25	-17	-42
Gainer	Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station	MA	23	83	0	106	84	190
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-18**	**-1**	**0**	**-19**	**0**	**-19**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
86	**New Castle Airport Air Guard Station, DE**	**Air Force - 15**	$15.50	1 yr	($29.06)	($120.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	New Castle County Airport Air Guard Station	DE	-47	-101	0	-148	-100	-248
Gainer	Charlotte/Douglas International Airport	NC	6	0	0	6	2	8
Gainer	Dover Air Force Base	DE	3	5	0	8	8	16
Gainer	McGuire Air Force Base	NJ	1	1	0	2	1	3
Gainer	Savannah International Airport Air Guard Station	GA	13	21	0	34	34	68
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-24**	**-74**	**0**	**-98**	**-55**	**-153**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
87	**Robins Air Force Base, GA**	**Air Force - 16**	$6.70	Immediate	($31.95)	($175.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Robins Air Force Base	GA	-435	-36	0	-471	-323	-794
Gainer	McConnell Air Force Base	KS	307	12	0	319	228	547
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-128**	**-24**	**0**	**-152**	**-95**	**-247**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
88	**Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID**	**Air Force - 17**	$2.50	8 yrs	$1.60	($1.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station	ID	-22	-62	0	-84	-73	-157
Gainer	Cheyenne Airport Air Guard Station	WY	21	58	0	79	48	127
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1**	**-4**	**0**	**-5**	**-25**	**-30**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
89	**Mountain Home Air Force, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base**	**Air Force - 18**	$74.20	Immediate	($21.18)	($389.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Elmendorf Air Force Base	AK	-769	-33	0	-802	-585	-1,387
Realign	Mountain Home Air Force Base	ID	-498	-30	0	-528	-304	-832
Gainer	Fresno Air Terminal	CA	14	49	0	63	40	103
Gainer	Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station	FL	41	6	0	47	55	102
Gainer	McEntire Air Guard Station	SC	418	8	0	426	259	685
Gainer	Nellis Air Force Base	NV	302	14	0	316	204	520
Gainer	Shaw Air Force Base	SC	19	15	0	34	26	60
Gainer	Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station	OK	9	26	0	35	27	62
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-464**	**55**	**0**	**-409**	**-278**	**-687**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
90	**Capital Air Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN**	**Air Force - 20**	$19.90	13 yrs	$13.34	($6.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Capital Airport Air Guard Station	IL	-30	-133	0	-163	-105	-268
Realign	Dane County Airport	WI	-4	1	0	-3	-1	-4
Realign	Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station	IA	-4	0	0	-4	-1	-5
Realign	Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station	IN	-12	-124	0	-136	-94	-230
Realign	Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station	SD	-4	0	0	-4	-1	-5
Realign	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	-5	0	0	-5	-4	-9
Gainer	Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station	IN	57	256	0	313	172	485
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-2**	**0**	**0**	**-2**	**-34**	**-36**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
91	**New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA**	**Air Force - 22**	$50.20	5 yrs	$32.50	($80.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Air Station New Orleans Air Reserve Station	LA	-4	-308	0	-312	-312	-624
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	-2	-2	0	-4	0	-4
Gainer	Barksdale Air Force Base	LA	4	40	0	44	47	91
Gainer	Buckley Air Force Base	CO	4	33	0	37	31	68
Gainer	Nellis Air Force Base	NV	1	31	0	32	26	58
Gainer	Whiteman Air Force Base	MO	3	58	0	61	49	110
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**6**	**-148**	**0**	**-142**	**-159**	**-301**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
92	**Andrews AFB, MD, Will Rogers AGS, OK, Tinker AFB, OK, Randolph AFB, TX**	**Air Force - 23**	$21.70	2 yrs	($12.17)	($83.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Andrews Air Force Base	MD	-85	-30	0	-115	-75	-190
Realign	Randolph Air Force Base	TX	-16	0	0	-16	-13	-29
Realign	Tinker Air Force Base	OK	-2	-16	0	-18	-21	-39
Realign	Will Rogers World Airport Air Guard Station	OK	84	-99	0	-15	-49	-64
Gainer	Carswell ARS, Naval Air Station Fort Worth	TX	8	33	0	41	39	80
Gainer	Rosecrans Memorial Airport Air Guard Station	MO	8	27	0	35	23	58
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-3**	**-85**	**0**	**-88**	**-96**	**-184**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
93	**Martin State Air Guard Station, MD**	**Air Force - 24**	$9.40	1 yr	($13.69)	($97.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Martin State Airport Air Guard Station	MD	-17	-102	0	-119	-109	-228
Gainer	Andrews Air Force Base	MD	1	0	0	1	0	1
Gainer	Channel Islands Air Guard Station	CA	0	21	0	0	0	
Gainer	Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station	RI	13	21	0	34	48	82
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-3**	**-60**	**0**	**-84**	**-61**	**-145**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
94	**Otis ANGB, MA, Lambert St. Louis International Airport AGS, MO, Atlantic City AGS, NJ**	**Air Force - 25**	$103.00	3 yrs	($12.25)	($336.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Otis Air Guard Base	MA	-62	-443	0	-505	-321	-826
Realign	Lambert International Airport, St Louis	MO	-34	-215	0	-249	-260	-509
Gainer	Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station	NJ	40	167	0	207	161	368
Gainer	Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station	MA	0	1	0	1	0	1
Gainer	Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station	CT	20	2	0	22	7	29
Gainer	Burlington International Airport Air Guard Station	VT	3	53	0	56	38	94
Gainer	Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station	FL	4	16	0	20	26	46
Gainer	Nellis Air Force Base	NV	10	186	0	196	163	359
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-19**	**-233**	**0**	**-252**	**-186**	**-438**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
95	**W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI**	**Air Force - 27**	$8.30	Immediate	($46.73)	($166.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	W. K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station	MI	-68	-206	0	-274	-166	-440
Gainer	Selfridge Air National Guard Base	MI	18	164	0	182	132	314
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-50**	**-42**	**0**	**-92**	**-34**	**-126**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
96	**Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN**	**Air Force - 28**	$2.10	5 yrs	($0.22)	($7.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station	MN	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
97	**Key Field Air Guard Station, MS**	**Air Force - 28**	$10.70	13 yrs	$6.89	($2.50)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Key Field Air Guard Station	MS	-33	-142	0	-175	-163	-338
Gainer	Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station	ME	1	29	0	30	23	53
Gainer	Gen Mitchell International Airport ARS	WI	24	56	0	80	56	136
Gainer	Jackson International Airport Air Guard Station	MS	0	1	0	1	0	1
Gainer	McGee Tyson APT Air Guard Station	TN	8	56	0	64	67	131
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**-17**	**-17**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
98	**Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station**	**Air Force - 30**	$9.30	4 yrs	($0.73)	($18.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station	MT	-26	-81	0	-107	-66	-173
Gainer	Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station	ID	0	1	0	1	1	2
Gainer	Dannelly Field Air Guard Station	AL	18	41	0	59	43	102
Gainer	Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station	IA	8	39	0	47	33	80
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**11**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
99	**Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV**	**Air Force - 31**	$22.90	9 yrs	$12.23	($22.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station	NV	-23	-124	0	-147	-115	-262
Gainer	Channel Islands Air Guard Station	CA	0	5	0	5	6	11
Gainer	Fresno Air Terminal	CA	0	1	0	1	0	1
Gainer	Little Rock Air Force Base	AR	21	114	0	135	134	269
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-2**	**-4**	**0**	**-6**	**25**	**19**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
100	**Cannon Air Force Base, NM**	**Air Force - 32**	$90.10	Immediate	($815.56)	($2,706.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Cannon Air Force Base	NM	-2,385	-384	-55	-2,824	-1,954	-4,778
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	0	38	0	38	0	38
Gainer	Andrews Air Force Base	MD	34	79	0	113	80	193
Gainer	Dane County Airport	WI	22	36	0	58	35	93
Gainer	Hill Air Force Base	UT	212	10	0	222	197	419
Gainer	Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station	SD	32	27	0	59	35	94
Gainer	Kirtland Air Force Base	NM	1	14	0	15	14	29
Gainer	Nellis Air Force Base	NV	248	12	0	260	169	429
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1,836**	**-168**	**-55**	**-2,059**	**-1,424**	**-3,483**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
101	**Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY**	**Air Force - 33**	$65.20	2 yrs	($5.31)	($199.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Niagara Falls International Airport Air Guard Station	NY	-115	-527	0	-642	-430	-1,072
Gainer	Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station	ME	34	137	0	171	122	293
Gainer	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	1	3	0	4	3	7
Gainer	Langley Air Force Base	VA	1	31	0	32	44	76
Gainer	Little Rock Air Force Base	AR	368	13	0	381	282	663
Gainer	Schriever Air Force Base	CO	44	51	0	95	84	179
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**333**	**-292**	**0**	**41**	**105**	**146**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
102	**Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station**	**Air Force - 34**	$3.50	8 yrs	$3.32	($2.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Schenectady County Air Guard Station	NY	-10	-9	0	-19	-18	-37
Gainer	Little Rock Air Force Base	AR	7	5	0	12	10	22
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-3**	**-4**	**0**	**-7**	**-8**	**-15**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
103	**Pope AFB, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport ARS, PA, Yeager AGS, WV**	**Air Force - 35**	$218.15	Immediate	($652.52)	($2,515.35)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station	PA	-44	-278	0	-322	-258	-580
Realign	Pope Air Force Base	NC	-5,969	-384	-132	-6,485	-4,356	-10,841
Realign	Sheppard Air Force Base	TX	-4	0	0	-4	-2	-6
Realign	Yeager Airport Air Guard Station	WV	-27	-129	0	-156	-88	-244
Gainer	Channel Islands Air Guard Station	CA	4	10	0	14	16	30
Gainer	Columbus Air Force Base	MS	4	0	0	4	2	6
Gainer	Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport Sheppard Air Guard Station	WV	7	3	0	10	7	17
Gainer	Fort Bragg	NC	1,560	225	0	1,785	1,216	3,001
Gainer	Laughlin Air Force Base	TX	4	0	0	4	2	6
Gainer	Little Rock Air Force Base	AR	1,736	85	0	1,821	1,361	3,182
Gainer	Moody Air Force Base	GA	926	38	0	964	667	1,631
Gainer	Offutt Air Force Base	NE	54	77	0	131	127	258
Gainer	Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station	RI	4	8	0	12	16	28
Gainer	Randolph Air Force Base	TX	4	0	0	4	3	7
Gainer	Vance Air Force Base	OK	4	0	0	4	3	7
Gainer	Youngstown-Warren Regional Airport	OH	0	8	0	8	7	15
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1,737**	**-337**	**-132**	**-2,206**	**-1,277**	**-3,483**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
104	**Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND**	**Air Force - 37**	$131.50	1 yr	($322.49)	($1,982.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Grand Forks Air Force Base	ND	-2,290	-355	0	-2,645	-2,283	-4,928
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	0	80	0	80	0	80
Gainer	Forbes Field Air Guard Station	KS	27	175	0	202	144	346
Gainer	Hickam Air Force Base	HI	159	7	0	166	127	293
Gainer	MacDill Air Force Base	FL	-123	155	0	32	72	104
Gainer	McConnell Air Force Base	KS	273	-171	0	102	7	109
Gainer	Scott Air Force Base	IL	53	187	0	240	245	485
Gainer	Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	NC	319	16	0	335	279	614
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1,582**	**94**	**0**	**-1,488**	**-1,409**	**-2,897**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
105	**Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND**	**Air Force - 38**	$1.80	2 yrs	($3.32)	($12.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Construction Battalion Center Gulfport	MS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Hector International Airport Air Guard Station	ND	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station	SD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	McGee Tyson APT Air Guard Station	TN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
106	**Mansfield Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH**	**Air Force - 39**	$33.40	3 yrs	($3.07)	($86.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Mansfield Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station	OH	-63	-171	0	-234	-293	-527
Gainer	Little Rock Air Force Base	AR	184	6	0	190	140	330
Gainer	Louisville International Airport Air Guard Station	KY	0	5	0	5	3	8
Gainer	Maxwell Air Force Base	AL	3	39	0	42	32	74
Gainer	Toledo Express Airport Air Guard Station	OH	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**124**	**-120**	**0**	**4**	**-118**	**-114**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
107	**Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH**	**Air Force - 40**	$11.40	17 yrs	$8.35	($0.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station	OH	-66	-225	0	-291	-148	-439
Gainer	Buckley Air Force Base	CO	9	48	0	57	46	103
Gainer	Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station	IA	31	83	0	114	75	189
Gainer	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	22	58	0	80	83	163
Gainer	Rickenbacker International Airport Air Guard Station	OH	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-4**	**-35**	**0**	**-39**	**56**	**17**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
108	**Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR**	**Air Force - 41**	$85.50	7 yrs	$36.22	($100.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Portland International Airport Air Guard Station	OR	-112	-452	0	-564	-453	-1,017
Gainer	Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station	NJ	19	43	0	62	44	106
Gainer	Forbes Field Air Guard Station	KS	26	19	0	45	23	68
Gainer	McChord Air Force Base	WA	38	9	0	47	37	84
Gainer	Naval Air Station New Orleans Air Reserve Station	LA	17	70	0	87	81	168
Gainer	Tinker Air Force Base	OK	3	60	0	63	78	141
Gainer	Vandenburg Air Force Base	CA	9	78	0	87	71	158
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-173**	**0**	**-173**	**-119**	**-292**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
109	**Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD, and Dyess Air Force Base, TX**	**Air Force - 43**	$299.10	1 yr	($316.38)	($1,853.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Ellsworth Air Force Base	SD	-3,315	-438	-99	-3,852	-2,913	-6,765
Gainer	Dyess Air Force Base	TX	310	64	0	374	357	731
Gainer	Elmendorf Air Force Base	AK	247	10	0	257	187	444
Gainer	Little Rock Air Force Base	AR	1,095	90	0	1,185	896	2,081
Gainer	Peterson Air Force Base	CO	482	-19	0	463	339	802
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1,181**	**-293**	**-99**	**-1,573**	**-1,134**	**-2,707**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
110	**Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN**	**Air Force - 44**	$25.40	2 yrs	$16.74	($120.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station	TN	-19	-172	0	-191	-136	-327
Gainer	Greater Peoria Regional Airport	IL	13	21	0	34	23	57
Gainer	Louisville International Airport Air Guard Station	KY	0	1	0	1	0	1
Gainer	Memphis International Airport Air Guard Station	TN	2	6	0	8	5	13
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-4**	**-144**	**0**	**-148**	**-108**	**-256**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
111	**Ellington Air Guard Station, TX**	**Air Force - 45**	$1.60	5 yrs	$0.10	($3.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Ellington Field Air Guard Station	TX	0	-3	0	-3	-2	-5
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-3**	**0**	**-3**	**-2**	**-5**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
112	**Lackland Air Force Base, TX**	**Air Force - 46**	$8.10	2 yrs	($4.69)	($32.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	-103	-4	0	-107	-90	-197
Gainer	McConnell Air Force Base	KS	63	3	0	66	47	113
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-40**	**-1**	**0**	**-41**	**-43**	**-84**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
113	**Hill AFB, UT, Edwards AFB, CA, Mountain Home AFB, ID, Luke AFB, AZ, Nellis AFB, NV**	**Air Force - 47**	$28.20	4 yrs	($7.23)	($85.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Edwards Air Force Base	CA	-2	0	0	-2	-1	-3
Realign	Hill Air Force Base	UT	80	-201	0	-121	-124	-245
Realign	Luke Air Force Base	AZ	-29	-1	0	-30	-22	-52
Realign	Mountain Home Air Force Base	ID	-40	-1	0	-41	-23	-64
Realign	Nellis Air Force Base	NV	-19	0	0	-19	-12	-31
Gainer	Carswell ARS, Naval Air Station Fort Worth	TX	0	71	0	71	76	147
Gainer	Homestead Air Reserve Station	FL	0	42	0	42	41	83
Gainer	Langley Air Force Base	VA	1	0	0	1	1	2
Gainer	Shaw Air Force Base	SC	-4	12	0	8	8	16
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-13**	**-78**	**0**	**-91**	**-56**	**-147**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
114	**Langley Air Force Base, VA**	**Air Force - 49**	$1.80	3 yrs	($1.47)	($8.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Langley Air Force Base	VA	-19	0	0	-19	-20	-39
Gainer	Tyndall Air Force Base	FL	11	0	0	11	10	21
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-8**	**0**	**0**	**-8**	**-10**	**-18**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
115	**Richmond Air Guard Station, VA, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA**	**Air Force - 50**	$24.20	10 yrs	$11.59	($13.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station	IA	-12	-98	0	-110	-80	-190
Realign	Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station	VA	-25	-101	0	-126	-92	-218
Gainer	Homestead Air Reserve Station	FL	0	29	0	29	28	57
Gainer	Toledo Express Airport Air Guard Station	OH	14	111	0	125	89	214
Gainer	Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station	OK	13	54	0	67	54	121
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-10**	**-5**	**0**	**-15**	**-1**	**-16**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
116	**Fairchild Air Force Base, WA**	**Air Force - 51**	$6.40	7 yrs	$1.65	($8.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Fairchild Air Force Base	WA	-26	-172	0	-198	-215	-413
Gainer	Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard	IA	33	170	0	203	154	357
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**7**	**-2**	**0**	**5**	**-61**	**-56**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
117	**General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI**	**Air Force - 52**	$38.40	5 yrs	$14.26	($50.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Gen Mitchell International Airport ARS	WI	-44	-302	0	-346	-270	-616
Gainer	Dobbins Air Reserve Base	GA	0	37	0	37	31	68
Gainer	Little Rock Air Force Base	AR	184	6	0	190	140	330
Gainer	Pope Air Force Base	NC	44	77	0	121	89	210
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**184**	**-182**	**0**	**2**	**-10**	**-8**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
118	**Air Force Logistics Support Centers**	**Air Force - 53**	$9.30	1 yr	($19.24)	($77.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Altus Air Force Base	OK	-16	0	0	-16	-10	-26
Realign	Hickam Air Force Base	HI	-134	-17	0	-151	-118	-269
Realign	Hurlburt Field	FL	-48	-6	0	-54	-43	-97
Realign	Little Rock Air Force Base	AR	-16	0	0	-16	-11	-27
Realign	Luke Air Force Base	AZ	-16	0	0	-16	-11	-27
Gainer	Langley Air Force Base	VA	80	15	0	95	104	199
Gainer	Scott Air Force Base	IL	97	6	0	103	84	187
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-53**	**-2**	**0**	**-55**	**-5**	**-60**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
119	**F-100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities**	**Air Force - 55**	$9.20	9 yrs	$3.80	($7.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station	FL	0	-6	0	-6	-8	-14
Realign	Langley Air Force Base	VA	-31	-1	0	-32	-33	-65
Realign	Tyndall Air Force Base	FL	-33	0	0	-33	-32	-65
Gainer	Naval Air Station New Orleans Air Reserve Station	LA	28	6	0	34	24	58
Gainer	Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	NC	26	1	0	27	21	48
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-10**	**0**	**0**	**-10**	**-28**	**-38**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
120	**Aviation Logistics School**	**E&T - 5**	$492.30	13 yrs	$348.07	($77.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Eustis	VA	-2,262	-148	0	-2,410	-2,588	-4,998
Gainer	Fort Rucker	AL	1,752	256	0	2,008	1,812	3,820
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-510**	**108**	**0**	**-402**	**-776**	**-1,178**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
121	**Combat Service Support Center**	**E&T - 6**	$754.00	6 yrs	$352.42	($934.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	-3,857	-343	0	-4,200	-3,184	-7,384
Realign	Fort Eustis	VA	-1,499	-210	0	-1,709	-1,870	-3,579
Realign	Redstone Arsenal	AL	-1,311	-132	0	-1,443	-675	-2,118
Gainer	Fort Lee	VA	5,672	303	0	5,975	3,467	9,442
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-995**	**-382**	**0**	**-1,377**	**-2,262**	**-3,639**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
122	**Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training**	**E&T - 7**	$1.50	1 yr	($5.78)	($18.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	-140	-15	0	-155	-103	-258
Gainer	Fort Lee	VA	136	4	0	140	80	220
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-4**	**-11**	**0**	**-15**	**-23**	**-38**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
123	**Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training**	**E&T - 8**	$5.00	4 yrs	($2.57)	($16.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	-282	-9	0	-291	-179	-470
Gainer	Fort Lee	VA	276	0	0	276	156	432
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-6**	**-9**	**0**	**-15**	**-23**	**-38**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
124	**Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education**	**E&T - 9**	$1.00	1 yr	($3.96)	($11.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Maxwell Air Force Base	AL	-19	-1	0	-20	-11	-31
Realign	Naval Air Station Meridian	MS	-15	0	-1	-16	-12	-28
Realign	Naval Station Newport	RI	-37	-2	0	-39	-46	-85
Gainer	Fort Jackson	SC	68	3	0	71	35	106
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-3**	**0**	**-1**	**-4**	**-34**	**-38**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
125	**Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site**	**E&T - 10**	$199.10	Never	$209.60	$226.30

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Luke Air Force Base	AZ	-45	-3	0	-48	-35	-83
Realign	Marine Corps Base Miramar	CA	-40	-3	0	-43	-38	-81
Realign	Naval Air Station Oceana	VA	-30	-3	0	-33	-34	-67
Realign	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	-384	-8	0	-392	-494	-886
Realign	Sheppard Air Force Base	TX	-291	-4	0	-295	-190	-485
Gainer	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	790	21	0	811	670	1,481
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**-121**	**-121**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
126	**Net Fires Center**	**E&T - 12**	$247.00	6 yrs	$92.96	($319.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Bliss	TX	-3,034	-335	0	-3,369	-2,649	-6,018
Gainer	Fort Sill	OK	2,527	279	0	2,806	1,645	4,451
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-507**	**-56**	**0**	**-563**	**-1,004**	**-1,567**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
127	**Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, MO**	**E&T - 13**	$6.02	16 yrs	$3.91	($0.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Belvoir	VA	-73	-29	0	-102	-66	-168
Gainer	Fort Leonard Wood	MO	71	25	0	96	38	134
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-2**	**-4**	**0**	**-6**	**-28**	**-34**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
128	**Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training**	**E&T - 14**	$71.70	4 yrs	$1.62	($174.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Moody Air Force Base	GA	-557	-145	0	-702	-466	-1,168
Realign	Randolph Air Force Base	TX	-472	-99	0	-571	-507	-1,078
Gainer	Columbus Air Force Base	MS	100	3	0	103	67	170
Gainer	Laughlin Air Force Base	TX	98	80	0	178	133	311
Gainer	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	502	123	0	625	841	1,466
Gainer	Sheppard Air Force Base	TX	51	2	0	53	33	86
Gainer	Vance Air Force Base	OK	89	6	0	95	90	185
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-189**	**-30**	**0**	**-219**	**191**	**-28**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
129	**Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations**	**H&SA - 3**	$90.50	Immediate	($10.83)	($308.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Crystal City Lease, VA	VA	-753	-342	-385	-1,480	-983	-2,263
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-240	-169	0	-409	-278	-687
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-119	-160	-10	-289	-201	-490
Gainer	Andrews Air Force Base	MD	640	450	271	1,361	919	2,280
Gainer	Headquarters Battalion, Headquarters Marine Corps, Henderson Hall	VA	412	186	81	679	450	1,129
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-60**	**-35**	**-43**	**-138**	**-93**	**-31**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
130	**Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities**	**H&SA - 5**	$67.10	13 yrs	$47.51	($11.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Leased Space - AZ	AZ	0	-1	0	-1	-1	-2
Closure	Leased Space - CA	CA	-2	-10	-2	-14	-8	-22
Closure	Leased Space - MD	MD	0	-42	0	-42	-40	-82
Closure	Leased Space - OH	OH	0	-177	-59	-236	-145	-381
Closure	Leased Space - VA	VA	-1	-5	0	-6	-4	-10
Closure	Leased Space - VA	VA	-2	-140	-22	-164	-123	-287
Realign	Bolling Air Force Base	DC	-32	-91	-60	-183	-128	-311
Realign	Natick Soldier Systems Center	MA	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1
Realign	Naval District Washington	DC	0	-136	-12	-148	-111	-259
Gainer	Fort Meade	MD	28	556	153	737	688	1,425
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-9**	**-47**	**-2**	**-58**	**128**	**70**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
131	**Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency**	**H&SA - 8**	$174.00	7 yrs	$87.99	($172.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Leased Space - CA	CA	0	-4	-2	-6	-5	-11
Closure	Leased Space - CO	CO	0	-11	0	-11	-11	-22
Closure	Leased Space - GA	GA	0	-6	-2	-8	-6	-14
Closure	Leased Space - MD	MD	-3	-79	-76	-158	-146	-304
Closure	Leased Space - OH	OH	0	-10	0	-10	-8	-18
Closure	Leased Space - VA	VA	-1	-454	0	-455	-343	-798
Realign	Andrews Air Force Base	MD	-273	-165	-362	-800	-534	-1,334
Realign	Fort Belvoir	VA	-161	-163	-85	-409	-279	-688
Realign	Naval District Washington	DC	-82	-526	-102	-710	-516	-1,226
Gainer	Marine Corps Base Quantico	VA	496	1,357	1,216	3,069	2,143	5,212
Gainer	Peterson Air Force Base	CO	0	11	36	47	36	83
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-24**	**-50**	**623**	**549**	**331**	**880**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
132	**Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations**	**H&SA - 10**	$44.10	1 yr	($59.49)	($322.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Bailey's Crossroads, VA	VA	-1	-85	-10	-96	-70	-166
Realign	Ballston Lease, VA	VA	-262	-93	-191	-546	-359	-905
Realign	Crystal City Lease, VA	VA	-294	-893	-408	-1,595	-1,129	-2,724
Realign	Hoffman Lease, VA	VA	0	-360	0	-360	-272	-632
Realign	Rosslyn Lease, VA	VA	0	-209	-83	-292	-212	-504
Gainer	Fort Belvoir	VA	557	1,681	692	2,930	2,079	5,009
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**41**	**0**	**41**	**37**	**78**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
133	**Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased Locations**	**H&SA - 12**	$539.00	9 yrs	$376.85	($257.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	0	-9	-1,518	-1,527	-1,013	-2,540
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-1,288	-3,218	0	-4,506	-3,243	-7,749
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-1,459	-2,326	0	-3,785	-2,674	-6,459
Gainer	Fort Belvoir	VA	2,693	5,215	1,462	9,370	6,603	15,973
Gainer	Fort Lee	VA	54	496	56	606	448	1,054
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**158**	**0**	**158**	**121**	**279**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
134	**Co-locate Missile and Space Defense Agencies**	**H&SA - 15**	$178.20	1 yr	($12.98)	($359.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-98	-418	-952	-1,468	-1,010	-2,478
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-46	-282	0	-328	-241	-569
Gainer	Fort Belvoir	VA	13	139	0	152	113	265
Gainer	Redstone Arsenal	AL	131	568	1,055	1,754	993	2,747
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**7**	**103**	**110**	**-145**	**-35**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
135	**Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center**	**H&SA - 17**	$33.30	10 yrs	$23.64	($14.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	-159	-488	-91	-738	-1,139	-1,877
Gainer	Naval Support Activity Mid South	TN	144	456	85	685	449	1,134
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-15**	**-32**	**-6**	**-53**	**-690**	**-743**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
136	**Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters**	**H&SA - 18**	$7.10	Immediate	($43.97)	($125.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	ATEC Lease, VA	VA	-181	-227	-62	-470	-325	-795
Gainer	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	169	193	62	424	364	788
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-12**	**-34**	**0**	**-46**	**39**	**-7**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
137	**Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies**	**H&SA - 19**	$97.50	4 yrs	$46.37	($196.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Bolling Air Force Base	DC	0	-37	0	-37	-28	-65
Realign	Fort Richardson	AK	-2	-59	-1	-62	-54	-116
Realign	Hill Air Force Base	UT	0	-85	0	-85	-82	-167
Realign	Human Resources Support Center Northeast	PA	0	-174	-9	-183	-148	-331
Realign	Human Resources Support Center Southeast	MS	0	-138	-10	-148	-131	-279
Realign	Human Resources Support Center Southwest	CA	0	-164	0	-164	-175	-339
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	0	-323	-6	-329	-249	-578
Realign	Naval Station Pearl Harbor	HI	0	-68	0	-68	-68	-136
Realign	Robins Air Force Base	GA	-1	-94	0	-95	-59	-154
Realign	Rock Island Arsenal	IL	0	-251	0	-251	-219	-470
Realign	Tinker Air Force Base	OK	0	-111	0	-111	-140	-251
Realign	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	OH	0	-127	0	-127	-107	-234
Gainer	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	0	106	0	106	101	207
Gainer	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Indianapolis	IN	0	22	4	26	16	42
Gainer	Defense Supply Center Columbus	OH	0	237	0	237	194	431
Gainer	Fort Huachuca	AZ	0	44	1	45	32	77
Gainer	Fort Riley	KS	0	106	0	106	80	186
Gainer	Human Resources Support Center Northwest	WA	0	23	0	23	24	47
Gainer	Naval Base Coronado	CA	0	198	0	198	212	410
Gainer	Naval Support Activity Philadelphia	PA	0	291	0	291	237	528
Gainer	Randolph Air Force Base	TX	1	379	0	380	425	805
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-2**	**-225**	**-21**	**-248**	**-139**	**-387**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
138	**Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities**	**H&SA - 22**	$178.80	16 yrs	$149.39	($2.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Edwards Air Force Base	CA	-12	0	0	-12	-10	-22
Realign	Fort Knox	KY	-98	-7	0	-105	-62	-167
Realign	Fort Lewis	WA	-2	-1	0	-3	-2	-5
Realign	Fort Sill	OK	-117	-3	-3	-123	-79	-202
Realign	Kirtland Air Force Base	NM	-12	0	0	-12	-9	-21
Realign	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	-9	0	0	-9	-7	-16
Realign	Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune	NC	-182	-16	-9	-207	-118	-325
Realign	Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton	CA	-145	-6	0	-151	-136	-287
Realign	Marine Corps Base Quantico	VA	-50	0	-6	-56	-34	-90
Realign	Naval Air Station Jacksonville	FL	-34	-2	0	-36	-41	-77
Realign	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	-17	-13	0	-30	-43	-73
Realign	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	-117	-6	0	-123	-131	-254
Realign	Submarine Base Bangor	WA	0	-1	0	-1	-1	-2
Gainer	Fort Leavenworth	KS	195	8	0	203	130	333
Gainer	Marine Corps Base Miramar	CA	81	6	0	87	78	165
Gainer	Naval Support Activity Norfolk	VA	222	22	0	244	263	507
Gainer	Naval Weapons Station Charleston	SC	39	3	0	42	58	100
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-258**	**-16**	**-18**	**-292**	**-144**	**-436**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
139	**Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional, and Hopewell Offices**	**H&SA - 26**	$47.20	14 yrs	$35.39	($4.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Leased Space - TX	TX	-1	-82	0	-83	-92	-175
Closure	Leased Space - VA	VA	0	-215	0	-215	-166	-381
Realign	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	-2	-107	0	-109	-150	-259
Gainer	Fort Lee	VA	1	346	0	347	268	615
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-2**	**-58**	**0**	**-60**	**-140**	**-200**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
140	**Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR Capability**	**H&SA - 27**	$220.00	2 yrs	$102.07	($491.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Arlington Service Center	VA	-224	-516	-383	-1,123	-785	-1,908
Realign	Leased Space - Slidell	LA	-1	-102	-48	-151	-143	-294
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-5	-16	-15	-36	-25	-61
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-225	-1,605	-1,037	-2,867	-2,044	-4,911
Realign	Naval Support Activity Panama City	FL	-12	-12	0	-24	-23	-47
Gainer	Fort Meade	MD	429	2,119	1,370	3,918	3,572	7,490
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-38**	**-132**	**-113**	**-283**	**552**	**269**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
141	**Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications**	**H&SA - 30**	$42.00	4 yrs	$2.90	($89.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Belvoir	VA	-3	0	0	-3	-2	-4
Realign	Leased Space - DC	DC	-103	-68	-10	-181	-123	-296
Realign	Leased Space - TX	TX	-77	-65	-131	-273	-242	-410
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-65	-117	-100	-282	-195	-477
Gainer	Fort Meade	MD	225	238	241	704	609	1,313
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-23**	**-12**	**0**	**-35**	**47**	**126**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
142	**Consolidate Transportation Command Components**	**H&SA - 31**	$101.80	Immediate	($339.32)	($1,278.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Eustis	VA	-23	-300	-54	-377	-498	-875
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-24	-508	-325	-857	-615	-1,472
Realign	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	-1	-104	0	-105	-145	-250
Gainer	Scott Air Force Base	IL	-209	654	86	531	634	1,165
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-257**	**-258**	**-293**	**-808**	**-624**	**-1,432**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
143	**Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force**	**H&SA - 33**	$119.30	Immediate	($463.03)	($1,913.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Air Reserve Personnel Center	CO	-122	-284	-59	-465	-363	-828
Realign	Hoffman Lease, VA	VA	-575	-1,438	-164	-2,177	-1,558	-3,735
Realign	Leased Space - IN	IN	-25	-111	-1	-137	-90	-227
Realign	Leased Space - MO	MO	-709	-1,234	-150	-2,093	-2,078	-4,171
Gainer	Fort Knox	KY	619	2,175	326	3,120	2,365	5,485
Gainer	Randolph Air Force Base	TX	110	243	63	416	414	830
Gainer	Robins Air Force Base	GA	0	30	-4	26	16	42
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-702**	**-619**	**11**	**-1,310**	**-1,294**	**-2,604**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
144	**Create Joint Mobilization Sites**	**H&SA - 35**	$0.10	Immediate	($30.85)	($37.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Eustis	VA	-1	0	0	-1	-1	-2
Realign	Fort Jackson	SC	-1	0	0	-1	0	-1
Realign	Submarine Base New London	CT	-3	0	0	-3	-2	-5
Gainer	Fort Dix	NJ	3	0	0	3	2	5
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-2**	**0**	**0**	**-2**	**-1**	**-3**

Item #	DoD Recommendation		Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
145	**Defense Finance and Accounting Service**		**H&SA - 37**	$282.10	Immediate	($158.12)	($1,313.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Charleston	SC	0	-368	0	-368	-607	-975
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Dayton	OH	0	-230	0	-230	-194	-424
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Kansas City	MO	-37	-576	0	-613	-548	-1,161
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Lexington	KY	-5	-40	0	-45	-26	-71
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Limestone	ME	0	-241	0	-241	-149	-390
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Oakland	CA	0	-50	0	-50	-40	-90
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Orlando	FL	-9	-200	0	-209	-204	-413
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Patuxent River	MD	0	-53	0	-53	-70	-123
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Rome	NY	0	-290	0	-290	-274	-564
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, San Antonio	TX	-32	-303	0	-335	-366	-701
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, San Bernardino	CA	0	-120	0	-120	-121	-241
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, San Diego	CA	-3	-237	0	-240	-256	-496
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Seaside	CA	-10	-51	0	-61	-61	-122
Closure	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, St. Louis	MO	-2	-291	0	-293	-317	-610
Realign	Air Reserve Personnel Center	CO	6	-195	0	-189	-169	-358
Realign	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Arlington	VA	-7	-401	0	-408	-307	-715
Realign	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Cleveland	OH	-15	-1,013	0	-1,028	-846	-1,874
Realign	Fort Sill	OK	-52	-181	0	-233	-206	-439
Realign	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	-1	-636	0	-637	-1,099	-1,736
Realign	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	-3	-311	0	-314	-435	-749
Realign	Naval Station Pearl Harbor	HI	-29	-177	0	-206	-198	-404
Realign	Offutt Air Force Base	NE	0	-235	0	-235	-259	-494
Realign	Rock Island Arsenal	IL	0	-235	0	-235	-205	-440
Gainer	Air Reserve Personnel Center	CO	14	532	0	546	477	1,023
Gainer	Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Indianapolis	IN	114	3,356	0	3,470	2,471	5,941
Gainer	Defense Supply Center Columbus	OH	65	1,272	0	1,337	1,065	2,402
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-6**	**-1,274**	**0**	**-1,280**	**-2,944**	**-4,224**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
146	**Joint Basing**	**H&SA - 41**	$50.60	Immediate	($601.32)	($2,342.50)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Andersen Air Force Base	GU	-64	-31	0	-95	-79	-174
Realign	Bolling Air Force Base	DC	-64	-55	0	-119	-81	-200
Realign	Fort Dix	NJ	-7	-82	0	-89	-92	-181
Realign	Fort Eustis	VA	-68	-170	0	-238	-307	-545
Realign	Fort Richardson	AK	-84	-140	0	-224	-187	-411
Realign	Fort Sam Houston	TX	-28	-52	0	-80	-81	-161
Realign	Headquarters Battalion, Headquarters Marine Corps, Henderson Hall	VA	-11	-2	0	-13	-7	-20
Realign	Hickam Air Force Base	HI	-177	-100	0	-277	-233	-510
Realign	McChord Air Force Base	WA	-306	-116	0	-422	-353	-775
Realign	Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst	NJ	-132	-41	0	-173	-111	-284
Realign	Naval Air Facility Washington	MD	-9	-9	0	-18	-11	-29
Realign	Naval Weapons Station Charleston	SC	-163	-101	0	-264	-392	-656
Realign	Randolph Air Force Base	TX	-40	-69	0	-109	-110	-219
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1,153**	**-968**	**0**	**-2,121**	**-2,044**	**-4,165**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
147	**Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA)**	**H&SA - 44**	$4.50	5 yrs	$0.92	($7.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Bolling Air Force Base	DC	0	-59	-3	-62	-45	-107
Gainer	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	0	59	0	59	66	125
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**-3**	**-3**	**21**	**18**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
148	**Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies**	**H&SA - 46**	$199.90	10 yrs	$111.82	($122.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	-5	-175	0	-180	-170	-350
Realign	Bailey's Crossroads, VA	VA	-23	-527	0	-550	-413	-963
Realign	Crystal City Lease, VA	VA	-25	-204	0	-229	-169	-398
Realign	Fort Belvoir	VA	-91	-1,212	0	-1,303	-974	-2,277
Realign	Fort Buchanan	PR	-9	-47	0	-56	-54	-110
Realign	Hoffman Lease, VA	VA	0	-83	0	-83	-62	-145
Realign	Rock Island Arsenal	IL	-3	-130	0	-133	-114	-247
Realign	Rosslyn Lease, VA	VA	0	-2	0	-2	-1	-3
Gainer	Fort Knox	KY	5	56	0	61	48	109
Gainer	Fort Sam Houston	TX	57	1,016	0	1,073	1,188	2,261
Gainer	Redstone Arsenal	AL	85	1,137	0	1,222	913	2,135
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-9**	**-171**	**0**	**-180**	**192**	**12**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
149	**Relocate Miscellaneous Department of the Navy Leased Locations**	**H&SA - 49**	$61.90	1 yr	$12.79	($164.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Leased Space - MD	MD	0	-164	0	-164	-217	-381
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-459	-973	0	-1,432	-1,024	-2,456
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	0	-10	0	-10	-7	-17
Gainer	Arlington Service Center	VA	435	406	0	841	579	1,420
Gainer	Leased Space - DC	DC	0	79	0	79	59	138
Gainer	Naval Air Station Patuxent River	MD	0	164	6	170	222	392
Gainer	Naval District Washington	DC	24	498	164	686	500	1,186
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**170**	**170**	**112**	**282**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
150	**Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA**	**Ind - 4**	$4.10	1 yr	($2.26)	($17.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach	CA	0	-47	0	-47	-38	-85
Gainer	Anniston Army Depot	AL	0	2	0	2	1	3
Gainer	Letterkenny Army Depot	PA	0	2	0	2	1	3
Gainer	Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany	GA	0	5	0	5	3	8
Gainer	Tobyhanna Army Depot	PA	0	31	0	31	21	52
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-7**	**0**	**-7**	**-12**	**-19**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
151	**Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA**	**Ind - 5**	$25.20	3 yrs	$10.44	($53.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant	CA	0	-4	-85	-89	-16	-105
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-4**	**-85**	**-89**	**-16**	**-105**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
152	**Sierra Army Depot, CA**	**Ind - 6**	$33.40	7 yrs	$7.21	($66.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Crane Army Ammunition Plant	IN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	OK	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Sierra Army Depot	CA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Tooele Army Depot	UT	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
153	**Rock Island Arsenal, IL**	**Ind - 7**	$27.00	9 yrs	$16.20	($13.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Rock Island Arsenal	IL	0	-181	0	-181	-158	-339
Gainer	Anniston Army Depot	AL	0	119	0	119	88	207
Gainer	Letterkenny Army Depot	PA	0	27	0	27	14	41
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-35**	**0**	**-35**	**-56**	**-91**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
154	**Newport Chemical Depot, IN**	**Ind - 8**	$7.10	Immediate	($95.62)	($436.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Newport Chemical Depot	IN	-210	-81	-280	-571	-267	-838
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	5	0	0	5	0	5
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-205**	**-81**	**-280**	**-566**	**-267**	**-833**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
155	**Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS**	**Ind - 9**	$25.20	2 yrs	($2.14)	($101.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Kansas Army Ammunition Plant	KS	0	-8	-159	-167	-108	-275
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-8**	**-159**	**-167**	**-108**	**-275**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
156	**Lima Tank Plant, OH**	**Ind - 10**	$0.20	Immediate	($5.85)	($22.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Lima Tank Plant	OH	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
157	**Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS**	**Ind - 11**	$32.40	7 yrs	$10.75	($38.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant	MS	0	-4	-50	-54	-35	-89
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-3**	**-50**	**-53**	**-35**	**-88**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
158	**Hawthorne Army Depot, NV**	**Ind - 12**	$180.30	Immediate	($59.22)	($777.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Hawthorne Army Depot	NV	-74	-45	-80	-199	-125	-324
Realign	Tooele Army Depot	UT	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	0	20	0	20	0	20
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-74**	**-25**	**-80**	**-179**	**-125**	**-304**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
159	**Watervliet Arsenal, NY**	**Ind - 13**	$63.70	18 yrs	$46.81	($5.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Watervliet Arsenal	NY	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
160	**Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR**	**Ind - 14**	$15.50	Immediate	($89.06)	($681.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Umatilla Army Depot	OR	-127	-385	0	-512	-371	-883
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-127**	**-385**	**0**	**-512**	**-371**	**-883**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
161	**Lackland Air Force Base, TX**	**Ind - 15**	$10.20	3 yrs	$0.07	($28.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	0	-177	0	-177	-198	-375
Gainer	Tobyhanna Army Depot	PA	0	138	0	138	96	234
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-39**	**0**	**-39**	**-102**	**-141**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
162	**Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant**	**Ind - 16**	$29.00	1 yr	$4.66	($164.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant	TX	-2	-18	-129	-149	-79	-228
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-2**	**-18**	**-129**	**-149**	**-79**	**-228**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
163	**Deseret Chemical Depot, UT**	**Ind - 17**	$4.40	Immediate	($65.05)	($356.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Deseret Chemical Depot	UT	-186	-62	0	-248	-142	-390
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-186**	**-62**	**0**	**-248**	**-142**	**-390**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
164	**Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA**	**Ind - 18**	$10.60	1 yr	($26.82)	($104.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	-217	-242	0	-459	-564	-1,023
Gainer	Naval Shipyard Norfolk	VA	164	200	0	364	449	813
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-53**	**-42**	**0**	**-95**	**-115**	**-210**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
165	**Fleet Readiness Centers **(Roll up)**	**Ind - 19**	$298.10	Immediate	($1,528.16)	($4,724.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point	NC	0	-632	0	-632	-557	-1,189
Realign	Naval Air Station Fallon	NV	-7	0	0	-7	-5	-12
Realign	Naval Air Station Jacksonville	FL	-38	-180	0	-218	-294	-512
Realign	Naval Air Station Oceana	VA	-80	53	0	-27	-11	-38
Realign	Naval Air Station Patuxent River	MD	-8	8	0	0	3	3
Realign	Naval Air Station Willow Grove	PA	-139	-5	0	-144	-68	-212
Realign	Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake	CA	-44	-9	0	-53	-50	-103
Realign	Naval Base Coronado	CA	-71	-587	0	-658	-691	-1,349
Realign	Naval Base Ventura County	CA	-12	5	0	-7	-5	-12
Realign	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	-31	14	0	-17	-13	-30
Realign	Naval Support Activity Crane	IN	0	-152	0	-152	-68	-220
Gainer	Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort	SC	0	12	0	12	9	21
Gainer	Marine Corps Air Station Yuma	AZ	0	5	0	5	4	9
Gainer	Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune	NC	0	15	0	15	9	24
Gainer	Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton	CA	0	7	0	7	7	14
Gainer	Marine Corps Base Miramar	CA	0	28	0	28	30	58
Gainer	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Ft. Worth	TX	0	5	0	5	5	10
Gainer	Naval Air Station Lemoore	CA	5	35	0	40	32	72
Gainer	Naval Air Station New Orleans	LA	0	2	0	2	2	4
Gainer	Naval Air Station Whidbey Island	WA	-34	173	0	139	162	301
Gainer	Naval Station Mayport	FL	-6	11	0	5	9	14
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-465**	**-1,192**	**0**	**-1,657**	**-1,490**	**-3,147**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
166	**Naval Shipyard Detachments**	**Ind - 26**	$12.50	4 yrs	$0.95	($20.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Shipyard Puget Sound-Boston Detachment	MA	0	-108	0	-108	-105	-213
Realign	Naval Station Annapolis	MD	0	-13	0	-13	-12	-25
Realign	Navy Philadelphia Business Center	PA	0	-63	0	-63	-51	-114
Gainer	Naval Shipyard Norfolk	VA	0	73	0	73	101	174
Gainer	Naval Station Bremerton	WA	0	103	0	103	108	211
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-8**	**0**	**-8**	**41**	**33**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
167	**Defense intelligence Agency**	**Int - 3**	$96.70	8 yrs	$48.78	($52.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Bolling Air Force Base	DC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Realign	Crystal City Lease, VA	VA	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
168	**National Geospatial Intelligence Agency**	**Int - 4**	$1,117.30	8 yrs	$796.70	($535.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Leased Space - DC	DC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Closure	Leased Space - MD	MD	-97	-1,770	-1,233	-3,100	-2,219	-5,319
Closure	Leased Space - VA	VA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gainer	Fort Belvoir	VA	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-97**	**-1,770**	**-1,233**	**-3,100**	**-2,219**	**-5,319**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
169	**Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD**	**Med - 4**	$988.80	10 yrs	$724.20	($301.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Undistributed or Overseas Reductions	US	13	47	0	60	0	60
Realign	Walter Reed Army Medical Center	DC	-2,679	-2,388	-750	-5,817	-3,980	-9,797
Gainer	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	12	13	44	69	59	128
Gainer	Dover Air Force Base	DE	112	128	0	240	244	484
Gainer	Fort Belvoir	VA	1,258	992	0	2,250	1,538	3,788
Gainer	Fort Detrick	MD	63	17	88	168	127	295
Gainer	Fort Sam Houston	TX	96	51	63	210	187	397
Gainer	National Naval Medical Center Bethesda	MD	839	109	0	948	689	1,637
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-286**	**-1,031**	**-555**	**-1,872**	**-1,136**	**-3,008**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
170	**Brooks City Base, TX**	**Med - 6**	$325.30	2 yrs	$45.93	($940.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Brooks City-Base	TX	-1,297	-1,268	-358	-2,923	-2,799	-5,722
Realign	Holloman Air Force Base	NM	-17	0	0	-17	-11	-28
Gainer	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	35	26	27	88	73	161
Gainer	Fort Sam Houston	TX	10	17	13	40	37	77
Gainer	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	220	361	127	708	690	1,398
Gainer	Randolph Air Force Base	TX	1	77	0	78	86	164
Gainer	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	OH	579	409	69	1,057	852	1,909
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-469**	**-378**	**-122**	**-969**	**-1,072**	**-2,041**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
171	**McChord Air Force Base, WA**	**Med - 9**	$1.10	Immediate	($55.12)	($164.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	McChord Air Force Base	WA	-156	-29	-7	-192	-153	-345
Gainer	Fort Lewis	WA	124	13	0	137	106	243
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-32**	**-16**	**-7**	**-55**	**-47**	**-102**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
172	**San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX**	**Med - 10**	$1,040.90	10 yrs	$826.72	($476.20)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	-1,849	-808	-243	-2,900	-2,655	-5,555
Realign	Naval Medical Center Portsmouth	VA	-463	-25	-1	-489	-522	-1,011
Realign	Naval Medical Center San Diego	CA	-1,596	-33	-1	-1,630	-1,469	-3,099
Realign	Naval Station Great Lakes	IL	-1,868	-58	0	-1,926	-2,445	-4,371
Realign	Sheppard Air Force Base	TX	-2,224	-154	0	-2,378	-1,583	-3,961
Gainer	Fort Sam Houston	TX	7,428	534	0	7,962	6,839	14,801
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-572**	**-544**	**-245**	**-1,361**	**-1,835**	**-3,196**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
173	**Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics**	**Med - 12**	$12.90	Immediate	($250.88)	($818.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Andrews Air Force Base	MD	-126	-34	0	-160	-103	-263
Realign	Fort Eustis	VA	-10	-24	0	-34	-43	-77
Realign	Fort Knox	KY	-34	-51	-142	-227	-146	-373
Realign	Keesler Air Force Base	MS	-181	-31	-190	-402	-247	-649
Realign	MacDill Air Force Base	FL	-18	-1	0	-19	-16	-35
Realign	Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point	NC	-16	-22	-20	-58	-42	-100
Realign	Naval Station Great Lakes	IL	-70	-45	0	-115	-175	-290
Realign	Scott Air Force Base	IL	-62	-15	0	-77	-66	-143
Realign	United States Air Force Academy	CO	-30	-9	-1	-40	-31	-71
Gainer	Fort Carson	CO	26	7	0	33	26	59
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-521**	**-225**	**-353**	**-1,099**	**-843**	**-1,942**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
174	**Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions**	**Med - 15**	$73.90	7 yrs	$45.93	($46.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Bailey's Crossroads, VA	VA	-9	-36	-44	-89	-61	-150
Realign	Bethesda/Chevy Chase	MD	-5	-2	0	-7	-3	-10
Realign	Fort Belvoir	VA	-9	-47	-11	-67	-47	-114
Realign	Leased Space - MD	MD	-16	-35	0	-51	-37	-88
Realign	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	-22	-12	-6	-40	-53	-93
Realign	Naval Station Great Lakes	IL	-67	-21	-11	-99	-149	-248
Realign	Naval Support Activity Crane	IN	0	-57	-11	-68	-30	-98
Realign	Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren	VA	0	-131	-17	-148	-172	-320
Realign	Potomac Annex	DC	-4	-5	-3	-12	-6	-18
Realign	Tyndall Air Force Base	FL	-15	-19	0	-34	-34	-68
Gainer	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	33	256	83	372	343	715
Gainer	Fort Detrick	MD	13	26	-132	-93	285	-112
Gainer	Fort Sam Houston	TX	61	20	16	97	85	182
Gainer	Walter Reed Army Medical Center	DC	11	15	128	154	101	255
Gainer	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	OH	22	11	6	39	30	69
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-7**	**-37**	**-2**	**-46**	**252**	**-98**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
175	**Commodity Management Privatization**	**S&S - 5**	$6.40	Immediate	($333.75)	($735.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Anniston Army Depot	AL	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1
Realign	Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin	CA	0	-31	0	-31	-20	-51
Realign	Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna	PA	0	-15	0	-15	-13	-28
Realign	Defense Supply Center Richmond	VA	0	-32	0	-32	-24	-56
Realign	Detroit Arsenal	MI	0	-30	0	-30	-18	-48
Realign	Naval Station Bremerton	WA	0	-1	0	-1	-1	-2
Realign	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	0	-7	0	-7	-9	-16
Realign	Naval Station Pearl Harbor	HI	0	-1	0	-1	-1	-2
Realign	Naval Support Activity Mechanicsburg	PA	0	-1	0	-1	0	-1
Realign	Tinker Air Force Base	OK	0	-1	0	-1	-1	-2
Gainer	Defense Supply Center Columbus	OH	0	4	0	4	3	7
Gainer	Hill Air Force Base	UT	0	4	0	0	0	
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-112**	**0**	**-116**	**-84**	**-200**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
176	**Depot-level Reparable Procurement Management Consolidation**	**S&S - 7**	$127.00	Immediate	($369.79)	($1,889.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Huachuca	AZ	0	-212	0	-212	-158	-370
Realign	Hill Air Force Base	UT	0	-47	0	-47	-45	-92
Realign	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	-97	-196	0	-293	-301	-594
Realign	Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany	GA	0	-7	0	-7	-5	-12
Realign	Natick Soldier Systems Center	MA	0	-18	0	-18	-12	-30
Realign	Naval Support Activity Mechanicsburg	PA	0	-10	0	-10	-9	-19
Realign	Redstone Arsenal	AL	0	-71	0	-71	-54	-125
Realign	Rock Island Arsenal	IL	0	-740	0	-740	-647	-1,387
Realign	Tinker Air Force Base	OK	0	-38	0	-38	-48	-86
Gainer	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	0	228	0	228	218	446
Gainer	Defense Supply Center Columbus	OH	0	152	0	152	124	276
Gainer	Defense Supply Center Richmond	VA	0	85	0	85	65	150
Gainer	Detroit Arsenal	MI	0	600	0	600	377	977
Gainer	Fort Belvoir	VA	0	7	0	7	5	12
Gainer	Robins Air Force Base	GA	87	143	0	230	150	380
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-10**	**-124**	**0**	**-134**	**-340**	**-474**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
177	**Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration**	**S&S - 13**	$192.70	Immediate	($1,047.33)	($2,925.80)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Anniston Army Depot	AL	0	-90	0	-90	-66	-156
Realign	Corpus Christi Army Depot	TX	0	-92	0	-92	-132	-224
Realign	Defense Supply Center Columbus	OH	-2	-19	0	-21	-15	-36
Realign	Defense Supply Center Richmond	VA	0	-47	0	-47	-36	-83
Realign	Hill Air Force Base	UT	-1	-63	0	-64	-61	-125
Realign	Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point	NC	0	-10	0	-10	-8	-18
Realign	Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany	GA	-2	-38	0	-40	-30	-70
Realign	Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow	CA	-3	-7	0	-10	-9	-19
Realign	Naval Air Station Jacksonville	FL	0	-29	0	-29	-40	-69
Realign	Naval Station Bremerton	WA	0	-59	0	-59	-62	-121
Realign	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	-1	-306	0	-307	-426	-733
Realign	Naval Station San Diego	CA	-1	-2	0	-3	-2	-5
Realign	Robins Air Force Base	GA	0	-9	785	776	464	1,240
Realign	Tobyhanna Army Depot	PA	-1	-85	0	-86	-59	-145
Gainer	Tinker Air Force Base	OK	0	33	0	33	41	74
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-11**	**-823**	**785**	**-49**	**-441**	**-490**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
178	**Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers**	**Tech - 5**	$153.50	2 yrs	($107.12)	($572.70)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Army Research Office Durham	NC	-1	-113	0	-114	-66	-180
Realign	Ballston Lease, VA	VA	-23	-111	0	-134	-97	-231
Realign	Center for Naval Research	VA	-25	-313	0	-338	-252	-590
Realign	Fort Belvoir	VA	-76	-132	0	-208	-147	-355
Realign	Leased Space - VA	VA	-18	-182	0	-200	-148	-348
Gainer	National Naval Medical Center Bethesda	MD	143	827	-29	941	839	1,780
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-24**	**-29**	**-53**	**129**	**76**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
179	**Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation**	**Tech - 6**	$254.40	8 yrs	$115.25	($238.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	-28	-50	0	-78	-61	-139
Realign	Lackland Air Force Base	TX	-12	-42	0	-54	-57	-111
Realign	Maxwell Air Force Base	AL	-724	-549	0	-1,273	-914	-2,187
Realign	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	OH	-62	-542	0	-604	-506	-1,110
Gainer	Edwards Air Force Base	CA	23	42	0	65	74	139
Gainer	Hanscom Air Force Base	MA	559	824	0	1,383	841	2,224
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-244**	**-317**	**0**	**-561**	**-623**	**-1,184**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
180	**Consolidate Ground Vehicle Development & Acquisition in a Joint Center**	**Tech - 7**	$3.80	2 yrs	$1.90	($17.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Redstone Arsenal	AL	-4	-73	0	-77	-57	-134
Realign	U.S. Marine Corps Direct Reporting Program Manager Advanced Amphibious Assault	VA	0	-32	0	-32	-24	-56
Gainer	Detroit Arsenal	MI	3	103	0	106	64	170
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1**	**-2**	**0**	**-3**	**-17**	**-20**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
181	**Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation**	**Tech - 9**	$106.10	1 yr	($88.56)	($455.10)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Air Station Jacksonville	FL	0	-34	0	-34	-47	-81
Realign	Naval Air Station Patuxent River	MD	-2	-32	0	-34	-43	-77
Realign	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	0	-102	0	-102	-176	-278
Realign	Naval Base Ventura County	CA	-1	-102	-24	-127	-158	-285
Realign	Naval District Washington	DC	0	-172	0	-172	-130	-302
Realign	Naval Weapons Station Charleston	SC	-1	-27	-380	-408	-636	-1,044
Realign	Naval Weapons Station Yorktown	VA	0	-130	0	-130	-180	-310
Gainer	Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek	VA	10	27	0	37	47	84
Gainer	Naval Base Point Loma	CA	-11	26	-59	-44	-44	-88
Gainer	Naval Station Newport	RI	2	12	-16	-2	-3	-5
Gainer	Naval Station Norfolk	VA	-1	7	0	6	8	14
Gainer	Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren	VA	0	13	144	157	102	259
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-4**	**-514**	**-335**	**-853**	**-1,260**	**-2,113**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
182	**Consolidate Navy Strategic Test and Evaluation**	**Tech - 12**	$86.40	7 yrs	$76.69	($61.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Patrick Air Force Base	FL	-136	-59	0	-195	-165	-360
Gainer	Submarine Base Kings Bay	GA	100	22	0	122	59	181
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-36**	**-37**	**0**	**-73**	**-106**	**-179**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
183	**Consolidate Sea Vehicle Development & Acquisition**	**Tech - 13**	$1.50	7 yrs	$0.14	($2.00)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Detroit Arsenal	MI	-4	-31	0	-35	-19	-54
Gainer	Naval District Washington	DC	4	24	0	28	20	48
Gainer	Naval Surface Weapons Station Carderock	MD	0	6	0	6	5	11
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**-1**	**0**	**-1**	**6**	**5**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
184	**Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center**	**Tech - 15**	$358.10	7 yrs	$148.66	($433.40)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Air Station Patuxent River	MD	0	-110	-148	-258	-285	-543
Realign	Naval Base Point Loma	CA	0	-47	0	-47	-50	-97
Realign	Naval Base Ventura County	CA	-220	-1,679	-351	-2,250	-2,760	-5,010
Realign	Naval Support Activity Crane	IN	0	-227	-31	-258	-117	-375
Realign	Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren	VA	0	-133	-22	-155	-177	-332
Realign	Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head	MD	0	-52	0	-52	-39	-91
Realign	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach	CA	0	-24	-21	-45	-31	-76
Realign	Naval Weapons Station Yorktown	VA	0	-49	-12	-61	-81	-142
Gainer	Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake	CA	187	1,961	493	2,641	3,168	5,809
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-33**	**-360**	**-92**	**-485**	**-372**	**-857**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
185	**Create an Air Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center**	**Tech - 18**	$2.70	2 yrs	($4.87)	($17.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Belvoir	VA	-24	-41	0	-65	-46	-111
Realign	Hill Air Force Base	UT	-7	-26	0	-33	-31	-64
Gainer	Eglin Air Force Base	FL	26	57	0	83	65	148
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-5**	**-10**	**0**	**-15**	**-12**	**-27**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
186	**Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition**	**Tech - 19**	$116.30	13 yrs	$81.24	($32.60)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Army Research Laboratory Adelphi	MD	0	-43	0	-43	-39	-82
Realign	Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake	CA	0	-5	0	-5	-6	-11
Realign	Naval Support Activity Crane	IN	0	-236	0	-236	-106	-342
Realign	Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren	VA	0	-83	0	-83	-102	-185
Realign	Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head	MD	0	-43	0	-43	-32	-75
Realign	Naval Weapons Station Earle	NJ	0	-63	0	-63	-55	-118
Realign	Naval Weapons Station Fallbrook	CA	0	-118	0	-118	-126	-244
Realign	Navy Recruiting Command Louisville	KY	-6	-217	0	-223	-165	-388
Gainer	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	5	688	0	693	565	1,258
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1**	**-120**	**0**	**-121**	**-66**	**-187**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
187	**Defense Research Service-Led Laboratories**	**Tech - 22**	$164.60	4 yrs	$45.03	($357.30)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Closure	Air Force Research Lab, Mesa City	AZ	-42	-46	0	-88	-82	-170
Realign	Glenn Research Center	OH	0	-50	0	-50	-42	-92
Realign	Hanscom Air Force Base	MA	-60	-219	0	-279	-178	-457
Realign	Langley Air Force Base	VA	-4	-46	0	-50	-67	-117
Realign	Rome Laboratory	NY	-13	-124	0	-137	-122	-259
Realign	White Sands Missile Range	NM	-13	-165	0	-178	-189	-367
Gainer	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	14	214	0	228	215	443
Gainer	Kirtland Air Force Base	NM	41	162	0	203	200	403
Gainer	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	OH	43	99	0	142	116	258
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-34**	**-175**	**0**	**-209**	**-149**	**-358**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
188	**Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation**	**Tech - 24**	$17.70	9 yrs	$7.91	($17.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	Total Dir.	Total InDir.	Total Chngs
Realign	Hill Air Force Base	UT	-6	-11	0	-17	-15	-32
Realign	Robins Air Force Base	GA	-9	-8	0	-17	-11	-28
Realign	Tinker Air Force Base	OK	-1	-12	0	-13	-15	-28
Gainer	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	OH	15	31	0	46	37	83
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-1**	**0**	**0**	**-1**	**-4**	**-5**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
189	**Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation**	**Tech - 26**	$49.40	26 yrs	$40.22	$11.80

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Fort Rucker	AL	-18	-102	0	-120	-121	-241
Realign	Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst	NJ	0	-13	0	-13	-11	-24
Realign	Robins Air Force Base	GA	0	-50	0	-50	-31	-81
Realign	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	OH	-8	-51	0	-59	-49	-108
Gainer	Naval Air Station Patuxent River	MD	7	54	0	61	77	138
Gainer	Redstone Arsenal	AL	16	124	0	140	102	242
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**-3**	**-38**	**0**	**-41**	**-33**	**-74**

Item #	DoD Recommendation	Recommendation	One-Time Cost ($M)	Payback	6-Yr Net ($M)	20-Yr NPV ($M)
190	**Navy Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation**	**Tech - 28**	$72.70	12 yrs	$50.87	($16.90)

Action	Base Name	State	Net Mil.	Net Civ.	Net Cont.	**Total Dir.**	**Total InDir.**	Total Chngs
Realign	Naval Base Ventura County	CA	-11	-368	-100	-479	-595	-1,074
Gainer	Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake	CA	11	368	0	379	484	863
	Net jobs for this Recommendation		**0**	**0**	**-100**	**-100**	**-111**	**-211**

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX L

BASES ADDED BY THE COMMISSION FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION, 2005

Recommendations initially considered for addition to Secretary's list:	12
Recommendations formally added by Commission for consideration:	8
Recommendations added and approved by Commission in some form:	7

APPROVED FOR THE COMMISSION'S FURTHER CONSIDERATION

RECOMMENDATION #: 191

NAME OF RECOMMENDATION: Naval Air Station Brunswick, Maine

SITES WITHIN RECOMMENDATION: One

DOD RECOMMENDATION: Realign NAS Brunswick, Maine

COMMISSION PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION: *Close NAS Brunswick, ME. Relocate aircraft, personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL.*

JULY 19 VOTE RESULT: 8 Yays, 1 Nay, 0 Recusals

FINAL COMMISSION DECISION: Approve *(Close) (See Appendix Q, Section 65 (DON 18) for full text of recommendation)*

AUGUST VOTE RESULT: 7 Yays, 2 Nays, 0 Recusals

RECOMMENDATION #: 192

NAME OF RECOMMENDATION: Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, California

SITES WITHIN RECOMMENDATION: One

DOD RECOMMENDATION: None

COMMISSION PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION: *Close Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, CA. Relocate Navy activities into excess administrative space on more secure Navy installations in San Diego.*

JULY 19 VOTE RESULT: 8 Yays, 1 Nay, 0 Recusals

FINAL COMMISSION DECISION: Approve *(amended) (See Appendix Q, Section 192, for full text of recommendation)*

AUGUST VOTE RESULT: 9 Yays

RECOMMENDATION #: 193

NAME OF RECOMMENDATION: Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia

SITES WITHIN RECOMMENDATION: One

DOD RECOMMENDATION: None

COMMISSION PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION: *Close Naval Air Station Oceana, VA. Transfer all squadrons, personnel, equipment and support to a suitable alternative site determined by the Navy.*

JULY 19 VOTE RESULT: 7 Yays, 1 Nay, 1 Recusal

FINAL COMMISSION DECISION: Approve *(amended) (See Appendix Q, Section 193, for full text of recommendation)*

AUGUST VOTE RESULT: 7 Yays, 0 Nays, 2 Recusals

RECOMMENDATION #: 194

NAME OF RECOMMENDATION: Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina

SITES WITHIN RECOMMENDATION: One

DOD RECOMMENDATION: Realign Pope AFB, North Carolina

COMMISSION PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION: *Realign Pope AFB, NC* [increase the extent of realignment beyond the original DoD recommendation].

JULY 19 VOTE RESULT: 7 Yays, 2 Nays

FINAL COMMISSION DECISION: Not approved

AUGUST VOTE RESULT: N/A *(never voted or considered)*

RECOMMENDATION #: 195

NAME OF RECOMMENDATION: Galena Forward Operating Location (FOL), Alaska

SITES WITHIN RECOMMENDATION: One

DOD RECOMMENDATION: None

COMMISSION PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION: *Close Galena FOL, Alaska*

JULY 19 VOTE RESULT: 9 Yays

FINAL COMMISSION DECISION: Approve *(close) (See Appendix Q, Section 195, for full text of recommendation)*

AUGUST VOTE RESULT: 9 Yays

RECOMMENDATION #: 196

NAME OF RECOMMENDATION: Defense Financing and Accounting Service (DFAS)

SITES WITHIN RECOMMENDATION: Three

DOD RECOMMENDATION: Close all except three DFAS sites (Denver, CO; Columbus, OH; and Indianapolis, IN), and distribute remaining DFAS workload to the three remaining sites.

COMMISSION PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION: *Close or realign DFAS Denver, CO. Close or realign DFAS Columbus, OH. Close or realign DFAS Indianapolis, IN.* [to allow for comparisons between all DFAS sites under consideration]

JULY 19 VOTE RESULT: 9 Yays

FINAL COMMISSION DECISION: Approve *(amended to close DFAS Denver, CO) (See Appendix Q, Section 145 (H&SA 37) for full text of recommendation)*

AUGUST VOTE RESULT: 7 Yays, 0 Nays, 2 Recusals

RECOMMENDATION #: 197

NAME OF RECOMMENDATION: Professional Development Education

SITES WITHIN RECOMMENDATION: Three

DOD RECOMMENDATION: None

COMMISSION PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION: *Realign Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA. Realign Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH. Realign Defense Language Institute, Monterey, CA.*

JULY 19 VOTE RESULT: 8 Yays, 0 Nay, 1 Recusal

FINAL COMMISSION DECISION: Approve *(amended) (See Appendix Q, Section 197, for full text of recommendation)*

AUGUST VOTE RESULT: 9 Yays

RECOMMENDATION #: 198

NAME OF RECOMMENDATION: Joint Medical Command Headquarters

SITES WITHIN RECOMMENDATION: Four

DOD RECOMMENDATION: None

COMMISSION PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION: *Close Navy Bureau of Medicine, Potomac Annex, DC. Realign Air Force Surgeon General, Bolling Air Force Base, DC, and Leased Space, VA. Realign TRICARE Management Activity, Army Office of the Surgeon General and OSD Health Affairs Leased Space, VA.*

JULY 19 VOTE RESULT: 8 Yays, 0 Nay, 1 Recusal

FINAL COMMISSION DECISION: Approved *(See Appendix Q, Section 198, for full text of recommendation)*

AUGUST VOTE RESULT: 8 Yays, 0 Nays, 1 Recusal

Rejected by Commission for Further Consideration

Name of Recommendation: Marine Corps Recruiting Depot, San Diego, California

Sites within Recommendation: One

DoD Recommendation: None

Commission Proposed Recommendation: *Close MCRD San Diego, CA. Consolidate Marine Corps recruit training at MCRD Parris Island, SC.*

July 19 Vote Result: 2 Yays, 6 Nays, 1 Recusal

Name of Recommendation: Naval Ship Yard Pearl Harbor, Hawaii

Sites within Recommendation: One

DoD Recommendation: None

Commission Proposed Recommendation: *Realign Naval Shipyard & Intermediate Maintenance Facility Pearl Harbor, HI.*

July 19 Vote Result: 2 Yays, 6 Nays, 1 Recusal

Name of Recommendation: Moody Air Force Base, Georgia

Sites within Recommendation: One

DoD Recommendation: Gainer

Commission Proposed Recommendation: *Realign Moody AFB, GA* [with intent to relocate possible Master Jet Base mission from NAS Oceana, Virginia to Moody AFB]

July 19 Vote Result: 1 Yay, 7 Nays, 1 Recusal

Name of Recommendation: Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota

Sites within Recommendation: One

DoD Recommendation: Realign Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota.

Commission Proposed Recommendation: *Close Grand Forks AFB, ND.*

July 19 Vote Result: 3 Yays, 6 Nays

APPENDIX M

COBRA ANALYSIS OF COMMISSION FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

All dollar figures are in millions. Savings shown are in (parentheses).

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
1	Fort Wainwright, AK	Army-5	$ 0.05	2	$(0.19)	$(0.05)	$(0.70)	$0.05	2	$(0.19)	$(0.05)	$(0.70)
2	Fort Gillem, GA	Army-6	$56.80	1	$(85.46)	$(35.30)	$(421.50)	$56.80	1	$(85.46)	$(35.30)	$(421.50)
3	Fort McPherson, GA	Army-8	$197.80	2	$(111.39)	$(82.09)	$(895.20)	$214.54	2	$(94.60)	$(82.09)	$(878.65)
4	Fort Bragg, NC	Army-10	$334.84	Never	$446.12	$23.78	$639.16	$334.84	Never	$446.12	$23.78	$639.16
5	Fort Monmouth, NJ	Army-11	$822.30	6	$395.61	$(143.69)	$(1,025.80)	$780.43	5	$346.60	$(146.00)	$(1,093.41)
6	Fort Hood, TX	Army-15	$435.80	Never	$579.49	$45.27	$980.40	$435.80	Never	$579.49	$45.27	$980.40
7	Red River Army Depot	Army-16	$456.20	4	$216.64	$(76.48)	$(539.00)	$150.89	5	$31.55	$(22.54)	$(187.65)
8	Fort Monroe, VA	Army-19	$72.40	1	$(146.96)	$(56.85)	$(686.60)	$72.40	1	$(146.96)	$(56.85)	$(686.60)
9	Maneuver Training	Army-20	$773.10	5	$244.05	$(123.34)	$(948.10)	$773.10	5	$244.05	$(123.34)	$(948.10)
10	Operational Army (IGPBS)	Army-22	$3,946.00	Never	$5,229.01	$294.68	$7,846.70	$3,946.00	Never	$5,229.01	$294.68	$7,846.70
11	RC Transformation, AL	Army-25	$109.20	6	$31.09	$(17.77)	$(140.30)	$109.20	6	$31.09	$(17.77)	$(140.30)
12	RC Transformation, AZ	Army-28	$31.10	5	$5.32	$(5.93)	$(51.70)	$31.10	5	$5.32	$(5.93)	$(51.70)
13	RC Transformation, AR	Army-30	$118.90	31	$97.58	$(5.79)	$38.20	$118.90	31	$97.58	$(5.79)	$38.20
14	RC Transformation, CA	Army-33	$78.70	10	$41.34	$(8.94)	$(46.00)	$78.70	10	$41.34	$(8.94)	$(46.00)
15	RC Transformation, CT	Army-35	$128.60	36	$107.03	$(5.77)	$47.50	$128.60	36	$107.03	$(5.77)	$47.50
16	RC Transformation, DE	Army-37	$13.60	19	$9.80	$(0.89)	$0.90	$13.60	19	$9.80	$(0.89)	$0.90
17	RC Transformation, GA	Army-39	$21.40	5	$3.51	$(5.03)	$(44.80)	$21.40	5	$3.51	$(5.03)	$(44.80)

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
18	RC Transformation, HI	Army-40	$56.60	7	$26.35	$(9.15)	$(62.40)	$56.60	7	$26.35	$(9.15)	$(62.40)
19	RC Transformation, IL	Army-42	$42.60	14	$28.10	$(3.49)	$(6.50)	$42.60	14	$28.10	$(3.49)	$(6.50)
20	RC Transformation, IN	Army-44	$47.60	22	$33.68	$(2.74)	$6.10	$47.60	22	$33.68	$(2.74)	$6.10
21	RC Transformation, IA	Army-46	$68.90	3	$(16.54)	$(19.40)	$(201.70)	$68.90	3	$(16.54)	$(19.40)	$(201.70)
22	RC Transformation, KY	Army-48	$25.30	6	$6.89	$(4.25)	$(34.10)	$25.30	6	$6.89	$(4.25)	$(34.10)
23	RC Transformation, LA	Army-50	$30.70	2	$(17.67)	$(13.62)	$(147.60)	$30.70	2	$(17.67)	$(13.62)	$(147.60)
24	RC Transformation, MD	Army-52	$6.30	3	$(1.37)	$(1.72)	$(17.80)	$6.30	3	$(1.37)	$(1.72)	$(17.80)
25	RC Transformation, MA	Army-54	$85.50	100	$79.73	$(1.69)	$60.40	$85.50	100	$79.73	$(1.69)	$60.40
26	RC Transformation, MI	Army-55	$7.90	3	$(1.44)	$(2.11)	$(21.60)	$7.90	3	$(1.44)	$(2.11)	$(21.60)
27	RC Transformation, MN	Army-57	$17.30	Never	$17.77	$0.01	$17.10	$17.30	Never	$17.77	$0.01	$17.10
28	RC Transformation, MO	Army-58	$28.60	3	$0.90	$(6.41)	$(61.00)	$28.60	3	$0.90	$(6.41)	$(61.00)
29	RC Transformation, MT	Army-60	$26.00	23	$19.75	$(1.53)	$4.30	$26.00	23	$19.75	$(1.53)	$4.30
30	RC Transformation, NE	Army-62	$33.10	5	$6.03	$(6.21)	$(53.70)	$33.10	5	$6.03	$(6.21)	$(53.70)
31	RC Transformation, NH	Army-65	$54.20	26	$44.57	$(3.12)	$12.90	$54.20	26	$44.57	$(3.12)	$12.90
32	RC Transformation, NJ	Army-66	$15.10	5	$2.03	$(2.99)	$(26.60)	$15.10	5	$2.03	$(2.99)	$(26.60)
33	RC Transformation, NM	Army-68	$17.90	6	$4.64	$(3.03)	$(24.60)	$17.90	6	$4.64	$(3.03)	$(24.60)
34	RC Transformation, NY	Army-69	$103.80	47	$88.49	$(4.02)	$46.50	$103.80	47	$88.49	$(4.02)	$46.50
35	RC Transformation, NC	Army-72	$9.20	2	$(5.11)	$(2.64)	$(30.20)	$9.20	2	$(5.11)	$(2.64)	$(30.20)
36	RC Transformation, ND	Army-73	$7.90	Never	$8.11	$0.02	$8.00	$7.90	Never	$8.11	$0.02	$8.00
37	RC Transformation, OH	Army-75	$134.80	18	$93.62	$(9.25)	$1.30	$134.80	18	$93.62	$(9.25)	$1.30
38	RC Transformation, OK	Army-77	$168.70	11	$98.56	$(16.53)	$(63.80)	$168.70	11	$98.56	$(16.53)	$(63.80)
39	RC Transformation, OR	Army-80	$24.10	100	$23.49	$(0.29)	$19.80	$24.10	100	$23.49	$(0.29)	$19.80
40	RC Transformation, PA	Army-82	$142.70	10	$81.06	$(14.19)	$(58.40)	$142.70	10	$81.06	$(14.19)	$(58.40)
41	RC Transformation, PR	Army-85	$87.00	15	$64.01	$(7.31)	$(8.60)	$87.00	15	$64.01	$(7.31)	$(8.60)
42	RC Transformation, RI	Army-87	$32.40	6	$9.44	$(4.63)	$(35.30)	$32.40	6	$9.44	$(4.63)	$(35.30)
43	RC Transformation, TN	Army-89	$36.90	18	$28.17	$(2.70)	$1.10	$36.90	18	$28.17	$(2.70)	$1.10

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
44	RC Transformation, TX	Army-91	$375.60	12	$220.58	$(36.04)	$(133.20)	$375.60	12	$220.58	$(36.04)	$(133.20)
45	RC Transformation, VT	Army-95	$61.40	100	$57.17	$(1.39)	$41.70	$61.40	100	$57.17	$(1.39)	$41.70
46	RC Transformation, WA	Army-97	$61.20	9	$33.63	$(8.19)	$(46.10)	$61.20	9	$33.63	$(8.19)	$(46.10)
47	RC Transformation, WV	Army-99	$29.50	3	$(4.17)	$(7.62)	$(77.00)	$29.50	3	$(4.17)	$(7.62)	$(77.00)
48	RC Transformation, WI	Army-102	$10.70	Immediate	$(37.67)	$(10.81)	$(139.70)	$10.70	Immediate	$(37.67)	$(10.81)	$(139.70)
49	RC Transformation, WY	Army-103	$72.40	21	$53.80	$(4.46)	$9.00	$72.40	21	$53.80	$(4.46)	$9.00
50	Single Drill Sergeant	Army-105	$1.84	1	$(7.57)	$(2.51)	$(31.35)	$1.84	1	$(7.57)	$(2.51)	$(31.35)
51	U.S. Army Garrison, MI	Army-106	$9.50	Immediate	$(91.39)	$(18.05)	$(260.90)	$9.50	Immediate	$(91.39)	$(18.05)	$(260.90)
52	USAR Command and Control New England	Army-107	$96.10	13	$61.19	$(8.42)	$(21.80)	$96.10	13	$61.19	$(8.42)	$(21.80)
53	USAR Command and Control Northeast	Army-109	$171.20	5	$44.32	$(35.90)	$(302.10)	$171.20	5	$44.32	$(35.90)	$(302.10)
54	USAR Command and Control Northwest	Army-112	$80.40	9	$43.37	$(11.09)	$(65.00)	$80.40	9	$43.37	$(11.09)	$(65.00)
55	USAR Command and Control Southeast	Army-115	$29.90	16	$22.54	$(2.40)	$(1.50)	$29.90	16	$22.54	$(2.40)	$(1.50)
56	USAR Command and Control Southwest	Army-117	$55.50	23	$44.13	$(3.38)	$9.80	$55.50	23	$44.13	$(3.38)	$9.80
57	Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA	DoN-6	$26.00	Immediate	$(56.49)	$(18.40)	$(230.60)	$26.00	Immediate	$(56.49)	$(18.40)	$(230.60)
58	Naval Support Activity Corona, CA	DoN-7	$91.46	22	$74.26	$(5.33)	$16.76	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
59	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, CA	DoN-9	$14.00	1	$(43.24)	$(16.39)	$(199.70)	$14.00	1	$(43.24)	$(16.39)	$(199.70)
60	Submarine Base New London, CT	DoN-10	$679.64	3	$345.44	$(192.77)	$(1,576.36)	$5.50	1	$(14.30)	$(4.40)	$(55.50)
61	Officer Training Command, Pensacola, FL	DoN-12	$3.60	4	$(1.38)	$(0.91)	$(10.00)	$4.10	6	$(0.16)	$(0.79)	$(7.61)

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
62	Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	DoN-13	$40.41	Immediate	$(128.70)	$(33.72)	$(445.98)	$40.41	Immediate	$(128.70)	$(33.72)	$(445.98)
63	Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA	DoN-14	$23.80	7	$13.56	$(3.54)	$(21.80)	$23.79	18	$18.17	$(1.60)	$1.36
64	Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA	DoN-15	$164.60	3	$86.12	$(36.50)	$(276.40)	$46.15	Immediate	$(45.69)	$(35.32)	$(387.69)
65	Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	DoN-18	$147.20	4	$112.62	$(34.87)	$(238.80)	$193.12	2	$77.00	$(88.68)	$(797.86)
66	Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO	DoN-19	$23.28	3	$8.03	$(5.83)	$(49.83)	$8.19	Immediate	$(7.88)	$(6.09)	$(67.00)
67	Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	DoN-20	$17.90	Immediate	$(220.02)	$(47.43)	$(665.70)	$17.90	Immediate	$(220.02)	$(47.43)	$(665.70)
68	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnston, PA	DoN-21	$126.30	2	$(134.73)	$(60.65)	$(710.50)	$239.50	2	$(51.70)	$(73.90)	$(757.80)
69	Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME		$448.40	4	$(21.42)	$(128.57)	$(1,262.40)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
70	Naval Station Newport, RI	DoN-25	$11.80	13	$8.33	$(1.02)	$(2.10)	$11.80	13	$8.33	$(1.02)	$(2.10)
71	Naval Station Ingleside, Texas and Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX	DoN-26	$177.05	3	$(44.33)	$(59.52)	$(614.20)	$177.05	3	$(44.33)	$(59.52)	$(614.20)
72	Engineering Field Division/Activity	DoN-28	$37.90	4	$9.06	$(9.33)	$(81.80)	$37.90	4	$9.06	$(9.33)	$(81.80)
73	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers **(Roll up)	DoN-29	$62.37	6	$17.09	$(9.75)	$(76.80)	$62.37	6	$17.09	$(9.75)	$(76.80)
74	Navy Recruiting Districts	DoN-34	$2.40	Immediate	$(78.27)	$(14.53)	$(214.50)	$2.40	Immediate	$(78.27)	$(14.53)	$(214.50)
75	Navy Regions	DoN-35	$3.20	1	$(8.88)	$(2.72)	$(34.60)	$3.20	1	$(8.88)	$(2.72)	$(34.60)
76	Navy Reserve Centers** (Roll up)	DoN-37	$2.55	1	$(87.02)	$(15.93)	$(236.60)	$2.55	1	$(87.02)	$(15.93)	$(236.60)

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
77	Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	DoN-44	$2.60	Immediate	$(30.94)	$(6.47)	$(91.70)	$2.60	Immediate	$(30.94)	$(6.47)	$(91.70)
78	Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station, AL	Air Force-5	$11.00	18	$7.69	$(0.82)	$(0.50)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
79	Eielson Air Force Base, AK, Moody Air Force Base, GA, and Shaw Air Force Base, SC	Air Force-6	$156.07	1	$(333.75)	$(155.91)	$(1,824.13)	$32.87	3	$(11.03)	$(12.11)	$(126.94)
80	Kulis Air Guard Station, AK, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK	Air Force-7	$121.31	8	$65.04	$(16.39)	$(95.42)	$147.37	10	$91.16	$(16.42)	$(70.63)
81	Fort Smith Air Guard Station, AR, and Luke Air Force Base, AZ	Air Force-8	$17.56	16	$12.44	$(1.45)	$(2.00)	$13.50	100	$11.76	$(0.36)	$7.89
82	Beale Air Force Base, CA and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI	Air-Force-10	$45.44	14	$34.62	$(3.88)	$(6.40)	$40.60	Never	$45.13	$1.72	$57.88
83	March Air Force Base, CA	Air Force-11	$10.77	5	$1.91	$(1.81)	$(15.50)	$5.20	7	$1.46	$(0.78)	$(6.10)
84	Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	Air Force-12	$123.73	5	$45.33	$(25.90)	$(211.00)	$123.73	5	$45.33	$(25.90)	$(211.00)
85	Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Air Guard Station, MD	Air Force-14	$3.23	2	$(6.12)	$(2.02)	$(25.24)	$14.33	7	$3.80	$(2.24)	$(17.78)
86	New Castle Airport Air Guard Station, DE	Air Force-15	$15.53	1	$(29.06)	$(9.62)	$(120.10)	(Recommendation amended by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
87	Robins Air Force Base, GA	Air Force-16	$6.70	Immediate	$(31.95)	$(14.98)	$(175.14)	$6.23	Immediate	$(31.56)	$(14.67)	$(171.70)

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
88	Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID	Air Force-17	$2.46	8	$1.60	$(0.33)	$(1.72)	$16.74	3	$1.88	$(6.10)	$(57.04)
89	Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base	Air Force-18	$74.24	Immediate	$(21.18)	$(37.84)	$(388.97)	$91.38	3	$45.53	$(23.82)	$(189.33)
90	Capital Air Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN	Air Force-20	$19.88	13	$13.34	$(1.99)	$(6.25)	$22.79	17	$16.92	$(1.86)	$(1.62)
91	New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	Air Force-22	$50.17	5	$32.50	$(11.26)	$(80.67)	$55.85	8	$44.06	$(8.33)	$(41.54)
92	Andrews Air Force Base, MD, Will Rogers Air Guard Station, OK, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Randolph Air Force Base, TX	Air Force-23	$21.66	2	$(12.17)	$(7.45)	$(83.11)	$19.36	3	$(9.47)	$(6.36)	$(69.98)
93	Martin State Air Guard Station, MD	Air Force-24	$9.43	1	$(13.69)	$(8.69)	$(97.11)	$23.98	Never	$93.96	$27.37	$353.66
94	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO, Atlantic City Air Guard Station, NJ	Air Force-25	$102.98	3	$(12.25)	$(33.56)	$(336.10)	$53.72	2	$(38.85)	$(27.88)	$(305.40)
95	W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI	Air Force-27	$8.27	Immediate	$(46.73)	$(12.72)	$(166.85)	$8.27	7	$3.14	$(1.48)	$(11.16)
96	Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station	Air Force-28	$2.13	5	$(0.22)	$(0.79)	$(7.83)					
97	Key Field Air Guard Station, MS	Air Force-28	$10.71	13	$6.89	$(0.93)	$(2.46)	$10.74	13	$6.89	$(0.94)	$(2.56)
98	Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station	Air Force-30	$9.34	4	$(0.73)	$(1.82)	$(18.10)	$6.80	Never	$7.01	$0.05	$7.23

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
99	Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV	Air Force-31	$22.89	9	$12.23	$(3.56)	$(22.63)	(Recommendation amended by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
100	Cannon Air Force Base, NM	Air Force-32	$90.10	Immediate	$(815.56)	$(200.50)	$(2,706.76)	$108.17	Immediate	$(685.42)	$(206.50)	$(2,647.46)
101	Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	Air Force-33	$87.02	4	$17.80	$(19.89)	$(175.03)	$4.82	26	$3.99	$(0.26)	$1.19
102	Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station	Air Force-34	$11.78	70	$12.19	$(0.44)	$7.25	(Recommendation amended by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
103	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air Guard Station, WV	Air Force-35	$290.25	Immediate	$(693.70)	$(221.32)	$(2,787.83)	$191.28	Immediate	$(728.88)	$(209.79)	$(2,711.53)
104	Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	Air Force-37	$131.48	1	$(322.49)	$(173.35)	$(1,981.98)	$104.18	1	$(14.59)	$(66.69)	$(637.08)
105	Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND	Air Force-38	$1.80	2	$(3.32)	$(1.02)	$(12.92)	$1.76	2	$(3.32)	$(1.02)	$(12.92)
106	Mansfield Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH	Air Force-39	$33.43	3	$(3.07)	$(8.66)	$(86.16)	$8.55	1	$(15.75)	$(6.71)	$(79.57)
107	Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH	Air Force-40	$11.37	17	$8.35	$(0.91)	$(0.69)	$30.82	14	$19.61	$(2.52)	$(5.41)
108	Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR	Air Force-41	$85.52	7	$36.22	$(13.99)	$(100.23)	$69.98	28	$58.23	$(3.69)	$19.93
109	Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD and Dyess Air Force Base, TX	Air Force-43	$299.13	1	$(316.38)	$(161.25)	$(1,853.28)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
110	Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN	Air Force-44	$25.36	2	$16.74	$(13.70)	$(120.03)	$48.65	Never	$62.32	$20.71	$261.30

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
111	Ellington Air Guard Station, TX	Air Force-45	$1.63	5	$0.10	$(0.37)	$(3.63)	$1.97	6	$0.44	$(0.33)	$(2.71)
112	Lackland Air Force Base, TX	Air Force-46	8..097	2	$(4.69)	$(2.90)	$(32.37)	$8.10	2	$(4.69)	$(2.90)	$(32.37)
113	Hill Air Force Base, UT, Edwards Air Force Base, CA, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Luke Air Force Base, AZ, Nellis Air Force Base, NV	Air Force-47	$28.63	4	$(7.23)	$(8.15)	$(85.00)	$28.63	4	$(7.23)	$(8.15)	$(85.00)
114	Langley Air Force Base, VA	Air Force-49	$1.79	3	$(1.47)	$(0.71)	$(8.47)	$1.79	3	$(1.47)	$(0.71)	$(8.47)
115	Richmond Air Guard Station, VA, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA	Air Force-50	$24.15	10	$11.59	$(2.55)	$(13.18)	$22.04	8	$8.50	$(2.81)	$(18.69)
116	Fairchild Air Force Base, WA	Air Force-51	$6.36	7	$1.65	$(1.04)	$(8.35)	$6.36	8	$2.21	$(0.93)	$(6.74)
117	General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	Air Force-52	$49.40	7	$25.74	$(6.47)	$(38.49)	See Section 103 Pope AFB, NC				
118	Air Force Logistics Support Centers	Air Force-53	$9.33	1	$(19.24)	$(6.11)	$(77.04)	$9.33	1	$(19.24)	$(6.11)	$(77.04)
119	F-100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities	Air Force-55	$9.15	9	$3.80	$(1.14)	$(7.15)	$9.15	9	$3.80	$(1.14)	$(7.15)
120	Aviation Logistics School	E&T-5	$492.30	13	$348.07	$(42.86)	$(77.40)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
121	Combat Service Support Center	E&T-6	$754.00	6	$352.42	$(131.81)	$(934.20)	$754.00	6	$352.42	$(131.81)	$(934.20)
122	Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training	E&T-7	$1.50	1	$(5.78)	$(1.30)	$(18.00)	$1.50	1	$(5.78)	$(1.30)	$(18.00)

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
123	Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training	E&T-8	$5.36	2	$(2.57)	$(1.40)	$(15.74)	$5.36	2	$(2.57)	$(1.40)	$(15.74)
124	Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education	E&T-9	$1.00	1	$(3.96)	$(0.85)	$(11.90)	$1.00	1	$(3.96)	$(0.85)	$(11.90)
125	Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site	E&T-10	$199.10	Never	$209.60	$3.33	$226.30	$199.10	Never	$209.60	$3.33	$226.30
126	Net Fires Center	E&T-12	$247.00	6	$92.96	$(42.62)	$(319.10)	$247.00	6	$92.96	$(42.62)	$(319.10)
127	Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, MO	E&T-13	$6.02	16	$3.91	$(0.48)	$(0.80)	$6.02	16	$3.91	$(0.48)	$(0.80)
128	Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training	E&T-14	$71.70	4	$1.62	$(18.30)	$(174.20)	$71.70	4	$1.62	$(18.30)	$(174.20)
129	Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations	H&SA-3	$90.50	1	$(10.23)	$(30.84)	$(308.18)	$90.50	1	$(10.23)	$(30.84)	$(308.18)
130	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	H&SA-5	$67.10	13	$47.51	$(5.72)	$(11.30)	$67.10	13	$47.51	$(5.72)	$(11.30)
131	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	H&SA-8	$171.99	7	$87.84	$(25.66)	$(166.36)	$171.99	7	$87.84	$(25.66)	$(166.36)
132	Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations	H&SA-10	$44.10	1	$(59.49)	$(27.75)	$(322.00)	$44.10	1	$(59.49)	$(27.75)	$(322.00)
133	Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased Locations	H&SA-12	$601.75	9	$414.63	$(67.02)	$(256.41)	$601.75	9	$414.63	$(67.02)	$(256.41)

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
134	Co-locate Missile and Space Defense Agencies	H&SA-15	$178.20	1	$(12.98)	$(36.10)	$(359.10)	$178.20	1	$(12.98)	$(36.10)	$(359.10)
135	Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center		$33.30	10	$23.64	$(3.74)	$(14.40)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
136	Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters	H&SA-18	$7.10	Immediate	$(43.97)	$(8.72)	$(125.70)	$7.10	Immediate	$(43.97)	$(8.72)	$(125.70)
137	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	H&SA-19	$100.29	3	$44.22	$(26.88)	$(222.74)	$87.11	4	$40.33	$(22.21)	$(180.46)
138	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	H&SA-22	$171.33	15	$141.33	$(14.74)	$(11.22)	$171.33	15	$141.33	$(14.74)	$(11.22)
139	Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional, and Hopewell Offices	H&SA-26	$31.70	5	$12.48	$(6.68)	$(53.32)	$31.70	5	$12.48	$(6.68)	$(53.32)
140	Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR Capability	H&SA-27	$219.98	2	$102.08	$(59.37)	$(491.20)	$219.98	2	$102.08	$(59.37)	$(491.20)
141	Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications	H&SA-30	$42.00	4	$2.90	$(9.55)	$(89.00)	$42.00	4	$2.90	$(9.55)	$(89.00)
142	Consolidate Transportation Command Components	H&SA-31	$101.88	Immediate	$(349.77)	$(101.49)	$(1,309.30)	$101.88	Immediate	$(349.77)	$(101.49)	$(1,309.30)

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
143	Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force	H&SA-33	$136.55	Immediate	$(443.45)	$(152.30)	$(1,890.13)	$128.73	Immediate	$(449.98)	$(151.16)	$(1,884.52)
144	Create Joint Mobilization Sites	H&SA-35	$0.10	Immediate	$(30.85)	$(0.79)	$(37.90)	$0.10	Immediate	$(30.85)	$(0.79)	$(37.90)
145	Defense Finance and Accounting Service		$281.94	Immediate	$(158.57)	$(120.48)	$(1,313.72)	$254.38	Immediate	$(38.91)	$(102.62)	$(1,030.44)
146	Joint Basing	H&SA-41	$50.60	Immediate	$(601.32)	$(183.76)	$(2,342.50)	$50.60	Immediate	$(601.32)	$(183.76)	$(2,342.50)
147	Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA)	H&SA-44	$4.50	5	$0.92	$(0.91)	$(7.90)	$4.50	5	$0.92	$(0.91)	$(7.90)
148	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	H&SA-46	$199.90	10	$111.82	$(23.93)	$(122.90)	$199.90	10	$111.82	$(23.93)	$(122.90)
149	Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations	H&SA-49	$61.75	1	$12.12	$(18.04)	$(164.68)	$61.75	1	$12.12	$(18.04)	$(164.68)
150	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	Ind-4	$4.10	1	$(2.26)	$(1.62)	$(17.70)	$3.95	1	$(3.25)	$(1.75)	$(19.88)
151	Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA	Ind-5	$25.20	3	$10.44	$(6.54)	$(53.30)	$25.20	3	$10.44	$(6.54)	$(53.30)
152	Sierra Army Depot, CA	Ind-6	$33.40	7	$7.21	$(7.48)	$(66.70)	$33.40	7	$7.21	$(7.48)	$(66.70)
153	Rock Island Arsenal, IL	Ind-7	$27.00	9	$16.20	$(3.06)	$(13.80)	$27.00	9	$16.20	$(3.06)	$(13.80)
154	Newport Chemical Depot, IN	Ind-8	$7.10	Immediate	$(95.62)	$(35.74)	$(436.20)	$2.28	Immediate	$(28.64)	$(10.92)	$(132.61)
155	Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS	Ind-9	$25.20	2	$(2.14)	$(10.28)	$(101.40)	$25.20	2	$(2.14)	$(10.28)	$(101.40)
156	Lima Tank Plant, OH	Ind-10	$0.20	Immediate	$(5.85)	$(1.73)	$(22.30)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
157	Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS	Ind-11	$32.40	7	$10.75	$(5.09)	$(38.60)	$32.40	7	$10.75	$(5.09)	$(38.60)

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
158	Hawthorne Army Depot, NV	Ind-12	$180.30	Immediate	$(59.22)	$(73.42)	$(777.70)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
159	Watervliet Arsenal, NY	Ind-13	$63.70	18	$46.81	$(5.17)	$(5.38)	$63.70	18	$46.81	$(5.17)	$(5.20)
160	Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR	Ind-14	$15.50	Immediate	$(89.06)	$(60.98)	$(681.10)	$13.62	Immediate	$(7.72)	$(34.69)	$(347.88)
161	Lackland Air Force Base, TX	Ind-15	$10.20	3	$0.07	$(2.93)	$(28.00)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
162	Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant	Ind-16	$29.00	1	$4.66	$(17.31)	$(164.20)	$29.00	1	$4.66	$(17.31)	$(164.20)
163	Deseret Chemical Depot, UT	Ind-17	$4.40	Immediate	$(65.05)	$(30.33)	$(356.40)	$18.26	Immediate	$(39.64)	$(37.95)	$(407.45)
164	Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA	Ind-18	$10.60	1	$(26.82)	$(8.22)	$(104.30)	$10.60	1	$(26.82)	$(8.22)	$(104.30)
165	Fleet Readiness Centers	Ind-19	$298.10	Immediate	$(1,528.16)	$(341.21)	$(4,724.20)	$33.45	Immediate	$(1,411.98)	$(248.42)	$(3,715.03)
166	Naval Shipyard Detachments	Ind-26	$12.50	4	$0.95	$(2.26)	$(20.70)	$12.50	4	$0.95	$(2.26)	$(20.70)
167	Defense intelligence Agency	Int-3	$96.70	8	$48.78	$(10.09)	$(52.80)	$96.70	8	$48.78	$(10.09)	$(52.80)
168	National Geospatial Intelligence Agency	Int-4	$1,117.30	8	$796.70	$(127.70)	$(535.10)	$1,117.30	8	$796.70	$(127.70)	$(535.10)
169	Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD	Med-4	$988.76	6	$632.79	$(145.27)	$(830.56)	$988.76	6	$632.79	$(145.27)	$(830.56)
170	Brooks City Base, TX	Med-6	$325.30	2	$45.93	$(102.06)	$(940.70)	$325.30	2	$45.93	$(102.06)	$(940.70)
171	McChord Air Force Base, WA	Med-9	$1.10	Immediate	$(55.12)	$(11.64)	$(164.40)	$1.10	Immediate	$(55.12)	$(11.64)	$(164.40)
172	San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX	Med-10	$1,040.90	10	$826.72	$(129.04)	$(476.20)	$1,040.90	10	$826.72	$(129.04)	$(476.20)
173	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	Med-12	$12.90	Immediate	$(250.88)	$(60.17)	$(818.10)	$141.25	Immediate	$(252.49)	$(93.89)	$(1,146.50)

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
174	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	Med-15	$73.90	7	$45.93	$(9.19)	$(46.00)	$55.23	6	$33.52	$(7.34)	$(39.54)
175	Commodity Management Privatization	S&S- 5	$6.40	Immediate	$(333.75)	$(43.78)	$(735.90)	$6.40	Immediate	$(333.75)	$(43.78)	$(735.90)
176	Depot-level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	S&S-7	$127.00	1	$(369.79)	$(159.28)	$(1,889.60)	$124.90	Immediate	$(361.95)	$(156.78)	$(1,857.82)
177	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	S&S-13	$192.70	Immediate	$(1,047.33)	$(203.21)	$(2,925.82)	$192.70	Immediate	$(1,047.33)	$(203.21)	$(2,925.82)
178	Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers	Tech-5	$153.50	2	$(107.12)	$(49.42)	$(572.70)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
179	Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	Tech-6	$254.40	8	$115.25	$(36.16)	$(238.01)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
180	Consolidate Ground Vehicle Development & Acquisition in a Joint Center	Tech-7	$3.80	2	$1.90	$(1.93)	$(17.10)	$3.80	2	$1.90	$(1.93)	$(17.10)
181	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	Tech-9	$106.10	1	$(88.56)	$(38.74)	$(455.10)	$86.62	1	$(91.70)	$(34.82)	$(420.89)
182	Consolidate Navy Strategic Test and Evaluation	Tech-12	$86.40	7	$76.69	$(13.40)	$(61.40)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
183	Consolidate Sea Vehicle Development & Acquisition	Tech-13	$1.50	7	$0.14	$(0.22)	$(2.00)	$1.50	7	$0.14	$(0.22)	$(2.00)

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
184	Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center	Tech-15	$343.33	7	$160.01	$(52.13)	$(349.53)	$343.33	7	$160.01	$(52.13)	$(349.53)
185	Create an Air Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	Tech-18	$2.70	2	$(4.87)	$(1.39)	$(17.90)	$2.70	2	$(4.87)	$(1.39)	$(17.90)
186	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition	Tech-19	$116.30	13	$81.24	$(11.34)	$(32.60)	$66.76	9	$38.46	$(9.14)	$(51.78)
187	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	Tech-22	$164.60	4	$45.03	$(41.11)	$(357.30)	$136.05	3	$16.56	$(40.76)	$(380.28)
188	Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	Tech-24	$17.70	9	$7.91	$(2.66)	$(17.90)	$17.70	9	$7.91	$(2.66)	$(17.90)
189	Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	Tech-26	$49.40	26	$40.22	$(2.77)	$11.80	$49.40	26	$40.22	$(2.77)	$11.80
190	Navy Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	Tech-28	$72.70	12	$50.87	$(6.73)	$(16.90)	(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
191	(incorporated into #65 NAS Brunswick)	Add		(not recommended by DoD)				(See #65 NAS Brunswick)				
192	Navy Broadway Complex San Diego, CA	Add		(not recommended by DoD)				$77.30	73	$69.88	$(2.48)	$39.66

			DoD Baseline					Commission Approved				
SECTION	RECOMMENDATION	DOD PAGE	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV	ONETIME COSTS	PAYBACK PERIOD	6-YEAR NET	ANNUAL RECURRING	20-YEAR NPV
193	NAS Oceana, VA	Add		(not recommended by DoD)				(Recommendation is conditional; COBRA data unavailable)				
194	(Added recommendation not approved)	Add		(not recommended by DoD)				(Recommendation rejected by Commission. No COBRA data to report)				
195	Galena FOL, AK	Add		(not recommended by DoD)				$11.50	1	$(50.00)	$(12.30)	$(165.54)
196	(incorporated into #145 DFAS)	Add		(not recommended by DoD)				(See #145 DFAS)				
197	Professional Military Education	Add		(not recommended by DoD)				$-		$-	$-	$-
198	Joint Medical Command	Add		(not recommended by DoD)				$106.25	2	$2.99	$(32.91)	$(316.28)
		Totals	$24,621.59	N/A	$4,946.35	$(5,433.24)	$(47,842.36)	$21,024.53	N/A	$5,482.07	$(4,225.28)	$(35,619.43)

Notes:
1. All figures are in millions of dollars.
2. Numbers in parentheses are savings.
3. DoD baseline recommendations include all revised recommendations provided to the Commission.

The 20-year net present value of the Commission's approved recommendations ($35.6B) includes the savings associated with the elimination of military personnel billets, as does the Department of Defense 20-year net present value ($47.8B). The Commission did this for ease of comparison. However, the Commission believes that the savings associated with military personnel are questionable and unlikely to be realized. The Commission believes the actual savings from this BRAC round will be approximately $15.1 billion.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX N

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COST COMPARISONS, 1988–2005

BRAC ROUND	ONE-TIME COSTS	NET ANNUAL RECURRING SAVINGS	20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE SAVINGS
1988	$2.8	$0.9	$8.5
1991	$5.2	$2.0	$22.6
1993	$7.6	$2.6	$26.3
1995	$6.8	$1.7	$16.6
TOTAL PREVIOUS ROUNDS	$22.4	$7.2	$74.0
TOTAL 2005	$21.0	$4.2	$35.6

All values are in billions of dollars.

The 20-year net present value of the 2005 Commission's approved recommendations ($35.6B) includes the savings associated with the elimination of military personnel billets, as does the Department of Defense 20-year net present value ($47.8B). The Commission did this for ease of comparison. However, the Commission believes that the savings associated with military personnel are questionable and unlikely to be realized. The Commission believes that the actual savings from the 2005 BRAC round will be approximately $15.1 billion.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX O

Final Commission Recommendations
Employment Impact by Economic Areas and States

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Alabama							
Anniston-Oxford, AL Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*60,648*	*jobs*
Anniston Army Depot	0	55	0	55	41	96	0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**55**	**0**	**55**	**41**	**96**	**0.2%**
Birmingham-Hoover, AL Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*622,605*	*jobs*
Birmingham Armed Forces Reserve Center	-146	-159	0	-305	-192	-497	-0.1%
Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station	-66	-117	0	-183	-123	-306	0.0%
Fort Hanna Army National Guard Reserve Center Birmingham	-28	0	0	-28	-12	-40	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-240**	**-276**	**0**	**-516**	**-327**	**-843**	**-0.1%**
Enterprise-Ozark, AL Micropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*48,094*	*jobs*
Fort Rucker	-18	-102	0	-120	-121	-241	-0.5%
Gary U.S. Army Reserve Center Enterprize	-9	-1	0	-10	-8	-18	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-27**	**-103**	**0**	**-130**	**-129**	**-259**	**-0.5%**
Huntsville, AL Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*225,625*	*jobs*
Redstone Arsenal	-986	1,586	1,055	1,655	1,270	2,925	1.3%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-986**	**1,586**	**1,055**	**1,655**	**1,270**	**2,925**	**1.3%**
Mobile, AL Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*213,966*	*jobs*
Armed Forces Reserve Center Mobile	22	0	0	22	9	31	0.0%
Fort Ganey Army National Guard Reserve Center Mobile	-13	0	0	-13	-5	-18	0.0%
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Mobile AL	-27	0	0	-27	-11	-38	0.0%
Wright U.S. Army Reserve Center	-8	-1	0	-9	-3	-12	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-26**	**-1**	**0**	**-27**	**-10**	**-37**	**0.0%**
Montgomery, AL Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*207,595*	*jobs*
BG William P. Screws U.S. Army Reserve Center Montgomery	-15	-3	0	-18	-11	-29	0.0%
Dannelly Field Air Guard Station	17	38	0	55	39	94	0.0%
Maxwell Air Force Base	-19	-1	0	-20	-11	-31	0.0%
Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Montgomery	-31	-5	-5	-41	-25	-66	0.0%
The Adjutant General Bldg, AL Army National Guard Montgomery	-85	0	0	-85	-56	-141	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-133**	**29**	**-5**	**-109**	**-64**	**-173**	**-0.1%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Troy, AL Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 15,306 jobs*			
Anderson U.S. Army Reserve Center Troy	-15	0	0	-15	-8	-23	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-15**	**0**	**0**	**-15**	**-8**	**-23**	**-0.2%**
Tuscaloosa, AL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 104,345 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Tuscaloosa AL	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-2**	**-9**	**0.0%**
Tuskegee, AL Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 8,256 jobs*			
Abbott U.S. Army Reserve Center Tuskegee	-2	-1	0	-3	-1	-4	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-2**	**-1**	**0**	**-3**	**-1**	**-4**	**0.0%**
Total for Alabama	**-1,436**	**1,289**	**1,050**	**903**	**771**	**1,674**	**0.5%**
Alaska							
Anchorage, AK Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 211,967 jobs*			
Elmendorf Air Force Base	-1,348	157	0	-1,191	-866	-2,057	-1.0%
Fort Richardson	-86	-199	-1	-286	-207	-493	-0.2%
Kulis Air Guard Station	-218	-241	0	-459	-376	-835	-0.4%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-1,652**	**-283**	**-1**	**-1,936**	**-1,449**	**-3,385**	**-1.6%**
Fairbanks, AK Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 54,469 jobs*			
Eielson Air Force Base	-691	-26	0	-717	-574	-1,291	-2.4%
Fort Greely	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Fort Wainwright	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-691**	**-26**	**0**	**-717**	**-574**	**-1,291**	**-2.4%**
Yukon-Koyukuk County				*Area's Total Employment = 2,971 jobs*			
Galena Airport Forward Operating Location	0	0	-40	-40	-26	-66	-2.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**0**	**-40**	**-40**	**-26**	**-66**	**-2.2%**
Total for Alaska	**-2,343**	**-309**	**-41**	**-2,693**	**-2,049**	**-4,742**	**-6.2%**
Arizona							
Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,971,119 jobs*			
Air Force Research Lab, Mesa City	-42	-46	0	-88	-64	-152	0.0%
Leased Space - AZ	0	-1	0	-1	-1	-2	0.0%
Luke Air Force Base	-101	-177	0	-278	-201	-479	0.0%
Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport	10	29	0	39	39	78	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-133**	**-195**	**0**	**-328**	**-227**	**-555**	**0.0%**
Sierra Vista-Douglas, AZ Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 51,749 jobs*			
Fort Huachuca	0	-168	1	-167	-119	-286	-0.6%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**-168**	**1**	**-167**	**-119**	**-286**	**-0.6%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Tucson, AZ Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 448,946 jobs*			
Allen Hall Armed Forces Reserve Center, Tucson	-60	0	0	-60	-52	-112	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-60**	**0**	**0**	**-60**	**-52**	**-112**	**0.0%**
Yuma, AZ Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 76,606 jobs*			
Marine Corps Air Station Yuma	0	5	0	5	4	9	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**5**	**0**	**5**	**4**	**9**	**0.0%**
Total for Arizona	**-193**	**-358**	**1**	**-550**	**-394**	**-944**	**-0.6%**
Arkansas							
El Dorado, AR Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 39,093 jobs*			
El Dorado Armed Forces Reserve Center	-24	0	0	-24	-12	-36	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-24**	**0**	**0**	**-24**	**-12**	**-36**	**-0.1%**
Fort Smith, AR-OK Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 152,388 jobs*			
Fort Smith Regional	42	92	0	134	96	230	0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**42**	**92**	**0**	**134**	**96**	**230**	**0.2%**
Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 394,114 jobs*			
Camp Pike (90th)	-86	-91	0	-177	-158	-335	-0.1%
Little Rock Air Force Base	3,045	234	0	3,279	2,456	5,735	1.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**2,959**	**143**	**0**	**3,102**	**2,298**	**5,400**	**1.4%**
Pine Bluff, AR Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 49,184 jobs*			
Stone U.S. Army Reserve Center, Pine Bluff	-30	-4	0	-34	-13	-47	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-30**	**-4**	**0**	**-34**	**-13**	**-47**	**-0.1%**
Total for Arkansas	**2,947**	**231**	**0**	**3,178**	**2,369**	**5,547**	**1.3%**
California							
				Area's Total Employment = 0 jobs			
Channel Islands Air Guard Station	0	21	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**21**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
Bakersfield, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 325,440 jobs*			
Edwards Air Force Base	-14	0	0	-14	-11	-25	0.0%
Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake	176	1,645	493	2,314	2,467	4,781	1.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**162**	**1,645**	**493**	**2,300**	**2,456**	**4,756**	**1.5%**
Fresno, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 427,912 jobs*			
Fresno Air Terminal	52	246	0	298	302	600	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**52**	**246**	**0**	**298**	**302**	**600**	**0.1%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Hanford-Corcoran, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 53,641 jobs*			
Naval Air Station Lemoore	5	35	0	40	32	72	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**5**	**35**	**0**	**40**	**32**	**72**	**0.1%**
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale, CA Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 5,554,695 jobs*			
Armed Forces Reserve Center Bell	48	0	0	48	22	70	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center Bell	-72	0	0	-72	-34	-106	0.0%
Leased Space - CA	-2	-14	-4	-20	-13	-33	0.0%
Marine Corps Reserve Center Pasadena CA	25	0	0	25	11	36	0.0%
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Encino	-33	0	0	-33	-15	-48	0.0%
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Los Angeles	-48	0	0	-48	-22	-70	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-82**	**-14**	**-4**	**-100**	**-51**	**-151**	**0.0%**
Modesto, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 212,388 jobs*			
Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant	0	-4	-85	-89	-16	-105	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**-4**	**-85**	**-89**	**-16**	**-105**	**0.0%**
Oakland-Fremont-Hayward, CA Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 1,383,332 jobs*			
Camp Parks (91st)	-25	-18	0	-43	-25	-68	0.0%
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Oakland	0	-50	0	-50	-40	-90	0.0%
Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Det Concord	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-25**	**-68**	**0**	**-93**	**-65**	**-158**	**0.0%**
Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 420,712 jobs*			
Channel Islands Air Guard Station	4	15	0	19	22	41	0.0%
Naval Base Ventura County	-233	-1,421	-375	-2,029	-1,533	-3,562	-0.8%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-229**	**-1,406**	**-375**	**-2,010**	**-1,511**	**-3,521**	**-0.8%**
Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,479,524 jobs*			
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, San Bernardino	0	-116	0	-116	-126	-242	0.0%
March Air Reserve Base	-71	-40	0	-111	-80	-191	0.0%
Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow	-140	-330	51	-419	-396	-815	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-211**	**-486**	**51**	**-646**	**-602**	**-1,248**	**-0.1%**
Salinas, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 235,299 jobs*			
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Seaside	-6	-47	0	-53	-50	-103	0.0%
Fort Hunter Liggett	25	18	0	43	40	83	0.0%
NAVPGSCOL MONTEREY, CA	-150	-121	0	-271	-269	-540	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-131**	**-150**	**0**	**-281**	**-279**	**-560**	**-0.2%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,806,321 jobs*			
Broadway Complex San Diego	-142	-827	-50	-1,019	-1,067	-2,086	0.0%
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, San Diego	-7	-314	-1	-322	-355	-677	0.0%
Human Resources Support Center Southwest	0	-164	0	-164	-145	-309	0.0%
Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton	-145	1	0	-144	-129	-273	0.0%
Marine Corps Base Miramar	41	31	0	72	70	142	0.0%
Naval Base Coronado	-71	-389	0	-460	-524	-984	-0.1%
Naval Base Point Loma	299	-311	-59	-71	-377	-448	0.0%
Naval Medical Center San Diego	-1,596	-33	-1	-1,630	-1,469	-3,099	-0.2%
Naval Station San Diego	1,226	911	52	2,189	2,134	4,323	0.1%
Naval Weapons Station Fallbrook	0	-118	0	-118	-126	-244	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-395**	**-1,213**	**-59**	**-1,667**	**-1,989**	**-3,656**	**-0.2%**
San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,187,969 jobs*			
Armed Forces Reserve Center Moffett Field	90	166	0	256	107	363	0.0%
Onizuka Air Force Station	-107	-171	0	-278	-114	-392	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Center, Moffett Field	-3	0	0	-3	0	-3	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-20**	**-5**	**0**	**-25**	**-7**	**-32**	**0.0%**
Santa Ana-Anaheim-Irvine, CA Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 1,901,499 jobs*			
Los Alamitos (63rd)	-92	-78	0	-170	-99	-269	0.0%
Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach	9	-78	-21	-90	-84	-174	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-83**	**-156**	**-21**	**-260**	**-183**	**-443**	**0.0%**
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 254,600 jobs*			
Vandenburg Air Force Base	44	101	0	145	110	255	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**44**	**101**	**0**	**145**	**110**	**255**	**0.1%**
Stockton, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 269,709 jobs*			
Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin	0	-31	0	-31	-20	-51	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**-31**	**0**	**-31**	**-20**	**-51**	**0.0%**
Susanville, CA Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 14,296 jobs*			
Sierra Army Depot	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
Yuba City, CA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 68,256 jobs*			
Beale Air Force Base	-8	-171	0	-179	-131	-310	-0.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-8**	**-171**	**0**	**-179**	**-131**	**-310**	**-0.5%**
Total for California	**-921**	**-1,656**	**0**	**-2,598**	**-1,952**	**-4,550**	**-0.1%**
Colorado							

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Colorado Springs, CO Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 349,783 jobs*			
Fort Carson	4,178	199	0	4,377	3,309	7,686	2.2%
Leased Space - CO	0	-11	0	-11	-11	-22	0.0%
Peterson Air Force Base	0	11	36	47	36	83	0.0%
United States Air Force Academy	-30	-9	-1	-40	-31	-71	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**4,148**	**190**	**35**	**4,373**	**3,303**	**7,676**	**2.2%**
Denver-Aurora, CO Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,545,580 jobs*			
Air Reserve Personnel Center	-181	-1,457	-159	-1,797	-1,317	-3,114	-0.2%
Buckley Air Force Base	79	296	0	375	386	761	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-102**	**-1,161**	**-159**	**-1,422**	**-931**	**-2,353**	**-0.2%**
Total for Colorado	**4,046**	**-971**	**-124**	**2,951**	**2,372**	**5,323**	**2.0%**
Connecticut							
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 578,009 jobs*			
Turner U.S. Army Reserve Center, Fairfield	-13	-4	0	-17	-9	-26	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-13**	**-4**	**0**	**-17**	**-9**	**-26**	**0.0%**
Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 760,915 jobs*			
Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station	-45	-106	0	-151	-120	-271	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Center Area Maintenance Support Facility Middletown	-13	-5	0	-18	-7	-25	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-58**	**-111**	**0**	**-169**	**-127**	**-296**	**0.0%**
New Haven-Milford, CT Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 472,774 jobs*			
SGT Libby U.S. Army Reserve Center, New Haven	-14	-7	0	-21	-11	-32	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-14**	**-7**	**0**	**-21**	**-11**	**-32**	**0.0%**
Norwich-New London, CT Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 168,620 jobs*			
Submarine Base New London	-46	-113	0	-159	-164	-323	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-46**	**-113**	**0**	**-159**	**-164**	**-323**	**-0.2%**
Total for Connecticut	**-131**	**-235**	**0**	**-366**	**-310**	**-676**	**-0.2%**
Delaware							
Dover, DE Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 74,718 jobs*			
Dover Air Force Base	115	133	0	248	252	500	0.7%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**115**	**133**	**0**	**248**	**252**	**500**	**0.7%**
Wilmington, DE-MD-NJ Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 405,766 jobs*			
Kirkwood U.S. Army Reserve Center, Newark	-7	-2	0	-9	-3	-12	0.0%
New Castle County Airport Air Guard Station	-47	-101	0	-148	-100	-248	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-54**	**-103**	**0**	**-157**	**-103**	**-260**	**-0.1%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Total for Delaware	**61**	**30**	**0**	**-91**	**149**	**240**	**0.6%**
District of Columbia							
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 2,771,791 jobs*			
Bolling Air Force Base	-244	-275	-213	-732	-525	-1,257	0.0%
Leased Space - DC	-103	11	-10	-102	-64	-158	0.0%
Naval District Washington	-80	-323	50	-353	-389	-742	0.0%
Potomac Annex	-219	-185	-153	-557	-1,025	-1,582	-0.1%
Walter Reed Army Medical Center	-2,668	-2,373	-622	-5,663	-3,869	-9,532	-0.3%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-3,314**	**-3,145**	**-948**	**-7,407**	**-5,872**	**-13,271**	**-0.5%**
Total for District of Columbia	**-3,314**	**-3,145**	**-948**	**-7,407**	**-5,872**	**-13,271**	**-0.5%**
Florida							
Fort Walton Beach-Crestview-Destin, FL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 120,139 jobs*			
Eglin Air Force Base	2,234	208	0	2,442	1,999	4,441	3.7%
Hurlburt Field	-48	-6	0	-54	-43	-97	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**2,186**	**202**	**0**	**2,388**	**1,956**	**4,344**	**3.6%**
Jacksonville, FL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 727,765 jobs*			
Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station	20	-2	0	18	20	38	0.0%
Naval Air Station Jacksonville	1,902	72	58	2,032	1,576	3,608	0.5%
Naval Station Mayport	397	13	0	410	479	889	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**2,319**	**83**	**58**	**2,460**	**2,075**	**4,535**	**0.6%**
Miami-Miami Beach-Kendall, FL Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 1,293,315 jobs*			
Homestead Air Reserve Station	0	71	0	71	62	133	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**71**	**0**	**71**	**62**	**133**	**0.0%**
Orlando, FL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,082,297 jobs*			
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Orlando	-13	-214	0	-227	-164	-391	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-13**	**-214**	**0**	**-227**	**-164**	**-391**	**0.0%**
Panama City-Lynn Haven, FL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 86,658 jobs*			
Naval Support Activity Panama City	-12	-12	0	-24	-23	-47	-0.1%
Tyndall Air Force Base	-22	0	0	-22	-22	-44	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-34**	**-12**	**0**	**-46**	**-45**	**-91**	**-0.1%**
Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 210,512 jobs*			
Naval Air Station Pensacola	-392	-699	-6	-1,097	-1,581	-2,678	-1.3%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-392**	**-699**	**-6**	**-1,097**	**-1,581**	**-2,678**	**-1.3%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence / Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,485,074 jobs*			
MacDill Air Force Base	152	83	0	235	200	435	0.0%
Navy Reserve Center ST Petersburg	-12	0	0	-12	-10	-22	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**140**	**83**	**0**	**223**	**190**	**413**	**0.0%**
Total for Florida	**4,206**	**-486**	**52**	**3,772**	**2,494**	**6,266**	**2.9%**
Georgia							
Albany, GA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 79,160 jobs*			
Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany	-1	-5	0	-6	-5	-11	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-1**	**-5**	**0**	**-6**	**-5**	**-11**	**0.0%**
Athens-Clarke County, GA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 96,829 jobs*			
Naval Supply Corps School Athens	-393	-108	-16	-517	-318	-835	-0.9%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-393**	**-108**	**-16**	**-517**	**-318**	**-835**	**-0.9%**
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 2,777,548 jobs*			
Dobbins Air Reserve Base	73	45	0	118	72	190	0.0%
Fort Gillem	-511	-570	0	-1,081	-734	-1,815	-0.1%
Fort McPherson	-2,260	-1,881	0	-4,141	-2,705	-6,846	-0.2%
Leased Space - GA	0	-6	-2	-8	-6	-14	0.0%
Naval Air Station Atlanta	-1,274	-156	-68	-1,498	-806	-2,304	-0.1%
Peachtree Leases Atlanta	-65	-97	0	-162	-114	-276	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-4,037**	**-2,665**	**-70**	**-6,772**	**-4,293**	**-11,065**	**-0.4%**
Columbus, GA-AL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 163,565 jobs*			
Fort Benning	9,274	621	0	9,895	4,034	13,929	8.5%
Fort Benning Bldg 15	-53	-3	0	-56	-32	-88	-0.1%
U.S. Army Reserve Center Columbus	-9	0	0	-9	-5	-14	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**9,212**	**618**	**0**	**9,830**	**3,997**	**13,827**	**8.5%**
Rome, GA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 30,944 jobs*			
Inspector/Instructor Rome GA	-9	0	0	-9	-3	-12	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-9**	**0**	**0**	**-9**	**-3**	**-12**	**0.0%**
Savannah, GA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 174,403 jobs*			
Savannah International Airport Air Guard Station	13	21	0	34	34	68	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**13**	**21**	**0**	**34**	**34**	**68**	**0.0%**
Valdosta, GA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 65,992 jobs*			
Moody Air Force Base	922	-86	0	836	585	1,421	2.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**922**	**-86**	**0**	**836**	**585**	**1,421**	**2.2%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Warner Robins, GA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 65,130 jobs*			
Robins Air Force Base	-103	-169	781	509	218	727	1.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-103**	**-169**	**781**	**509**	**218**	**727**	**1.1%**
Total for Georgia	**5,604**	**-2,394**	**695**	**3,905**	**215**	**4,120**	**10.5%**
Guam							
Guam County, GU				*Area's Total Employment = 54,980 jobs*			
Andersen Air Force Base	-64	-31	0	-95	-79	-174	-0.3%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-64**	**-31**	**0**	**-95**	**-79**	**-174**	**-0.3%**
Total for Guam	**-64**	**-31**	**0**	**-95**	**-79**	**-174**	**-0.3%**
Hawaii							
Honolulu, HI Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 573,389 jobs*			
Hickam Air Force Base	-152	-110	0	-262	-360	-622	-0.1%
Naval Station Pearl Harbor	-43	-247	0	-290	-328	-618	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-195**	**-357**	**0**	**-552**	**-688**	**-1,240**	**-0.2%**
Kapaa, HI Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 37,731 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Honokaa	-118	0	0	-118	-100	-218	-0.6%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-118**	**0**	**0**	**-118**	**-100**	**-218**	**-0.6%**
Total for Hawaii	**-313**	**-357**	**0**	**-670**	**-788**	**-1,458**	**-0.8%**
Idaho							
Boise City-Nampa, ID Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 314,811 jobs*			
Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station	-17	-62	0	-79	-69	-148	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-17**	**-62**	**0**	**-79**	**-69**	**-148**	**0.0%**
Mountain Home, ID Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 14,441 jobs*			
Mountain Home Air Force Base	-640	-36	0	-676	-482	-1,158	-8.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-640**	**-36**	**0**	**-676**	**-482**	**-1,158**	**-8.0%**
Pocatello, ID Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 47,266 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Pocatello	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-2**	**-9**	**0.0%**
Total for Idaho	**-664**	**-98**	**0**	**-762**	**-553**	**-1,315**	**-8.1%**
Illinois							
Carbondale, IL Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 38,275 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Carbondale	-32	0	0	-32	-17	-49	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-32**	**0**	**0**	**-32**	**-17**	**-49**	**-0.1%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 4,607,077 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Forest Park	-15	0	0	-15	-4	-19	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-15**	**0**	**0**	**-15**	**-4**	**-19**	**0.0%**
Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 279,053 jobs*			
Rock Island Arsenal	154	-1,595	0	-1,441	-1,363	-2,804	-1.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**154**	**-1,595**	**0**	**-1,441**	**-1,363**	**-2,804**	**-1.2%**
Lake County-Kenosha County, IL-WI Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 498,103 jobs*			
Fort Sheridan	-17	-17	0	-34	-52	-86	0.0%
Naval Station Great Lakes	-1,989	-23	-10	-2,022	-2,498	-4,520	-0.9%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-2,006**	**-40**	**-10**	**-2,056**	**-2,550**	**-4,606**	**-0.9%**
Peoria, IL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 217,455 jobs*			
Greater Peoria Regional Airport	13	21	0	34	23	57	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**13**	**21**	**0**	**34**	**23**	**57**	**0.0%**
Springfield, IL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 139,247 jobs*			
Capital Airport Air Guard Station	-18	-121	0	-139	-100	-239	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-18**	**-121**	**0**	**-139**	**-100**	**-239**	**-0.2%**
St. Louis, MO-IL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,668,793 jobs*			
Scott Air Force Base	-87	969	86	968	994	1,962	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-87**	**969**	**86**	**968**	**994**	**1,962**	**0.1%**
Total for Illinois	**-1,991**	**-766**	**76**	**-2,681**	**-3,016**	**-5,697**	**-2.3%**
Indiana							
Evansville, IN-KY Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 212,719 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Evansville	-7	0	0	-7	-1	-8	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-1**	**-8**	**0.0%**
Fort Wayne, IN Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 256,503 jobs*			
Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station	34	199	0	233	168	401	0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**34**	**199**	**0**	**233**	**168**	**401**	**0.2%**
Indianapolis, IN Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,037,290 jobs*			
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Indianapolis	40	1,330	4	1,374	1,205	2,579	0.2%
Leased Space - IN	-25	-111	-1	-137	-99	-236	0.0%
Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Indianapolis	-27	-5	-6	-38	-14	-52	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Center Seston	-12	0	0	-12	-4	-16	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-24**	**1,214**	**-3**	**1,187**	**1,088**	**2,275**	**0.2%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Lafayette, IN Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 112,699 jobs*			
U.S. Army Reserve Center Lafeyette	-21	0	0	-21	-11	-32	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-21**	**0**	**0**	**-21**	**-11**	**-32**	**0.0%**
Martin County, IN				*Area's Total Employment = 8,523 jobs*			
Crane Army Ammunition Plant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Naval Support Activity Crane	0	-615	-31	-646	-361	-1,007	-11.8%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**-615**	**-31**	**-646**	**-361**	**-1,007**	**-11.8%**
Peru, IN Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 14,974 jobs*			
Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Grissom Air Reserve Base, Bunker Hill	-7	0	0	-7	-1	-8	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-1**	**-8**	**-0.1%**
Terre Haute, IN Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 89,765 jobs*			
Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station	-6	-118	0	-124	-90	-214	-0.2%
Newport Chemical Depot	-7	-19	-280	-306	-221	-527	-0.6%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-13**	**-137**	**-280**	**-430**	**-311**	**-741**	**-0.8%**
Total for Indiana	**-38**	**661**	**-314**	**309**	**572**	**881**	**-12.3%**
Iowa							
Cedar Rapids, IA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 162,044 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Cedar Rapids	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-2**	**-9**	**0.0%**
Des Moines, IA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 362,215 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Camp Dodge	-217	-1	0	-218	-83	-301	-0.1%
Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station	24	83	0	107	81	188	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-193**	**82**	**0**	**-111**	**-2**	**-113**	**0.0%**
Dubuque, IA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 62,005 jobs*			
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Dubuque	-19	-5	0	-24	-7	-31	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-19**	**-5**	**0**	**-24**	**-7**	**-31**	**0.0%**
Sioux City, IA-NE-SD Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 93,206 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Sioux City	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9	0.0%
Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard	33	170	0	203	220	423	0.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**26**	**170**	**0**	**196**	**218**	**414**	**0.4%**
Total for Iowa	**-193**	**247**	**0**	**54**	**208**	**262**	**0.4%**
Kansas							

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Kansas City, MO-KS Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,225,451 jobs*			
Fort Leavenworth	195	8	0	203	130	333	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**195**	**8**	**0**	**203**	**130**	**333**	**0.0%**
Manhattan, KS Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 72,434 jobs*			
Fort Riley	2,415	337	0	2,752	1,740	4,492	6.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**2,415**	**337**	**0**	**2,752**	**1,740**	**4,492**	**6.2%**
Parsons, KS Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 15,144 jobs*			
Kansas Army Ammunition Plant	0	-8	-159	-167	-108	-275	-1.8%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**-8**	**-159**	**-167**	**-108**	**-275**	**-1.8%**
Topeka, KS Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 144,675 jobs*			
Forbes Field Air Guard Station	53	194	0	247	487	734	0.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**53**	**194**	**0**	**247**	**487**	**734**	**0.5%**
Wichita, KS Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 364,878 jobs*			
McConnell Air Force Base	664	-166	0	498	363	861	0.2%
U.S. Army Reserve Center Wichita	-22	-56	0	-78	-75	-153	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**642**	**-222**	**0**	**420**	**288**	**708**	**0.2%**
Total for Kansas	**3,305**	**309**	**-159**	**3,455**	**2,537**	**5,992**	**5.1%**
Kentucky							
Clarksville, TN-KY Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 128,436 jobs*			
Fort Campbell	-360	9	0	-351	-253	-604	-0.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-360**	**9**	**0**	**-351**	**-253**	**-604**	**-0.5%**
Elizabethtown, KY Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 65,926 jobs*			
Fort Knox	-4,867	1,874	184	-2,809	-52	-2,861	-4.6%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-4,867**	**1,874**	**184**	**-2,809**	**-52**	**-2,861**	**-4.6%**
Lexington-Fayette, KY Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 296,523 jobs*			
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Lexington	-5	-40	0	-45	-26	-71	0.0%
Navy Reserve Center Lexington	-9	0	0	-9	-2	-11	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-14**	**-40**	**0**	**-54**	**-28**	**-82**	**0.0%**
Louisville, KY-IN Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 728,101 jobs*			
Louisville International Airport Air Guard Station	0	6	0	6	4	10	0.0%
Navy Recruiting Command Louisville	-6	-217	0	-223	-165	-388	-0.1%
U.S. Army Reserve Center Louisville	-30	-13	0	-43	-21	-64	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-36**	**-224**	**0**	**-260**	**-182**	**-442**	**-0.1%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Maysville, KY Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 16,643 jobs*			
U.S. Army Reserve Center Maysville	-16	-2	0	-18	-9	-27	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-16**	**-2**	**0**	**-18**	**-9**	**-27**	**-0.2%**
Paducah, KY-IL Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 61,551 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Paducah	-31	0	0	-31	-16	-47	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-31**	**0**	**0**	**-31**	**-16**	**-47**	**-0.1%**
Total for Kentucky	**-5,324**	**1,617**	**184**	**-3,523**	**-540**	**-4,063**	**-5.4%**
Louisiana							
Baton Rouge, LA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 411,691 jobs*			
Baton Rouge Army National Guard Reserve Center	-117	0	0	-117	-57	-174	0.0%
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Baton Rouge	-18	0	0	-18	-8	-26	0.0%
Roberts U.S. Army Reserve Center, Baton Rouge	-30	0	0	-30	-14	-44	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-165**	**0**	**0**	**-165**	**-79**	**-244**	**-0.1%**
New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 763,801 jobs*			
Leased Space - Slidell	-1	-102	-48	-151	-143	-294	0.0%
Naval Air Station New Orleans	720	405	3	1,128	845	1,973	0.3%
Naval Air Station New Orleans Air Reserve Station	24	-307	0	-283	-292	-575	-0.1%
Naval Support Activity New Orleans	-1,310	-603	-62	-1,975	-1,353	-3,328	-0.4%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-567**	**-607**	**-107**	**-1,281**	**-942**	**-2,223**	**-0.3%**
Shreveport-Bossier City, LA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 211,384 jobs*			
Barksdale Air Force Base	1,235	80	0	1,315	955	2,270	1.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**1,235**	**80**	**0**	**1,315**	**955**	**2,270**	**1.1%**
Total for Louisiana	**503**	**-527**	**-107**	**-131**	**-66**	**-197**	**0.7%**
Maine							
Aroostook County, ME				*Area's Total Employment = 41,134 jobs*			
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Limestone	0	300	0	300	217	517	1.3%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**300**	**0**	**300**	**217**	**517**	**1.3%**
Bangor, ME Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 92,291 jobs*			
Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station	36	158	0	194	141	335	0.4%
Naval Reserve Center, Bangor	-2	0	0	-2	2	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**34**	**158**	**0**	**192**	**142**	**334**	**0.4%**
Portland-South Portland-Biddeford ME Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 331,655 jobs*			
Naval Air Station Brunswick	-2,880	-395	0	-3,275	-2,590	-5,865	-1.8%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-2,880**	**-395**	**0**	**-3,275**	**-2,590**	**-5,865**	**-1.8%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Total for Maine	-2,846	63	0	-2,783	-2,231	-5,014	-0.1%
Maryland							
Baltimore-Towson, MD Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,568,140 jobs*			
Aberdeen Proving Ground	-3,452	4,433	216	1,197	687	1,884	0.1%
Fort Meade	682	2,915	1,764	5,361	4,870	10,231	0.7%
Leased Space - MD	-100	-1,891	-1,309	-3,300	-2,405	-5,705	-0.4%
Martin State Airport Air Guard Station	-16	-83	0	-99	-94	-193	0.0%
Naval Station Annapolis	0	-13	0	-13	-12	-25	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	-2,886	5,361	671	3,146	3,046	6,192	0.4%
Bethesda/Frederick/Gaithersburg, MD Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 727,010 jobs*			
Army Research Laboratory, Adelphi	0	-43	0	-43	-39	-82	0.0%
Bethesda/Chevy Chase	-5	-2	0	-7	-5	-12	0.0%
Fort Detrick	76	43	-44	75	34	109	0.0%
Leased Space - MD	-16	-35	0	-51	-37	-88	0.0%
National Naval Medical Center Bethesda	1,418	674	737	2,829	2,049	4,878	0.7%
Naval Surface Weapons Station Carderock	0	6	0	6	5	11	0.0%
PFC Flair U.S. Army Reserve Center, Frederick	-20	-2	0	-22	-15	-37	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	1,453	641	693	2,787	1,992	4,779	0.7%
Lexington Park, MD Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 53,347 jobs*			
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Patuxent River	0	-55	-57	-112	-148	-260	-0.5%
Leased Space - MD	0	-164	0	-164	-217	-381	-0.7%
Naval Air Station Patuxent River	-3	84	-142	-61	-50	-111	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	-3	-135	-199	-337	-415	-752	-1.4%
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 2,771,791 jobs*			
Andrews Air Force Base	191	300	-57	434	313	747	0.0%
Naval Air Facility Washington	-9	-9	0	-18	-23	-41	0.0%
Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head	0	-95	0	-95	-71	-166	0.0%
Navy Reserve Center Adelphi	-17	0	0	-17	-10	-27	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	165	196	-57	304	209	513	0.0%
Total for Maryland	-1,271	6,063	1,108	5,900	4,832	10,732	-0.3%
Massachusetts							
Barnstable Town, MA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 137,499 jobs*			
Otis Air Guard Base	-62	-443	0	-505	-365	-870	-0.6%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	-62	-443	0	-505	-365	-870	-0.6%

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Boston-Quincy, MA Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 1,343,997 jobs*			
Naval Shipyard Puget Sound-Boston Detachment	0	-108	0	-108	-105	-213	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**-108**	**0**	**-108**	**-105**	**-213**	**0.0%**
Cambridge-Newton-Framingham, MA Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 1,054,892 jobs*			
Armed Forces Reserve Center Ayers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Combined Support Maintenance Shop Devens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center Ayer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Fort Devens, 323d Maintenance Facility	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Hanscom Air Force Base	-46	-259	0	-305	-309	-614	-0.1%
Malony U.S. Army Reserve Center	-100	-55	0	-155	-87	-242	0.0%
Natick Soldier Systems Center	0	-19	0	-19	-23	-42	0.0%
Regional Training Site Maintenance (98), U.S. Army Reserve Fort Devens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Ayer Area 3713	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve ECS 65 Ayers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-146**	**-333**	**0**	**-479**	**-419**	**-898**	**-0.1%**
Springfield, MA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 374,117 jobs*			
Armed Forces Reserve Center Westover (new)	72	11	0	83	43	126	0.0%
Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station	55	201	0	256	350	606	0.2%
Westover U.S. Army Reserve Center, Cicopee	-13	0	0	-13	-5	-18	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**114**	**212**	**0**	**326**	**387**	**713**	**0.2%**
Total for Massachusetts	**-94**	**-672**	**0**	**-766**	**-502**	**-1,268**	**-0.5%**
Michigan							
Battle Creek, MI Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 74,652 jobs*			
W. K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station	-6	-155	0	-161	-116	-277	-0.4%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-6**	**-155**	**0**	**-161**	**-116**	**-277**	**-0.4%**
Detroit-Livonia-Dearborn, MI Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 994,108 jobs*			
Detroit Arsenal	0	1,005	0	1,005	723	1,728	0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**1,005**	**0**	**1,005**	**723**	**1,728**	**0.2%**
Lansing-East Lansing, MI Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 281,040 jobs*			
Parisan U.S. Army Reserve Center, Lansing	-25	0	0	-25	-11	-36	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-25**	**0**	**0**	**-25**	**-11**	**-36**	**0.0%**
Marquette, MI Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 34,562 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Marquette	-7	0	0	-7	-1	-8	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-1**	**-8**	**0.0%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Warren-Farmington Hills-Troy, MI Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 1,505,252 jobs*			
Selfridge Air National Guard Base	62	137	0	199	159	358	0.0%
Selfridge Army Activity	-126	-174	-76	-376	-225	-601	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-64**	**-37**	**-76**	**-177**	**-66**	**-243**	**0.0%**
Total for Michigan	**-102**	**813**	**-76**	**635**	**528**	**1,163**	**-0.2%**
Minnesota							
Duluth, MN-WI Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 157,359 jobs*			
Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Navy Reserve Center Duluth	-8	0	0	-8	-2	-10	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-8**	**0**	**0**	**-8**	**-2**	**-10**	**0.0%**
Faribault-Northfield, MN Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 30,123 jobs*			
Armed Forces Reserve Center New Faribault	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Faribault	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Faribault	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 2,127,894 jobs*			
Armed Forces Reserve Center New Cambridge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Cambridge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Fort Snelling	-130	-124	0	-254	-155	-409	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Cambridge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-130**	**-124**	**0**	**-254**	**-155**	**-409**	**0.0%**
Total for Minnesota	**-138**	**-124**	**0**	**-262**	**-157**	**-419**	**0.0%**
Mississippi							
Columbus, MS Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 34,053 jobs*			
Columbus Air Force Base	104	3	0	107	69	176	0.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**104**	**3**	**0**	**107**	**69**	**176**	**0.5%**
Gulfport-Biloxi, MS Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 151,445 jobs*			
Construction Battalion Center Gulfport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Keesler Air Force Base	-181	-31	-190	-402	-247	-649	-0.4%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-181**	**-31**	**-190**	**-402**	**-247**	**-649**	**-0.4%**
Jackson, MS Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 307,475 jobs*			
Jackson International Airport Air Guard Station	0	27	0	27	25	52	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**27**	**0**	**27**	**25**	**52**	**0.0%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes: Military	Net Job Changes: Civilian	Net Job Changes: Contractor	Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
Meridian, MS Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 54,548 jobs*			
Key Field Air Guard Station	-27	-134	0	-161	-169	-330	-0.6%
Naval Air Station Meridian	-15	0	-1	-16	-12	-28	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-42**	**-134**	**-1**	**-177**	**-181**	**-358**	**-0.7%**
Pascagoula, MS Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 68,520 jobs*			
Naval Station Pascagoula	-844	-112	-7	-963	-797	-1,760	-2.6%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-844**	**-112**	**-7**	**-963**	**-797**	**-1,760**	**-2.6%**
Picayune, MS Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 16,286 jobs*			
Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant	0	-4	-50	-54	-35	-89	-0.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**-4**	**-50**	**-54**	**-35**	**-89**	**-0.5%**
Vicksburg, MS Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 29,916 jobs*			
U.S. Army Reserve Center Vicksburg	-26	-2	0	-28	-14	-42	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-26**	**-2**	**0**	**-28**	**-14**	**-42**	**-0.1%**
Total for Mississippi	**-989**	**-253**	**-248**	**-1,490**	**-1,179**	**-2,669**	**-3.8%**
Missouri							
Cape Girardeau-Jackson, MO-IL Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 59,473 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Cape Girardeau	-7	0	0	-7	-1	-8	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-1**	**-8**	**0.0%**
Fort Leonard Wood, MO Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 25,515 jobs*			
Fort Leonard Wood	-110	23	0	-87	-15	-102	-0.4%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-110**	**23**	**0**	**-87**	**-15**	**-102**	**-0.4%**
Kansas City, MO-KS Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,225,451 jobs*			
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Kansas City	-67	-675	-140	-882	-848	-1,730	-0.1%
Marine Corps Support Center Kansas City	-191	-139	-3	-333	-249	-582	0.0%
Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Kansas	-21	-6	-6	-33	-22	-55	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-279**	**-820**	**-149**	**-1,248**	**-1,119**	**-2,367**	**-0.2%**
St. Joseph, MO-KS Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 68,849 jobs*			
Rosecrans Memorial Airport Air Guard Station	8	27	0	35	23	58	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**8**	**27**	**0**	**35**	**23**	**58**	**0.1%**
St. Louis, MO-IL Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,668,793 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Jefferson Barracks	-67	0	0	-67	-54	-121	0.0%
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, St. Louis	-1	-327	0	-328	-270	-598	0.0%
Lambert International Airport- St Louis	-22	-201	0	-223	-173	-396	0.0%
Leased Space - MO	-709	-1,234	-150	-2,093	-1,587	-3,680	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-799**	**-1,762**	**-150**	**-2,711**	**-2,084**	**-4,795**	**-0.3%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes Military	Civilian	Contractor	Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
Warrensburg, MO Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 28,670 jobs*			
Whiteman Air Force Base	3	58	0	61	44	105	0.4%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**3**	**58**	**0**	**61**	**44**	**105**	**0.4%**
Total for Missouri	**-1,184**	**-2,474**	**-299**	**-3,957**	**-3,152**	**-7,109**	**-0.4%**
Montana							
Great Falls, MT Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 49,192 jobs*			
Galt Hall U.S. Army Reserve Center, Great Falls	-14	-3	0	-17	-8	-25	-0.1%
Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station	-9	117	0	108	78	186	0.4%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-23**	**114**	**0**	**91**	**70**	**161**	**0.3%**
Total for Montana	**-23**	**114**	**0**	**91**	**70**	**161**	**0.3%**
Nebraska							
Columbus, NE Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 22,545 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Columbus	-31	0	0	-31	-16	-47	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-31**	**0**	**0**	**-31**	**-16**	**-47**	**-0.2%**
Grand Island, NE Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 45,763 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Grand Island	-31	0	0	-31	-16	-47	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-31**	**0**	**0**	**-31**	**-16**	**-47**	**-0.1%**
Kearney, NE Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 35,434 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Kearny	-8	0	0	-8	-4	-12	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-8**	**0**	**0**	**-8**	**-4**	**-12**	**0.0%**
Lincoln, NE Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 198,773 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Lincoln	-7	0	0	-7	-3	-10	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-3**	**-10**	**0.0%**
Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 538,121 jobs*			
Naval Recruiting District Headquarters Omaha	-19	-7	-6	-32	-27	-59	0.0%
Offutt Air Force Base	5	-148	-13	-156	-89	-245	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-14**	**-155**	**-19**	**-188**	**-116**	**-304**	**-0.1%**
Total for Nebraska	**-91**	**-155**	**-19**	**-265**	**-155**	**-420**	**-0.4%**
Nevada							
Fallon, NV Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 15,858 jobs*			
Naval Air Station Fallon	-7	0	0	-7	-5	-12	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-5**	**-12**	**-0.1%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Las Vegas-Paradise, NV Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 760,624 jobs*		
Nellis Air Force Base	1,029	75	248	1,352	1,004	2,356	0.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**1,029**	**75**	**248**	**1,352**	**1,004**	**2,356**	**0.5%**
Reno-Sparks, NV Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 243,270 jobs*		
Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station	-23	-124	0	-147	-115	-262	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-23**	**-124**	**0**	**-147**	**-115**	**-262**	**-0.1%**
Total for Nevada	**999**	**-49**	**248**	**1,198**	**884**	**2,082**	**0.3%**
New Hampshire							
Rockingham County-Strafford County, NH Metropolitan Division					*Area's Total Employment = 238,671 jobs*		
Doble U.S. Army Reserve Center Portsmouth	-39	-5	0	-44	-29	-73	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-39**	**-5**	**0**	**-44**	**-29**	**-73**	**0.0%**
Total for New Hampshire	**-39**	**-5**	**0**	**-44**	**-29**	**-73**	**0.0%**
New Jersey							
Atlantic City, NJ Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 175,797 jobs*		
Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station	23	43	0	66	50	116	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**23**	**43**	**0**	**66**	**50**	**116**	**0.1%**
Camden, NJ Metropolitan Division					*Area's Total Employment = 819,919 jobs*		
Fort Dix	209	144	0	353	347	700	0.1%
McGuire Air Force Base	679	92	0	771	553	1,324	0.2%
SFC Nelson V. Brittin U.S. Army Reserve Center	-34	-1	0	-35	-29	-64	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**854**	**235**	**0**	**1,089**	**871**	**1,960**	**0.3%**
Edison, NJ Metropolitan Division					*Area's Total Employment = 1,220,335 jobs*		
Fort Monmouth	-620	-4,652	0	-5,272	-4,464	-9,736	-0.8%
Kilmer U.S. Army Reserve Center, Edison	-23	-21	0	-44	-31	-75	0.0%
Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst	-132	-54	0	-186	-186	-372	0.0%
Naval Weapons Station Earle	0	-63	0	-63	-55	-118	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-775**	**-4,790**	**0**	**-5,565**	**-4,736**	**-10,301**	**-0.8%**
Newark-Union, NJ-PA Metropolitan Division					*Area's Total Employment = 1,246,371 jobs*		
Picatinny Arsenal	5	688	0	693	565	1,258	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**5**	**688**	**0**	**693**	**565**	**1,258**	**0.1%**
Trenton-Ewing, NJ Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 249,721 jobs*		
Inspector/Instructor Center West Trenton	-11	-1	0	-12	-3	-15	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-11**	**-1**	**0**	**-12**	**-3**	**-15**	**0.0%**
Total for New Jersey	**96**	**-3,825**	**0**	**-3,729**	**-3,253**	**-6,982**	**-0.4%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes Military	Civilian	Contractor	Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
New Mexico							
Alamogordo, NM Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 27,515 jobs*			
Holloman Air Force Base	-17	0	0	-17	-11	-28	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-17**	**0**	**0**	**-17**	**-11**	**-28**	**-0.1%**
Albuquerque, NM Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 454,397 jobs*			
Jenkins Armed Forces Reserve Center Albuquerque	-35	-1	0	-36	-29	-65	0.0%
Kirtland Air Force Base	30	176	1	207	221	428	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-5**	**175**	**1**	**171**	**192**	**363**	**0.1%**
Clovis, NM Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 23,348 jobs*			
Cannon Air Force Base	-384	-55	-2,385	-2,824	-1,956	-4,780	-20.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-384**	**-55**	**-2,385**	**-2,824**	**-1,956**	**-4,780**	**-20.5%**
Las Cruces, NM Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 79,256 jobs*			
White Sands Missile Range	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
Total for New Mexico	**-406**	**120**	**-2,384**	**-2,670**	**-1,775**	**-4,445**	**-20.5%**
New York							
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 529,819 jobs*			
Schenectady County Air Guard Station	-10	-9	0	-19	-18	-37	0.0%
Watervliet Arsenal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-10**	**-9**	**0**	**-19**	**-18**	**-37**	**0.0%**
Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 643,318 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Niagara Falls	-1	0	0	-1	0	-1	0.0%
Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Buffalo	-25	-6	-6	-37	-14	-51	0.0%
Niagara Falls International Airport Air Guard Station	-26	-128	0	-154	-116	-270	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-52**	**-134**	**-6**	**-192**	**-130**	**-322**	**0.0%**
Elmira, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 50,494 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Horsehead	-7	0	0	-7	-6	-13	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-6**	**-13**	**0.0%**
Glens Falls, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 64,173 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Glenn Falls	-7	0	0	-7	-1	-8	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-1**	**-8**	**0.0%**
Nassau-Suffolk, NY Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 1,530,568 jobs*			
Armed Forces Reserve Center Amityville	-24	-4	0	-28	-8	-36	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-24**	**-4**	**0**	**-28**	**-8**	**-36**	**0.0%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
New York-Wayne-White Plains, NY-NJ Metropolitan Division					*Area's Total Employment = 6,226,027 jobs*		
Fort Totten / Pyle	-75	-74	0	-149	-72	-221	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	-75	-74	0	-149	-72	-221	0.0%
Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 312,628 jobs*		
Carpenter U.S. Army Reserve Center,Poughkeepie	-8	-1	0	-9	-4	-13	0.0%
United States Military Academy	226	38	0	264	157	421	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	218	37	0	255	153	408	0.1%
Utica-Rome, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 158,421 jobs*		
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Rome	0	630	0	630	455	1,085	0.7%
Rome Laboratory	1	-69	0	-68	-57	-125	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	1	561	0	562	398	960	0.6%
Watertown-Fort Drum, NY Micropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 62,390 jobs*		
Navy Reserve Center Watertown	-9	0	0	-9	-5	-14	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	-9	0	0	-9	-5	-14	0.0%
Total for New York	35	377	-6	406	312	718	0.6%
North Carolina							
Albemarle, NC Micropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 26,102 jobs*		
Niven U.S. Army Reserve Center, Albermarle	-34	5	0	-29	-14	-43	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	-34	5	0	-29	-14	-43	-0.2%
Asheville, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 217,211 jobs*		
Navy Reserve Center Asheville	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9	0.0%
Charlotte-Gastonia-Concord, NC-SC Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 936,991 jobs*		
Charlotte/Douglas International Airport	13	23	0	36	32	68	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	13	23	0	36	32	68	0.0%
Fayetteville, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 195,370 jobs*		
Fort Bragg	4,078	247	0	4,325	2,913	7,238	3.7%
Pope Air Force Base	-10,298	382	-132	-10,048	13,138	3,090	1.6%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	-6,220	629	-132	-5,723	16,051	10,328	5.3%
Goldsboro, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 60,040 jobs*		
Seymore Johnson Air Force Base	345	17	0	362	310	672	1.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	345	17	0	362	310	672	1.1%
Jacksonville, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 91,677 jobs*		
Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune	-182	-1	-9	-192	-109	-301	-0.3%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	-182	-1	-9	-192	-109	-301	-0.3%

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
New Bern, NC Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 66,366 jobs*			
Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point	283	-630	-20	-367	-324	-691	-1.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**283**	**-630**	**-20**	**-367**	**-324**	**-691**	**-1.0%**
Total for North Carolina	**-5,802**	**43**	**-161**	**-5,920**	**15,944**	**10,024**	**4.9%**
North Dakota							
Fargo, ND-MN Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 129,893 jobs*			
Fargo, ND Armed Forces Reserve Center	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Hector International Airport Air Guard Station	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Johnson U.S. Army Reserve Center, Fargo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
Grand Forks, ND-MN Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 66,242 jobs*			
Grand Forks Air Force Base	-2,293	-363	0	-2,656	-2,293	-4,949	-7.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-2,293**	**-363**	**0**	**-2,656**	**-2,293**	**-4,949**	**-7.5%**
Total for North Dakota	**-2,293**	**-363**	**0**	**-2,656**	**-2,293**	**-4,949**	**-7.5%**
Ohio							
Akron, OH Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 398,976 jobs*			
Armed Forces Reserve Center Akron	37	0	0	37	14	51	0.0%
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Akron	-26	0	0	-26	-10	-36	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**11**	**0**	**0**	**11**	**4**	**15**	**0.0%**
Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,301,423 jobs*			
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Cleveland	0	294	0	294	263	557	0.0%
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Cleveland	-24	-1	0	-25	-7	-32	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-24**	**293**	**0**	**269**	**256**	**525**	**0.0%**
Columbus, OH Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,122,033 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Westerville	-12	0	0	-12	-4	-16	0.0%
Defense Supply Center Columbus	-2	1,598	0	1,596	1,417	3,013	0.3%
Leased Space - OH	0	-187	-59	-246	-153	-399	0.0%
Rickenbacker Army National Guard Bldg 943 Columbus	-4	0	0	-4	-1	-5	0.0%
Rickenbacker International Airport Air Guard Station	0	1	0	1	1	2	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Center Whitehall	-25	0	0	-25	-9	-34	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-43**	**1,412**	**-59**	**1,310**	**1,251**	**2,561**	**0.2%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Dayton, OH Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*512,393*	*jobs*
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Dayton	-9	-351	-5	-365	-319	-684	-0.1%
Glenn Research Center	0	-50	0	-50	-47	-97	0.0%
Wright Patterson Air Force Base	501	251	75	827	722	1,549	0.3%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**492**	**-150**	**70**	**412**	**356**	**768**	**0.1%**
Hardin County, OH					*Area's Total Employment =*	*13,264*	*jobs*
Parrott U.S. Army Reserve Center Kenton	-9	-1	0	-10	-4	-14	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-9**	**-1**	**0**	**-10**	**-4**	**-14**	**-0.1%**
Mansfield, OH Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*73,323*	*jobs*
Army National Guard Reserve Center Mansfield	-37	0	0	-37	-34	-71	-0.1%
Mansfield Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station	-25	-81	0	-106	-77	-183	-0.2%
Scouten U.S. Army Reserve Center Mansfield	-22	-2	0	-24	-22	-46	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-84**	**-83**	**0**	**-167**	**-133**	**-300**	**-0.4%**
Springfield, OH Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*67,753*	*jobs*
Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station	-56	-215	0	-271	-281	-552	-0.8%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-56**	**-215**	**0**	**-271**	**-281**	**-552**	**-0.8%**
Toledo, OH Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*403,161*	*jobs*
Toledo Express Airport Air Guard Station	4	41	0	45	36	81	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**4**	**41**	**0**	**45**	**36**	**81**	**0.0%**
Youngstown-Warren-Boardman, OH-PA Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*307,480*	*jobs*
Youngstown-Warren Regional Airport	0	8	0	8	7	15	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**8**	**0**	**8**	**7**	**15**	**0.0%**
Total for Ohio	**291**	**1,305**	**11**	**1,607**	**1,492**	**3,099**	**-0.9%**
Oklahoma							
Altus, OK Micropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*16,463*	*jobs*
Altus Air Force Base	-16	0	0	-16	-10	-26	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-16**	**0**	**0**	**-16**	**-10**	**-26**	**-0.2%**
Enid, OK Micropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment =*	*34,406*	*jobs*
Vance Air Force Base	93	6	0	99	93	192	0.6%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**93**	**6**	**0**	**99**	**93**	**192**	**0.6%**
Johnston County, OK					*Area's Total Employment =*	*4,603*	*jobs*
Army National Guard Reserve Center Tishomingo	-30	0	0	-30	-16	-46	-1.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-30**	**0**	**0**	**-30**	**-16**	**-46**	**-1.0%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Lawton, OK Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 63,978 jobs*			
Fort Sill	3,445	105	-3	3,547	2,110	5,657	8.8%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**3,445**	**105**	**-3**	**3,547**	**2,110**	**5,657**	**8.8%**
McAlester, OK Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 21,197 jobs*			
McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
Muskogee, OK Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 40,416 jobs*			
Ashworth U.S. Army Reserve Center Muskogee	-14	-2	0	-16	-8	-24	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-14**	**-2**	**0**	**-16**	**-8**	**-24**	**-0.1%**
Oklahoma City, OK Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 703,918 jobs*			
Krowse U.S. Army Reserve Center Oklahoma City	-78	-6	0	-84	-77	-161	0.0%
Oklahoma City (95th)	-31	-22	0	-53	-55	-108	0.0%
Tinker Air Force Base	0	-85	0	-85	-57	-142	0.0%
Will Rogers World Airport Air Guard Station	84	-99	0	-15	-49	-64	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-25**	**-212**	**0**	**-237**	**-238**	**-475**	**-0.1%**
Tulsa, OK Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 533,659 jobs*			
Armed Forces Reserve Center Broken Arrow	32	0	0	32	11	43	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center Broken Arrow RC	-26	0	0	-26	-9	-35	0.0%
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Tulsa	-32	0	0	-32	-11	-43	0.0%
Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station	9	50	0	59	43	102	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-17**	**50**	**0**	**33**	**34**	**67**	**0.0%**
Total for Oklahoma	**3,436**	**-53**	**-3**	**3,380**	**1,965**	**5,345**	**8.1%**
Oregon							
Medford, OR Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 106,355 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Central Point	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-2**	**-9**	**0.0%**
Pendleton-Hermiston, OR Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 44,887 jobs*			
Umatilla Army Depot	-1	-348	0	-349	-253	-602	-1.3%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-1**	**-348**	**0**	**-349**	**-253**	**-602**	**-1.3%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,232,839 jobs*			
Armed Forces Reserve Center Camp With (New)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center Camp Withycombe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center Jackson Band	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center Lake Oswego	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center Maison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Portland International Airport Air Guard Station	-38	-277	0	-315	-390	-705	-0.1%
Sears U.S. Army Reserve Center, Portland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Sharff U.S. Army Reserve Center, Portland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-38**	**-277**	**0**	**-315**	**-390**	**-705**	**-0.1%**
Total for Oregon	**-46**	**-625**	**0**	**-671**	**-645**	**-1,316**	**-1.4%**
Pennsylvania							
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 396,091 jobs*			
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Lehigh	8	0	0	8	3	11	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**8**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**3**	**11**	**0.0%**
Bloomsburg-Berwick, PA Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 49,836 jobs*			
U.S. Army Reserve Center Bloomsburg	-20	-2	0	-22	-11	-33	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-20**	**-2**	**0**	**-22**	**-11**	**-33**	**-0.1%**
Chambersburg, PA Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 65,783 jobs*			
Letterkenny Army Depot	-36	202	0	166	124	290	0.4%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-36**	**202**	**0**	**166**	**124**	**290**	**0.4%**
Harrisburg-Carlisle, PA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 384,888 jobs*			
Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna	0	-15	0	-15	-13	-28	0.0%
Naval Support Activity Mechanicsburg	0	-11	0	-11	-9	-20	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**-26**	**0**	**-26**	**-22**	**-48**	**0.0%**
Johnstown, PA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 74,441 jobs*			
Marine Corps Reserve Center Johnstown	-86	0	0	-86	-72	-158	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-86**	**0**	**0**	**-86**	**-72**	**-158**	**-0.2%**
Lewisburg, PA Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 22,716 jobs*			
U.S. Army Reserve Center Lewisburg	-9	-2	0	-11	-5	-16	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-9**	**-2**	**0**	**-11**	**-5**	**-16**	**-0.1%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Philadelphia, PA Metropolitan Division					*Area's Total Employment = 2,273,372 jobs*		
Bristol U.S. Army Reserve Center, Philadelphia	-9	-2	0	-11	-5	-16	0.0%
Engineering Field Activity Northeast	-4	-188	0	-192	-154	-346	0.0%
Human Resources Support Center Northeast	0	-174	-9	-183	-132	-315	0.0%
Naval Air Station Willow Grove	-992	-679	-5	-1,676	-1,175	-2,851	-0.1%
Naval Support Activity Philadelphia	0	180	0	180	146	326	0.0%
Navy Crane Center Lester	-1	-54	0	-55	-44	-99	0.0%
Navy Philadelphia Business Center	0	-63	0	-63	-51	-114	0.0%
North Penn U.S. Army Reserve Center, Norristown	-22	-1	0	-23	-10	-33	0.0%
W. Reese U.S. Army Reserve Center/OMS, Chester	-9	-1	0	-10	-4	-14	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-1,037**	**-982**	**-14**	**-2,033**	**-1,430**	**-3,463**	**-0.2%**
Pittsburgh, PA Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 1,403,312 jobs*		
Kelly Support Center	-174	-136	0	-310	-183	-493	0.0%
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Pittsburgh	7	0	0	7	2	9	0.0%
Pitt U.S. Army Reserve Center, Corapolis	-119	-101	0	-220	-132	-352	0.0%
Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station	-44	-278	0	-322	-258	-580	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-330**	**-515**	**0**	**-845**	**-571**	**-1,416**	**-0.1%**
Reading, PA Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 213,550 jobs*		
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Reading	-18	0	0	-18	-6	-24	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-18**	**0**	**0**	**-18**	**-6**	**-24**	**0.0%**
Scranton-Wilkes-Barre, PA Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 306,854 jobs*		
Serrenti U.S. Army Reserve Center, Scranton	-47	-8	0	-55	-20	-75	0.0%
Tobyhanna Army Depot	2	69	0	71	49	120	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-45**	**61**	**0**	**16**	**29**	**45**	**0.0%**
Williamsport, PA Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 67,466 jobs*		
U.S. Army Reserve Williamsport	-25	-4	0	-29	-16	-45	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-25**	**-4**	**0**	**-29**	**-16**	**-45**	**-0.1%**
Total for Pennsylvania	**-1,598**	**-1,268**	**-14**	**-2,880**	**-1,978**	**-4,858**	**-0.2%**
Puerto Rico							
Aguadilla-Isabela-San Sebastian, PR Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 80,981 jobs*		
Aguadillla-Ramey U.S. Army Reserve Center/BMA-126	-10	0	0	-10	-5	-15	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-10**	**0**	**0**	**-10**	**-5**	**-15**	**0.0%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes Military	Civilian	Contractor	Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
San Juan-Caguas-Guaynabo, PR Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 850,261 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Humacao	-26	0	0	-26	-18	-44	0.0%
Camp Euripedes Rubio, Puerto Nuevo	-43	0	0	-43	-29	-72	0.0%
Fort Buchanan	-9	-47	0	-56	-54	-110	0.0%
Lavergne U.S. Army Reserve Center Bayamon	-25	-1	0	-26	-18	-44	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-103**	**-48**	**0**	**-151**	**-119**	**-270**	**0.0%**
Total for Puerto Rico	**-113**	**-48**	**0**	**-161**	**-124**	**-285**	**-0.1%**
Rhode Island							
Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 864,734 jobs*			
Bristol U.S. Army Reserve Center	-24	0	0	-24	-28	-52	0.0%
Harwood U.S. Army Reserve Center, Providence	-20	-4	0	-24	-30	-54	0.0%
Naval Station Newport	719	233	-89	863	1,010	1,873	0.2%
Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station	17	29	0	46	64	110	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**692**	**258**	**-89**	**861**	**1,016**	**1,877**	**0.2%**
Total for Rhode Island	**692**	**258**	**-89**	**861**	**1,016**	**1,877**	**0.2%**
South Carolina							
Charleston-North Charleston, SC Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 331,580 jobs*			
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Charleston	0	-386	0	-386	-386	-772	-0.2%
Naval Weapons Station Charleston	-125	-125	-380	-630	-428	-1,058	-0.3%
South Naval Facilities Engineering Command	-6	-492	-45	-543	-890	-1,433	-0.4%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-131**	**-1,003**	**-425**	**-1,559**	**-1,704**	**-3,263**	**-1.0%**
Columbia, SC Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 418,871 jobs*			
Fort Jackson	435	180	0	615	366	981	0.2%
McEntire Air Guard Station	418	8	0	426	308	734	0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**853**	**188**	**0**	**1,041**	**674**	**1,715**	**0.4%**
Hilton Head Island-Beaufort, SC Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 93,051 jobs*			
Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort	0	12	0	12	9	21	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**12**	**0**	**12**	**9**	**21**	**0.0%**
Sumter, SC Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 54,168 jobs*			
Shaw Air Force Base	765	75	0	840	617	1,457	2.7%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**765**	**75**	**0**	**840**	**617**	**1,457**	**2.7%**
Total for South Carolina	**1,487**	**-728**	**-425**	**334**	**-404**	**-70**	**2.1%**
South Dakota							

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Sioux Falls, SD Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 149,410 jobs*			
Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station	28	27	32	87	63	150	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**28**	**27**	**32**	**87**	**63**	**150**	**0.1%**
Total for South Dakota	**28**	**27**	**32**	**87**	**63**	**150**	**0.1%**
Tennessee							
Kingsport-Bristol-Bristol, TN-VA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 161,187 jobs*			
U.S. Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Facility Kingsport	-30	-2	0	-32	-6	-38	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-30**	**-2**	**0**	**-32**	**-6**	**-38**	**0.0%**
Knoxville, TN Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 402,476 jobs*			
McGee Tyson APT Air Guard Station	64	244	0	308	412	720	0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**64**	**244**	**0**	**308**	**412**	**720**	**0.2%**
Memphis, TN-MS-AR Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 758,153 jobs*			
Memphis International Airport Air Guard Station	2	6	0	8	5	13	0.0%
Naval Support Activity Mid South	228	145	3	376	217	593	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**230**	**151**	**3**	**384**	**222**	**606**	**0.1%**
Nashville-Davidson-Murfreesboro, TN Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 919,365 jobs*			
Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station	-19	-172	0	-191	-136	-327	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-19**	**-172**	**0**	**-191**	**-136**	**-327**	**0.0%**
Total for Tennessee	**245**	**221**	**3**	**469**	**492**	**961**	**0.2%**
Texas							
Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 193,048 jobs*			
Navy Reserve Center Orange,TX	-11	0	0	-11	-6	-17	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-11**	**0**	**0**	**-11**	**-6**	**-17**	**0.0%**
Corpus Christi, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 221,376 jobs*			
Corpus Christi Army Depot	0	-92	0	-92	-132	-224	-0.1%
Naval Air Station Corpus Christi	-926	-89	-10	-1,025	-1,182	-2,207	-1.0%
Naval Station Ingleside	-1,726	-254	-57	-2,037	-2,558	-4,595	-2.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-2,652**	**-435**	**-67**	**-3,154**	**-3,872**	**-7,026**	**-3.2%**
Dallas-Plano-Irving, TX Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 2,410,769 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center # 2 Dallas	-90	0	0	-90	-48	-138	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center California Crossing	-47	0	0	-47	-25	-72	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-137**	**0**	**0**	**-137**	**-73**	**-210**	**0.0%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Del Rio, TX Micropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 21,096 jobs*		
Laughlin Air Force Base	102	80	0	182	135	317	1.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**102**	**80**	**0**	**182**	**135**	**317**	**1.5%**
El Paso, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 328,741 jobs*		
Army National Guard Reserve Center (Hondo Pass) El Paso	-106	0	0	-106	-81	-187	-0.1%
Fort Bliss	11,354	147	0	11,501	8,884	20,385	6.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**11,248**	**147**	**0**	**11,395**	**8,803**	**20,198**	**6.1%**
Fort Worth-Arlington, TX Metropolitan Division					*Area's Total Employment = 1,004,416 jobs*		
Carswell ARS, Naval Air Station Fort Worth	8	104	0	112	115	227	0.0%
Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Ft. Worth	276	36	2	314	196	510	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**284**	**140**	**2**	**426**	**311**	**737**	**0.1%**
Houston-Baytown-Sugar Land, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 2,898,160 jobs*		
Army National Guard Reserve Center Ellington	-14	-45	0	-59	-41	-100	0.0%
Ellington Field Air Guard Station	0	-3	0	-3	-2	-5	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Center # 2 Houston	-2	0	0	-2	0	-2	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-16**	**-48**	**0**	**-64**	**-43**	**-107**	**0.0%**
Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 186,916 jobs*		
Fort Hood	-73	-118	0	-191	-163	-354	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-73**	**-118**	**0**	**-191**	**-163**	**-354**	**-0.2%**
Lubbock, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 156,975 jobs*		
Navy Reserve Center Lubbock, TX	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-2**	**-9**	**0.0%**
Lufkin, TX Micropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 45,773 jobs*		
U.S. Army Reserve Center Lufkin	-10	0	0	-10	-5	-15	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-10**	**0**	**0**	**-10**	**-5**	**-15**	**0.0%**
Marshall, TX Micropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 29,682 jobs*		
Army National Guard Reserve Center Marshall	-15	-1	0	-16	-8	-24	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-15**	**-1**	**0**	**-16**	**-8**	**-24**	**-0.1%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes Military	Civilian	Contractor	Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
San Antonio, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,009,217 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center New Braunfels	-106	0	0	-106	-89	-195	0.0%
Brooks City-Base	-1,297	-1,268	-358	-2,923	-2,799	-5,722	-0.6%
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, San Antonio	-56	-312	0	-368	-329	-697	-0.1%
Fort Sam Houston	7,625	1,622	92	9,339	8,354	17,693	1.8%
Lackland Air Force Base	-2,168	-416	-116	-2,700	-2,282	-4,982	-0.5%
Leased Space - TX	-78	-147	-131	-356	-334	-585	-0.1%
Randolph Air Force Base	-433	316	63	-54	36	-18	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**3,487**	**-205**	**-450**	**2,832**	**2,557**	**5,494**	**0.5%**
Texarkana, TX-Texarkana, AR Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 67,895 jobs*			
Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant	-2	-18	-129	-149	-79	-228	-0.3%
Red River Army Depot	0	-257	0	-257	-172	-429	-0.6%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-2**	**-275**	**-129**	**-406**	**-251**	**-657**	**-1.0%**
Wichita Falls, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 93,033 jobs*			
Sheppard Air Force Base	-2,468	-156	0	-2,624	-1,742	-4,366	-4.7%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-2,468**	**-156**	**0**	**-2,624**	**-1,742**	**-4,366**	**-4.7%**
Total for Texas	**9,730**	**-871**	**-644**	**8,215**	**5,642**	**13,962**	**-0.9%**
Utah							
				Area's Total Employment = 0 jobs			
Hill Air Force Base	0	4	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
Ogden-Clearfield, UT Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 332,721 jobs*			
Hill Air Force Base	278	-423	212	67	35	102	-0.2%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**278**	**-423**	**212**	**67**	**35**	**102**	**-0.2%**
Salt Lake City, UT Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 701,532 jobs*			
Deseret Chemical Depot	-1	-469	0	-470	-340	-810	-0.1%
Fort Douglas	-15	-38	0	-53	-41	-94	0.0%
Tooele Army Depot	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-16**	**-507**	**0**	**-523**	**-381**	**-904**	**-0.1%**
Total for Utah	**262**	**-926**	**212**	**-456**	**-346**	**-802**	**-0.3%**
Vermont							
Barre, VT Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 43,696 jobs*			
U.S. Army Reserve Center Berlin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Burlington-South Burlington, VT Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 145,790 jobs*		
Burlington International Airport Air Guard Station	1	51	0	52	38	90	0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**1**	**51**	**0**	**52**	**38**	**90**	**0.1%**
Lebanon, NH-VT Micropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 115,211 jobs*		
Armed Forces Reserve Center White River Jct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center Ludlow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center North Springfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center Windsor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Center Chester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
Rutland, VT Micropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 38,502 jobs*		
Armed Forces Reserve Center New Rutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Army National Guard Reserve Center Rutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Courcelle Brothers U.S. Army Reserve Center, Rutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Facility #160, Rutland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
Total for Vermont	**1**	**51**	**0**	**52**	**38**	**90**	**0.1%**
Virginia							
					Area's Total Employment = 0 jobs		
CRYSTAL CITY LEASE, VA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Fort Belvoir	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Leased Space - VA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0.0%**
King George County, VA					*Area's Total Employment = 14,171 jobs*		
Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren	0	-203	122	-81	-64	-145	-1.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**-203**	**122**	**-81**	**-64**	**-145**	**-1.0%**
Richmond, VA Metropolitan Statistical Area					*Area's Total Employment = 715,302 jobs*		
Defense Supply Center Richmond	0	6	0	6	4	10	0.0%
Fort Lee	6,139	1,149	56	7,344	4,419	11,763	1.6%
Leased Space - VA	0	-215	0	-215	-166	-381	-0.1%
Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station	-20	-96	0	-116	-84	-200	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**6,119**	**844**	**56**	**7,019**	**4,173**	**11,192**	**1.6%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 978,888 jobs*			
Fort Eustis	-639	728	169	258	633	891	0.1%
Fort Monroe	-1,393	-1,948	-223	-3,564	-4,418	-7,982	-0.8%
Langley Air Force Base	550	-14	0	536	582	1,118	0.1%
Naval Air Station Oceana	-110	50	0	-60	-45	-105	0.0%
Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek	10	27	0	37	51	88	0.0%
Naval Medical Center Portsmouth	-463	-25	-1	-489	-522	-1,011	-0.1%
Naval Shipyard Norfolk	165	327	0	492	626	1,118	0.1%
Naval Station Norfolk	473	-815	89	-253	-662	-915	-0.1%
Naval Support Activity Norfolk	567	205	16	788	895	1,683	0.2%
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown	0	-179	-12	-191	-261	-452	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-840**	**-1,644**	**38**	**-2,446**	**-3,121**	**-5,567**	**-0.6%**
Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 2,771,791 jobs*			
Arlington Service Center	211	-110	-383	-282	-206	-488	0.0%
ATEC LEASE, VA	-181	-227	-62	-470	-325	-795	0.0%
BAILEY'S CROSSROADS, VA	-426	-1,038	-220	-1,684	-1,251	-2,935	-0.1%
BALSTON LEASE, VA	-262	-93	-191	-546	-359	-905	0.0%
CRYSTAL CITY LEASE, VA	-1,075	-1,453	-793	-3,321	-2,292	-5,413	-0.2%
Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Arlington	-83	-372	0	-455	-485	-940	0.0%
Fort Belvoir	4,162	6,375	2,058	12,595	8,727	21,323	0.8%
Headquarters Battalion, Headquarters Marine Corps, Henderson Hall	401	184	81	666	441	1,107	0.0%
HOFFMAN LEASE, VA	-575	-1,881	-164	-2,620	-2,495	-5,115	-0.2%
Leased Space - VA	-4,032	-10,733	-3,985	-18,750	-13,309	-32,059	-1.1%
Marine Corps Base Quantico	446	1,357	1,210	3,013	2,109	5,122	0.2%
ROSSLYN LEASE, VA	0	-211	-83	-294	-213	-507	0.0%
U.S. Marine Corps Direct Reporting Program Manager Advanced Amphibious Assault	0	-32	0	-32	-24	-56	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-1,414**	**-8,234**	**-2,532**	**-12,180**	**-9,684**	**-21,663**	**-0.7%**
Total for Virginia	**3,865**	**-9,237**	**-2,316**	**-7,688**	**-8,695**	**-16,182**	**-0.8%**
Washington							
Bremerton-Silverdale, WA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 119,170 jobs*			
Human Resources Support Center Northwest	0	23	0	23	17	40	0.0%
Naval Station Bremerton	0	43	0	43	45	88	0.1%
Submarine Base Bangor	0	-1	0	-1	-1	-2	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**0**	**65**	**0**	**65**	**61**	**126**	**0.1%**
Oak Harbor, WA Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 35,843 jobs*			
Naval Air Station Whidbey Island	-34	173	0	139	162	301	0.8%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-34**	**173**	**0**	**139**	**162**	**301**	**0.8%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes Military	Civilian	Contractor	Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 1,332,839 jobs*			
Vancover Barracks	-29	-16	0	-45	-27	-72	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-29**	**-16**	**0**	**-45**	**-27**	**-72**	**0.0%**
Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 1,690,448 jobs*			
Army National Guard Reserve Center Everett	-57	0	0	-57	-32	-89	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Center Fort Lawton	-53	-54	0	-107	-75	-182	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-110**	**-54**	**0**	**-164**	**-107**	**-271**	**0.0%**
Spokane, WA Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 249,887 jobs*			
1LT Richard H. Walker U.S. Army Reserve Center	-38	0	0	-38	-32	-70	0.0%
Fairchild Air Force Base	-26	-172	0	-198	-150	-348	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-64**	**-172**	**0**	**-236**	**-182**	**-418**	**-0.2%**
Tacoma, WA Metropolitan Division				*Area's Total Employment = 339,431 jobs*			
Fort Lewis	185	45	0	230	185	415	0.1%
McChord Air Force Base	-424	-136	-7	-567	-537	-1,104	-0.3%
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Tacoma	-20	0	0	-20	-15	-35	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-259**	**-91**	**-7**	**-357**	**-367**	**-724**	**-0.2%**
Total for Washington	**-496**	**-95**	**-7**	**-598**	**-459**	**-1,057**	**0.5%**
West Virginia							
Charleston, WV Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 176,245 jobs*			
Yeager Airport Air Guard Station	-27	-129	0	-156	-88	-244	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-27**	**-129**	**0**	**-156**	**-88**	**-244**	**-0.1%**
Fairmont, WV Micropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 26,404 jobs*			
Fairmont U.S. Army National Guard Reserve Center	-88	0	0	-88	-47	-135	-0.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-88**	**0**	**0**	**-88**	**-47**	**-135**	**-0.5%**
Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 116,091 jobs*			
Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport Sheppard Air Guard Station	7	3	0	10	7	17	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**7**	**3**	**0**	**10**	**7**	**17**	**0.0%**
Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 139,908 jobs*			
Bias U.S. Army Reserve Center, Huntington	-1	0	0	-1	0	-1	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-1**	**0**	**0**	**-1**	**0**	**-1**	**0.0%**
Wheeling, WV-OH Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment = 80,664 jobs*			
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Moundsville	-16	0	0	-16	-5	-21	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-16**	**0**	**0**	**-16**	**-5**	**-21**	**0.0%**
Total for West Virginia	**-125**	**-126**	**0**	**-251**	**-133**	**-384**	**-0.7%**

Economic Area / Region of Influence Installation	Net Job Changes			Direct Job Changes	Indirect Job Changes	Total Job Changes	Changes as % of Area's Employment
	Military	Civilian	Contractor				
Wisconsin							
La Crosse, WI-MN Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment =*		*89,588*	*jobs*
Navy Reserve Center La Crosse	-7	0	0	-7	-2	-9	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-7**	**0**	**0**	**-7**	**-2**	**-9**	**0.0%**
Madison, WI Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment =*		*401,730*	*jobs*
Armed Forces Reserve Center Madison	40	8	0	48	21	69	0.0%
Dane County Airport	18	37	22	77	56	133	0.0%
Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Madison	-23	-3	0	-26	-10	-36	0.0%
Olson U.S. Army Reserve Center, Madison	-113	0	0	-113	-42	-155	0.0%
U.S. Army Reserve Center O'Connell	-11	-1	0	-12	-4	-16	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-89**	**41**	**22**	**-26**	**21**	**-5**	**0.0%**
Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment =*		*986,431*	*jobs*
Gen Mitchell International Airport ARS	-23	-250	0	-273	-217	-490	0.0%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-23**	**-250**	**0**	**-273**	**-217**	**-490**	**0.0%**
Monroe County, WI				*Area's Total Employment =*		*23,884*	*jobs*
Fort McCoy	-282	51	0	-231	-135	-366	-1.5%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-282**	**51**	**0**	**-231**	**-135**	**-366**	**-1.5%**
Total for Wisconsin	**-401**	**-158**	**22**	**-537**	**-334**	**-871**	**-1.6%**
Wyoming							
Cheyenne, WY Metropolitan Statistical Area				*Area's Total Employment =*		*55,849*	*jobs*
Army Aviation Support Facility Cheyenne	-23	0	0	-23	-10	-33	-0.1%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-23**	**0**	**0**	**-23**	**-10**	**-33**	**-0.1%**
Hot Springs County, WY				*Area's Total Employment =*		*3,204*	*jobs*
Army National Guard Reserve Center Thermopolis	-19	0	0	-19	-10	-29	-0.9%
Net Changes for This Economic Area	**-19**	**0**	**0**	**-19**	**-10**	**-29**	**-0.9%**
Total for Wyoming	**-42**	**0**	**0**	**-42**	**-20**	**-62**	**-1.0%**

APPENDIX P

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION COSTS FOR DOD'S 33 MAJOR PROPOSED CLOSURES

INSTALLATION	COST TO COMPLETE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION	DOLLARS SPENT THROUGH FY03	OPERATIONAL RANGES COST TO CLOSE	COMMENTS
Kulis Air Guard Station, AK	0*	$0.75M	0	
Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	0	0	0	
Otis Air National Guard Base, MA	$146.78M*	$83.45M	0	
WK Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI	0*	$7.89M	0	
Cannon Air Force Base, NM	$1.20M	$12.5M	0*	Indicates ranges will not be closed
Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	$1.42M	$9.23M	0	
Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA	0	$2.10M	0	
Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD	$27.00M	$67.36M	0*	Indicates ranges will not be closed
Brooks City Base, TX	$4.19M	$41.86M	0	
General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	0	$2.06M	0	Cost to complete is $30K
Air Force Total: 10 sites	**$180.59M**	**$227.20M**	**0**	
Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, CA	$40.30M	$54.9M	0	
Naval Support Activity, Corona, CA	0	0	0	
Naval Submarine Base, New London, CT	$23.90M	$56.5M	0	
Naval Air Station, Atlanta, GA	0	0	0*	
Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, LA	0	$0.3M	0	
Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, ME	$47.10M	$46.8M	0	
Naval Station, Pascagoula, MS	0	0	0*	

Installation	Cost to Complete Environmental Restoration	Dollars Spent Through FY03	Operational Ranges Cost to Close	Comments
Naval Air Station, Joint Reserve Base, Willow Grove, PA	$10.31M	$6.3M	0	
Naval Station, Ingleside, TX	0	0	0*	
Navy Total: 9 sites	**$121.61M**	**$164.80M**	**0**	
Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA	$10.50M*	$50.2M	0	
Fort Gillem, GA	$18.00M*	$27.1M	$8.8–21.4M	11 operational ranges
Fort McPherson, GA	$8.90M*	$11.1M	$3.1–29.3M	4 operational & 2 small arms ranges
Newport Chemical Depot, IN	$1.22M*	$16.3M	0*	Has potential buried VX munitions, cost TBD
Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS	$33.18M*	$30.7M	$4.7–46.6M	5 operational & 2 small arms ranges
U.S. Army Garrison Selfridge, MI	$13.30M	0	0	
Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS	$2.3M*	0	0	
Hawthorne Army Depot, NV	$383.20M*	$28.5M	$29.2–324.8M	16 operational ranges
Fort Monmouth, NJ	$2.90M*	$11M	$15.3–110M	11 operational ranges
Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR	$10.29M	$53.5M	$0.5–20M	Additional costs for UXO and or chemical contamination
Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX	$2.74M	$21.3M	$1–24.2M	3 operational ranges
Red River Army Depot, TX	$62.56M	$17.9M	$6.4–73.9M	8 operational & 2 small arms ranges
Deseret Chemical Depot, UT	$66.85M	$23.3M	$1–5M	UXO, chemical weapons, building decontamination and range cleanup
Fort Monroe, VA	0*	$1.8M	0*	No operational ranges; UXO in moat, no estimate given
Army total: 14 sites	**$615.94M**	**$292.70M**	**$70 M to 655.2 M**	
Total all 33 major proposed closures	**$918.14M**	**$684.70M**	**$70M to $655.2M**	

Cost-to-complete environmental restoration includes military munitions response program costs.

All cost data pulled from the Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts provided by DoD, unless marked by an *.

* Revised or verified cost to complete data from DoD clearinghouse responses.

Potential Environmental Impacts to Reuse for Selected Major DoD Recommendations

Otis Air National Guard Base, Massachusetts

The Otis Air National Guard Base is located on the much larger (approximately 22,000 acres) Massachusetts Military Reservation (MMR), which in turn is listed on the National Priorities List ("Super Fund"). The facility has spent $83,453,000 through FY03 on environmental restoration, and the estimated cost to complete is $146,783,000. The Air Force detected volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in onsite monitoring wells near the base landfill and a Fire Training Area. Monitoring had also detected VOCs in several hundred private wells (all of which now use safe municipal water) and in one town well (which is shut down). The EPA has designated the Sagamore Lens underlying MMR as a sole-source aquifer under the Safe Drinking Water Act. The groundwater is contaminated with VOCs, including trichloroethane, tetrachloroethylene, ethylene dibromide, carbon tetrachloride, and dichloroethylene. Ethylene dibromide has been found to be upwelling in two separate locations, outside the MMR property boundaries, within cranberry bogs in Mashpee and Falmouth. Contaminated groundwater could also pose a threat to the environment within several ponds and streams used for recreation. Soil contamination primarily includes heavy metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, pesticides, and PCBs. Possible residential reuse of Otis, therefore, would be impacted by the risks of these contaminants' creating future residential exposures as well as ecological risks.

W.K Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, Michigan

The facility is located on 320 acres of leased property, and $7,890,000 has been spent through FY03 on environmental restoration, with the Air Force estimating a cost to complete of $0. As part of the cleanup, landfills and a surface storage yard were capped. Ground water contamination was not delineated on a site-specific basis, although there are small pockets of contamination, and the facility installed monitors at the fence line to confirm that contamination does not migrate offsite. If the facility is closed, land-use controls will be needed to prevent use of the ground water and impacts to the capped landfills. The current cost-to-complete estimate does not account for the potential additional workload required to implement the land-use controls or to verify the extent of ground-water contamination (which is unknown)..

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota

The facility is located on 4,858 acres and is on the National Priorities List, and $67,364,000 had been spent through FY03 on environmental restoration, with an estimated cost to complete of $26,983,000. Ground-water contamination, capped landfills, and monitored natural attenuation at the facility will require institutional controls and long-term groundwater monitoring. Waste is still onsite under presumptive-remedy landfill caps, so continued monitoring and maintenance on the cap will be needed. Ground-water cleanup could be ongoing for anywhere from 5 years to 30 years, depending on the location of the contamination plume. Construction completion for environmental restoration is scheduled for 2028.

Fort McPherson, Georgia

The facility is located on 487 acres, and $11,100,000 had been spent through FY03 on environmental restoration, with an estimated DERA cost to complete of $120,000. The estimated MMRP cost to complete is $8,780,000, for a total of $8,900,000. In addition to these costs, the facility has four operational ranges and two small-arms ranges with estimated closure and cleanup costs from $3,080,000 to $29,300,000. The MMRP is still a new program, and costs are being revised as the initial surveys are completed.

Newport Chemical Depot, Indiana

The facility is located on 7,098 acres, and $16,300,000 has been spent through FY03 on environmental restoration, with an estimated cost to complete of $1,220,000. Cleanup is being completed under a permit issued by the state. Corrective action has been completed at the majority of the identified solid-waste management units. Removal and decontamination of the former VX plant has started, and the chemical agent disposal facility began destruction of VX stockpiles earlier this year. Although this installation listed no MMRP cost, the program is still new, and the costs are being revised as the initial surveys are completed. For example, the Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2004 reported Newport's MMRP costs as $3,286,000.

Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas

The facility is located on 13,727 acres, and $30,700,000 had been spent through FY03 on environmental restoration, with an estimated cost to complete of $33,180,000. No MMRP cost to complete was provided. In addition, the facility has five operational ranges and two small-arms ranges with estimated closure costs from $4,700,000 to $46,600,000. Cleanup is being completed under a permit issued by EPA, which requires investigation at several landfills, open burn/open detonation areas, and fly ash/lime slurry pits from the power plant. Construction completion for environmental restoration is scheduled for 2011.

Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, Mississippi

The facility is located on 4,337 acres, containing three manufacturing complexes. Available data indicate that very little had been spent through FY03 on environmental restoration, with an estimated cost to complete of $2,300,000. Although this installation listed no MMRP cost, the program is new, and costs are being revised as the initial surveys are completed. For example, the Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2004 reported MMRP cost of $8,413,000.

Hawthorne Army Depot, Nevada

The facility is located on 147,189 acres of land withdrawn from public use. After all remedial work is complete and if the site is closed, the land would be returned to the Bureau of Land Management. Approximately $28,500,000 has been spent on environmental restoration, with an estimated DERA cost to complete of $21,600,000 and an estimated MMRP cost to complete of $361,600,000, for a grand total of $383,200,000. In addition, the facility has 16 operational ranges with estimated closure costs from $29,200,000 to $324,800,000. Environmental restoration includes remediation of soils and groundwater contaminated with explosive residues, ground water contaminated with chlorinated solvents, and landfills with unknown munitions/ordinance and pesticides. In addition, some buildings could be contaminated with explosives. Construction completion for environmental restoration is scheduled for 2032. The MMRP is a new program, and costs are being revised as the initial surveys are completed. For example, the Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2004 reported MMRP costs of $444,276,000 for this installation, an increase of $82,676,000 over FY 2003.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

The facility is located on 1,338 acres, and $11,000,000 has been spent on environmental restoration, with an estimated DERA cost to complete of $2,900,000. In addition, the facility has 11 operational ranges, with estimated closure costs from $15,300,000 to $110,000,000. Environmental restoration remaining includes removal of polychlorinated biphenyl spill areas and hazard abatement within historic buildings. Although this installation listed no MMRP cost, the program is new and costs are being revised as the initial surveys are completed. For example, the Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2004 reported MMRP costs of $1,198,000.

Red River Army Depot, Texas

The facility is located on 19,081 acres, with 765 acres transferred during the 1995 BRAC round. The facility has spent $17,900,000 on environmental restoration through FY03, with an estimated DERA cost to complete of $35,720,000. The estimated MMRP cost to complete is $26,840,000, for a total of $62,560,000. In addition to these costs, the facility has eight operational ranges and two small-arms ranges with estimated closure costs from $6,400,000 to $73,900,000. There exists environmental contamination (perchlorates) delineated to the property boundaries from the smaller previous BRAC round portion, and it is presumed to be offsite as well. Other sites include potential sediment contamination, landfills, open burn/open detonation areas, munitions, and special-purpose concrete igloos. Construction completion for environmental restoration is scheduled for 2032. The MMRP is a new program, and costs are being revised as the initial surveys are completed.

Deseret Chemical Depot, Utah

The facility has spent $23,300,000 on environmental restoration through FY03, with an estimated DERA cost to complete of $7,250,000 and an estimated MMRP cost to complete of $59,600,000 (with a total of $66,850,000). The facility has

potential chemical weapons disposal areas, open burn/open detonation areas, and potential building decontamination that will be required. Construction completion for the environmental restoration is scheduled for 2032. The MMRP is a new program, and costs are being revised for many facilities as the initial surveys are completed. The Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2004 reported MMRP costs of $170,125,000 for this installation, an increase of $110,525,000 over FY 2003.

Fort Monroe, Virginia

The facility is located on 570 acres, and field sampling for ground water, surface water, and soils for other possible environmental contaminants is incomplete. The summary reports indicated that no DERA money was being spent at the facility, and there was no MMRP cost shown. However, during the site visit, the facility provided information that the MMRP cost to complete could require investments of up to $192,000,000, with a completion date of 2049. The MMRP is a new program, and costs are being revised as the initial surveys are completed. For example, the Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2004 reported MMRP costs of $201,165,000.

Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, California

This 12,800-acre site contains two geographically separate units: the Inland (5,170 acres) and Tidal (7,630 acres). DoD's proposal closes only the Inland facility, except those parts necessary to support the Tidal operations. The facility is on the National Priorities List, and $57,900,000 of environmental restoration has been spent, with an estimated cost to complete of $40,300,000. It is unknown how much of these costs are directly related to the Inland portion of the site. Environmental contamination at the site includes elevated arsenic in soils in the 500-acre Main Magazine Area; supplemental investigation in the planning stage to assess offsite residences, other magazine areas, and Mt. Diablo Creek (sediments); as well as low-level perchlorate detected in the former Open Burn and Fire Training Area. Construction completion for environmental restoration is scheduled for 2023. The MMRP is a new program, and costs are being revised as the initial surveys are completed. For example, the Defense Environmental Programs Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2004 reported MMRP costs as $33,840,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut

Included on the National Priorities List, this 576-acre facility has spent $56,500,000 through FY03 on environmental restoration, with an estimated cost to complete of $23,900,000. Three landfills have been capped, and seven removal actions have been completed, with additional investigations under way in the Lower Sub Base Area and for ground water throughout the base. The reuse and redevelopment at this facility may be impacted by land-use restrictions. Construction completion for environmental restoration is scheduled for 2020, and although no MMRP costs were listed, the program is new, and costs are being revised as the initial surveys are completed.

Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, New Hampshire

Included on the National Priorities List, this facility occupies a 278-acre site, two-thirds of which is covered by a high-density industrial area containing 376 buildings. About $46,800,000 had been spent through FY03 on environmental restoration, with an estimated cost to complete of $47,100,000. The facility includes landfills, potential sediment contamination, and ground-water contamination, and investigations are under way at all remaining sites. A former storage yard has been capped, with plans under way to cap the remaining landfill. Construction completion for environmental restoration is scheduled for 2016. Although this installation listed no MMRP cost, the program is new, and the costs are being revised as the initial surveys are completed.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX Q

TEXT OF 2005 DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION FINAL AND APPROVED RECOMMENDATIONS

A BILL TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PRESIDENT UNDER THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACT OF 1990

EXTRACT FROM THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACT OF 1990, AS AMENDED.

Section. 2913. Final selection criteria for additional round of base closures and realignments.

(a) Final selection criteria. The final criteria to be used by the Secretary in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part in 2005 shall be the military value and other criteria specified in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) Military value criteria. The military value criteria are as follows:

(1) **[Criterion 1]** The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department of Defense, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.

(2) **[Criterion 2]** The availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.

(3) **[Criterion 3]** The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training.

(4) **[Criterion 4]** The cost of operations and the manpower implications.

(c) Other criteria. The other criteria that the Secretary shall use in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part in 2005 are as follows:

(1) **[Criterion 5]** The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.

(2) **[Criterion 6]** The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.

(3) **[Criterion 7]** The ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel.

(4) **[Criterion 8]** The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities.

(d) Priority given to military value. The Secretary shall give priority consideration to the military value criteria specified in subsection (b) in the making of recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations.

(e) Effect on Department and other agency costs. The selection criteria relating to the cost savings or return on investment from the proposed closure or realignment of military installations shall take into account the effect of the proposed closure or realignment on the costs of any other activity of the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency that may be required to assume responsibility for activities at the military installations.

CHAPTER I. DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. FORT WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA (ARMY 5).[1]

a. **Realign Fort Wainwright, AK,** by relocating the Cold Regions Test Center (CRTC) headquarters from Fort Wainwright, AK, to Fort Greely, AK.

2. FORT GILLEM, GEORGIA (ARMY 6).

a. **Close Fort Gillem, GA.** Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Rock Island Arsenal, IL. Relocate the 2d Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52d Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Group to Fort Campbell, KY. Relocate the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Fort Benning, GA. Relocate the 3d US Army Headquarters support office to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Headquarters US Forces Command (FORSCOM) VIP Explosive Ordnance Support to Pope Air Force Base, NC.

b. **Close the Army-Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) Atlanta Distribution Center** and establish a contiguous enclave [2] for the Georgia Army National Guard, the remainder of the 81st RRC units and the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Forensics Laboratory.

3. FORT MCPHERSON, GEORGIA (ARMY 8).[3]

a. **Close Fort McPherson, GA.** Relocate the Headquarters US Army Forces Command (FORSCOM), and the Headquarters US Army Reserve Command (USARC) to Pope Air Force Base, NC. Relocate the Headquarters 3d US Army to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Installation Management Agency Southeastern Region Headquarters and the US Army Network Enterprise Technology Command (NETCOM) Southeastern Region Headquarters to Fort Eustis, VA. Relocate the Army Contracting Agency Southern Region Headquarters to Fort Sam Houston.

4. FORT BRAGG, NORTH CAROLINA (ARMY 10).[4]

a. **Realign Fort Bragg, NC,** by relocating the 7th Special Forces Group (SFG) to Eglin AFB, FL, and by activating the 4th Brigade Combat Team (BCT), 82d Airborne Division and relocating European-based forces to Fort Bragg, NC.

5. FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY (ARMY 11).

a. **Close Fort Monmouth, NJ.** Relocate the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY. Relocate the Joint Network Management System Program Office to Fort Meade, MD. Relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as

[1] By Motion G-1-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[2] By Motion 2-4A, the Commission struck the language "establish an enclave" and inserted in its place "establish a contiguous enclave".

[3] By Motion G-1-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[4] By Motion G-4-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Inventory Control Point functions, detachment of Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate Information Systems, Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research and Development & Acquisition (RDA) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate the elements of the Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems and consolidate into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA.

b. **Realign Fort Belvoir, VA** by relocating and consolidating Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare Research, Development and Acquisition activities to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD except the Night Vision and Electronic Sensors Directorate (the Night Vision Lab) and the Project Manager Night Vision/Reconnaissance, Surveillance and Target Acquisition (PM NV/RSTA), and by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Research and Development and Acquisition (except for the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.[5]

c. **Realign Army Research Institute, Fort Knox, KY**, by relocating Human Systems Research to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

d. **Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL**, by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Development and Acquisition to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

e. **Realign the PM Acquisition, Logistics and Technology Enterprise Systems and Services (ALTESS) facility at 2511 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA**, a leased installation, by relocating and consolidating into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA.

f. The Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the[6] Congressional Committees of Jurisdiction, that movement of organizations, functions, or activities from Fort Monmouth to Aberdeen Proving Ground will be accomplished without disruption of their support to the Global War on Terrorism or other critical contingency operations, and that safeguards exist to ensure that necessary redundant capabilities are put in place to mitigate potential degradation of such support, and to ensure maximum retention of critical workforce.[7]

6. Fort Hood, Texas (Army 15).[8]

a. **Realign Fort Hood, TX**, by relocating a Brigade Combat Team (BCT) and Unit of Employment (UEx) Headquarters to Fort Carson, CO.

7. Red River Army Depot, Texas (Army 16).

a. **Realign Red River Army Depot, TX.**[9] Relocate the storage and demilitarization functions of the Munitions Center to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK. Relocate the munitions maintenance functions of the Munitions Center to

---

[5] By Motion 5-3A, the Commission struck the entire text of the former paragraph "b", which read "**Realign Fort Belvoir, VA** by relocating and consolidating Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare Research, Development and Acquisition activities to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Research and Development and Acquisition (except for the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD."

By Motion 5-4C, the Commission inserted a new paragraph "b", as reflected above.

[6] A verbal motion by Commissioner Skinner, with the concurrence of Commissioner Coyle, deleted the language "certify to the President, and provide copies of such certification to" and inserted in its place "shall submit a report to the".

[7] By Motion 5-4D, the Commission appended a new paragraph "f", as reflected above.

[8] By Motion G-4-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[9] By Motion 7-4A, the Commission struck the language "**Close Red River Army Depot, TX**. Relocate the depot maintenance of Armament and Structural Components, Combat Vehicles, Depot Fleet/Field Support, Engines and Transmissions, Fabrication and Manufacturing, Fire Control Systems and Components, and Other to Anniston Army Depot, AL. Relocate the depot maintenance of Powertrain Components, and Starters/Generators to Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Relocate the depot maintenance of Construction Equipment to Anniston Army Depot, AL, and Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Vehicles to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA and Letterkenny Depot, PA." and replaced it with the language "**Realign Red River Army Depot,**

McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK, and Blue Grass Army Depot, KY. Relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA. Disestablish the supply, storage, and distribution functions for tires, packaged Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants, and compressed gases.

8. Fort Monroe, Virginia (Army 19).[10]

a. **Close Fort Monroe, VA.** Relocate the US Army Training & Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Headquarters, the Installation Management Agency (IMA) Northeast Region Headquarters, the US Army Network Enterprise Technology Command (NETCOM) Northeast Region Headquarters and the Army Contracting Agency Northern Region Office to Fort Eustis, VA. Relocate the US Army Accessions Command and US Army Cadet Command to Fort Knox, KY.

9. Maneuver Training (Army 20).[11]

a. **Realign Fort Knox, KY**, by relocating the Armor Center and School to Fort Benning, GA, to accommodate the activation of an Infantry Brigade Combat Team (BCT) at Fort Knox, KY, and the relocation of engineer, military police, and combat service support units from Europe and Korea.

b. **Realign Fort McCoy, WI**, by relocating the 84th Army Reserve Regional Training Center to Fort Knox, KY.

10. Operational Army (IGPBS) (Army 22).[12]

a. **Realign Fort Bliss, TX** by relocating air defense artillery units to Fort Sill and relocating 1st Armored Division and various echelons above division units from Germany and Korea to Fort Bliss, TX.

b. **Realign Fort Sill** by relocating an artillery (Fires) brigade to Fort Bliss.

c. **Realign Fort Hood, TX** by relocating maneuver battalions, a support battalion, and aviation units to Fort Bliss, TX.

d. **Realign Fort Riley, KS** by inactivating various units, activating a Brigade Combat Team (BCT) and relocating 1st Infantry Division units and various echelons above division units from Germany and Korea to Fort Riley, KS.

e. **Realign Fort Campbell, KY**, by relocating an attack aviation battalion to Fort Riley, KS.

11. RC Transformation in Alabama (Army 25).[13]

a. **Realign Birmingham Armed Forces Reserve Center, Birmingham, AL**, by relocating Detachment 1, 450th Military Police Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center(AFRC) on or near Birmingham Air National Guard Base, Birmingham, Alabama, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Alabama National Guard units from the following Alabama ARNG Readiness Centers: Fort Graham, Fort Hanna and Fort Terhune, Birmingham, Alabama, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close the Wright United States Army Reserve Center, Mobile, AL** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Mobile, Alabama, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Alabama National Guard units from the following Alabama

---

TX.", and struck the language "Relocate the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot to the Defense Distribution Depot, Oklahoma City, OK."

[10] By Motion G-1-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[11] By Motion G-9-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[12] By Motion G-4-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[13] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

ARNG Readiness Centers: Fort Ganey, and Fort Hardeman, Mobile, Alabama, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

c. **Close the Faith Wing United States Army Reserve Center on Fort McClellan, AL** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Pelham Range in Anniston, Alabama.

d. **Close the Finnell United States Army Reserve Center and the Area Maintenance Support Activity, Tuscaloosa, AL, and the Vicksburg United States Army Reserve Center, Vicksburg, Mississippi,** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Area Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA) in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and AMSA shall have the capability to accommodate the 31st Chemical Brigade from the Northport Alabama Army National Guard Readiness Center, and units from the Fort Powell-Shamblin Alabama Army National Guard Readiness Center, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

e. **Close the Screws Army Reserve Center in Montgomery, AL; close the Cleveland Abbot Army Reserve Center, Tuskegee, AL; close the Harry Gary, Jr. Army Reserve Center, in Enterprise, AL; close the Quarles-Flowers Army Reserve Center in Decatur, AL; close the Grady Anderson Army Reserve Center, Troy, AL;** and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) at the Alabama Army National Guard Joint Forces Headquarters Complex in Montgomery, AL, if the Army is able to acquire suitable property for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate ARNG units currently located on the Alabama Army National Guard Joint Forces Headquarters Complex in Montgomery, Alabama, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

12. Reserve Component Transformation in Arizona (Army 28).[14]

a. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Allen Hall near Tucson AZ and the Area Maintenance Support Activity 18 on Fort Huachuca, AZ** by relocating all units from the closed facilities to an Armed Forces Reserve Center and maintenance facility on the Arizona Army National Guard Silverbell Army Heliport/Pinal Air Park in Marana, Arizona, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Arizona National Guard 860th MP Company and the 98th Troop Command from Papago Park Readiness Center, if the State of Arizona decides to relocate those units.

b. **Close the Deer Valley United States Army Reserve Center (#2) in Phoenix** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the Arizona Army National Guard Buckeye Training Site. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Army National Guard Phoenix Readiness Center, if the State of Arizona decides to relocate those units.

13. Reserve Component Transformation in Arkansas (Army 30).[15]

a. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Arkadelphia, AR** and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Arkadelphia, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Arkadelphia if the State of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

b. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Camden, AR** and relocate units into an Armed Forces Reserve Center by converting the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Camden if the state decides to alter their facility.

c. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, El Dorado, AR** and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in El Dorado, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, El Dorado if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

---

[14] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[15] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

d. **Realign the Army Reserve Center, Darby, AR,** by relocating the 341st Engineer Company and elements of the 75th Division (Exercise) from buildings #2552-2560, 2516, and 2519, Fort Chaffee, AR into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center, on Fort Chaffee, AR. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the following Arkansas National Guard Readiness Centers: the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Charleston, AR, the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Van Buren, AR, and the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Fort Smith, AR, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

e. **Close the Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site (ECS), Barling, AR** and relocate units to a new Joint Maintenance Facility on Fort Chaffee, Arkansas. The new Joint Maintenance Facility shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Combined Support Maintenance Shop (CSMS) on Fort Chaffee if the State of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

f. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Hot Springs, AR and the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Activity (OMS), Malvern, AR** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on property located in Hot Springs, AR, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas Army National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center in Hot Springs, AR if the State of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

g. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Jonesboro, AR and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Field Maintenance Site in Jonesboro, AR** if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Jonesboro, AR, the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Paragould, AR and the Field Maintenance Site (FMS), Jonesboro, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

h. **Close the Pond United States Army Reserve Center, Fayetteville, Arkansas** and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Northwest Arkansas, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Centers in Fayetteville, Springdale, Rogers and Bentonville, Arkansas if the State of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

i. **Close the Stone United States Army Reserve Center, Pine Bluff, AR** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Pine Bluff if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

14. Reserve Component Transformation in California (Army 33).[16]

a. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Moffett Field, CA, the George Richey United States Army Reserve Center, San Jose, CA, and the Jones Hall United States Army Reserve Center, Mountain View, CA** and relocate units to a new armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Shop on existing Army Reserve property on Moffett Field, California. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate California National Guard Units from the following California ARNG Readiness Centers: Sunnyvale, California, San Lorenzo, California, Redwood City, California, and the Organizational Maintenance Shop, San Jose, California, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close the Desiderio United States Army Reserve Center, Pasadena, CA, the Schroeder Hall United States Army Reserve Center, Long Beach, CA, the Hazard Park United States Army Reserve Center, Los Angeles, CA,** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on property being transferred to the Army Reserve from the General Services Administration at Bell, California. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate California National Guard Units from the following California ARNG Readiness Centers: Bell, California, and Montebello, California, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

[16] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

15. Reserve Component Transformation in Connecticut (Army 35).[17]

a. **Close Turner US Army Reserve Center, Fairfield, CT, close Sutcovey US Army Reserve Center, Waterbury, CT; close Danbury US Army Reserve Center Danbury, CT,** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Maintenance Facility in Newtown, CT, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities adjacent to the existing CT Army National Guard Armory in Newtown, CT. The new AFRC and OMS shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Connecticut Army National Guard Armories in Naugatuck, Norwalk and New Haven, CT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close the US Army Reserve Center, Middletown, CT, the Organizational Maintenance Shop, Middletown, CT; the SGT Libby US Army Reserve Center, New Haven, CT; the Organizational Maintenance Shop, New Haven, CT; the Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity #69, Milford, CT** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center, Organizational Maintenance Shop and Army Maintenance Support Activity in Middletown, Connecticut, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC, OMS and AMSA shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Connecticut Army National Guard Armories in Putnam, Manchester, New Britain and the CTARNG facility in Newington, CT if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

16. Reserve Component Transformation in Delaware (Army 37).[18]

a. **Close the Major Robert Kirkwood United States Army Reserve Center and its organizational maintenance shop in Newark, DE** and re-locate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and organizational maintenance support facility in Newark, DE, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Delaware Army National Guard units from the William Nelson Armory in Middletown, DE, if the state decided to relocate those units.

17. Reserve Component Transformation in Georgia (Army 39).[19]

a. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Columbus, GA** and relocate and consolidate those units together with Army Reserve Units currently on Fort Benning into a new United States Army Reserve Center on Fort Benning, GA.

18. Reserve Component Transformation in Hawaii (Army 40).[20]

a. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Hilo (SFC Minoru Kunieda), HI** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Keaukaha Military Reservation if the Army can acquire suitable land for the construction of the new facilities. The New AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Hawaii National Guard units from the following Hawaii ARNG Armories: Keaau and Honokaa if the state decides to relocate those units.

19. Reserve Component Transformation in Illinois (Army 42).[21]

a. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Marion, IL,** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Carbondale, IL, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new

---

[17] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[18] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[19] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[20] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[21] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Illinois National Guard Units from the following Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Cairo, IL and Carbondale, IL, if the State of Illinois decides to relocate those units.

b. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Centralia, IL and the United States Army Reserve Center in Fairfield, IL**, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Mt. Vernon, IL. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Illinois National Guard Units from the following Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Mt. Vernon (17B75), IL, Mt. Vernon (17B73), IL, and Salem (17C65), IL, if the State of Illinois decides to relocate those units.

c. **Close the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Waukegan, IL** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Lake County, IL, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Illinois National Guard Units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center in Waukegan, IL, if the State of Illinois decides to relocate those units.

20. Reserve Component Transformation in Indiana (Army 44).[22]

a. **Close Lafayette United States Army Reserve Center in Lafayette, IN** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on the site of the existing Indiana Army Guard Armory (18B75) Lafayette, IN, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Indiana National Guard units from the following Indiana ARNG Readiness Centers: Boswell, IN, Attica, IN, Delphi, IN, Remington, IN, Monticello, IN, and Darlington, IN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Realign Charles H. Seston United States Army Reserve Center** by relocating the 402d Engineer Company and Detachment 1 of the 417th Petroleum Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Greenwood and Franklin, IN, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Indiana National Guard units from the Camp Atterbury Army National Guard Readiness Center (Building #500), and the 219th Area Support Group Readiness Center (Building #4), Camp Atterbury, IN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

21. Reserve Component Transformation in Iowa (Army 46).[23]

a. **Close the Recruiting Battalion Headquarters and Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) leased facilities in Des Moines** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and MEPS at Camp Dodge, IA. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center located at Camp Dodge, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

a. **b. Close the United States Army Reserve Center and the Area Maintenance Support Activity in Middletown, IA** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) with an Organizational Maintenance and Vehicle Storage Facility on Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, IA. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Burlington Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Burlington, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

c. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Muscatine, IA** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) in Muscatine, IA, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Muscatine Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Muscatine, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

d. **Close the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Cedar Rapids, IA** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) with an Organizational Maintenance Facility (OMF) in Cedar Rapids, IA, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from

[22] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[23] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

the Cedar Rapids Army National Guard Readiness Center and its Organizational Maintenance Facility located in Cedar Rapids, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

22. Reserve Component Transformation in Kentucky (Army 48).[24]

a. **Close the Richmond US Army Reserve Center, Maysville US Army Reserve Center** and relocate and consolidate those units with Army Reserve units currently on Bluegrass Army Depot into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Field Maintenance Facility (FMS) on Blue Grass Army Depot, KY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Kentucky National Guard units located on Bluegrass Army Depot, KY, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close the Paducah Memorial United States Army Reserve Center and the Paducah #2 United States Army Reserve Center** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Field Maintenance Shop (FMS) adjacent to the Paducah Airport, Paducah, KY, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and FMS shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Paducah Army National Guard Readiness Center and the Kentucky Army National Guard Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS) #2, Paducah, KY, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

23. Reserve Component Transformation in Louisiana (Army 50).[25]

a. **Close the Roberts United States Army Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA** and **the Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Baton Rouge, LA**, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Field Maintenance Shop on suitable state property adjacent to the Baton Rouge Airport (State Property). The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Louisiana National Guard Units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Baton Rouge, LA and the Army National Guard Organizational Maintenance Shop #8 located in Baton Rouge, LA if the State of Louisiana decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close United States Army Reserve Center, Shreveport, LA**, and **the United States Army Reserve Center, Bossier City, LA** and relocate all Reserve Component units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center that will be constructed on or adjacent to the Naval-Marine Corps Reserve Center[26] in Bossier City, LA if the Army is able to acquire suitable property for construction of the facilities.

24. Reserve Component Transformation in Maryland (Army 52).[27]

a. **Close the Flair Memorial Armed Forces Reserve Center and its organizational maintenance shop in Frederick, MD** and re-locate US Army Reserve and US Marine Corps Reserve units to new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center and organizational maintenance support facility on Fort Detrick, MD.

25. Reserve Component Transformation in Massachusetts (Army 54).[28]

a. **Close the Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site 65 Annex, Ayer, MA** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Ayer, MA; **realign the Devens Reserve Forces Training Area, MA**, by relocating the 323d

[24] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[25] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[26] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language ", Shreveport" to avoid confusion over the location of the facility.

[27] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[28] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Maintenance Facility, and the Regional Training Site Maintenance to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex in Ayer, MA; **realign Ayer Area 3713** by relocating storage functions to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex in Ayer, MA. **Realign the Marine Corps Reserve Center Ayer, MA,** by relocating the 1/25th Marines Maintenance Facility, Marine Corps Reserve Electronic Maintenance Section, and Maintenance Company/4th Marine Battalion to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex in Ayer, MA. The new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex shall have the capability to accommodate all Reserve units affected by this recommendation including Army National Guard units from the Ayer Armory and Consolidated Support Maintenance Shop, Ayer, MA, if the Commonwealth of Massachusetts decides to relocate the National Guard units.

26. Reserve Component Transformation in Michigan (Army 55).[29]

a. **Close the US Army Reserve Center Stanford C. Parisian in Lansing, MI, close the Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity #135 in Battle Creek, MI,** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Custer Reserve Training Center, MI.

27. Reserve Component Transformation in Minnesota (Army 57).[30]

a. **Close US Army Reserve Center Faribault, MN** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center at Faribault Industrial Park if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Faribault Minnesota Army National Guard Armory, if the state decides to relocate those units.

b. **Close US Army Reserve Center Cambridge, MN** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Cambridge, MN if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Minnesota ARNG units from the Cambridge Minnesota Army National Guard Armory, if the state decides to relocate those units.

28. Reserve Component Transformation in Missouri (Army 58).[31]

a. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Greentop, MO,** and relocate units to a new United States Army Reserve Center in Kirksville, MO, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

b. **Close the Jefferson Barracks United States Army Reserve Center,** and re-locate units into a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center on Jefferson Barracks, MO, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Missouri Army National Guard Units from the Readiness Center in Jefferson Barracks if the State of Missouri decides to relocate those units.

29. Reserve Component Transformation in Montana (Army 60).[32]

a. **Close Galt Hall Army Reserve Center in Great Falls, MT** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, MT.

b. **Close Army Reserve Center Veuve Hall (building #26) and Area Maintenance Support Activity #75 on Fort Missoula, MT,** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Missoula, MT if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Montana

---

[29] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[30] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[31] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[32] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

National Guard units from the Montana Army National Guard Armory in Missoula, MT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

30. Reserve Component Transformation in Nebraska (Army 62).[33]

a. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Wymore, NE**, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in the vicinity of Beatrice, NE, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard units from the following Nebraska ARNG Readiness Centers: Fairbury, NE, Falls City, NE and Troop C, 1-167th Cavalry in Beatrice, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Columbus, NE**, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Columbus, NE. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard units from the Nebraska ARNG Readiness Center, Columbus, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

c. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Hastings, NE**, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Greenlief Training Site in Nebraska. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard units from the following Nebraska ARNG Readiness Centers: Grand Island, NE, Crete, NE, and Hastings, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

d. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Kearney, NE**, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Kearney, NE if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard units from the Nebraska ARNG Readiness Center, Kearney, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

e. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in McCook, NE**, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in McCook, NE, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard units from the Nebraska ARNG Readiness Center, McCook, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

31. Reserve Component Transformation in New Hampshire (Army 65).[34]

a. **Close Paul Doble Army Reserve Center in Portsmouth, NH**; and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and associated training and maintenance facilities adjacent to Pease Air National Guard Base, NH, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and complex will have the capability to accommodate New Hampshire National Guard units from the following New Hampshire ARNG armories: Rochester, Portsmouth, Somersworth and Dover, NH, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

32. Reserve Component Transformation in New Jersey (Army 66).[35]

a. **Close the Nelson Brittin Army Reserve Center in Camden, NJ** and relocate units to a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center in Camden, NJ, if the Army can acquire suitable land for the construction of the new facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the New Jersey ARNG Armory, Burlington, if the state decides to relocate those units.

---

[33] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[34] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[35] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

33. Reserve Component Transformation in New Mexico (Army 68).[36]

a. **Close the Jenkins Armed Forces Reserve Center located in Albuquerque, NM** and re-locate the units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Kirtland Air Force Base.

34. Reserve Component Transformation in New York (Army 69).[37]

a. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Stewart-Newburg, NY** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Stewart Army Sub-Post adjacent to Stewart Air National Guard Base, NY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate New York National Guard units from the Readiness Center at Newburg, NY, if the State of New York decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center and Army Maintenance Support Activity, Niagara Falls, NY** and construct a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the existing site or on the former Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, if a suitable site is available,[38] in Niagara Falls, NY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the NY National Guard units from the Niagara Falls Readiness Center, if the state of New York decides to relocate those National Guard units.

c. **Close the BG Theodore Roosevelt United States Army Reserve Center, Uniondale, NY, the Amityville Armed Forces Reserve Center (Army Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve), Amityville, NY**, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Shop on federal property licensed to the New York Army National Guard in Farmingdale, NY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate New York National Guard units from the following New York Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Bayshore, Freeport, Huntington Station, Patchogue and Riverhead, and Organizational Maintenance Shop 21, Bayshore, NY, if the State of New York decides to relocate those National Guard units.

35. Reserve Component Transformation in North Carolina (Army 72).[39]

a. **Close the Army Reserve Adrian B. Rhodes Armed Forces Reserve Center in Wilmington, NC, close the Rock Hill Armed Forces Reserve Center in Rock Hill, South Carolina, close the Niven Armed Forces Reserve Center in Albermarle, NC** and relocate all Army and Navy units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS) in Wilmington, NC, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

36. Reserve Component Transformation in North Dakota (Army 73).[40]

a. **Close 96th RRC David Johnson USARC in Fargo, ND** and relocate into a new Reserve Center on Hector Field Air National Guard Base.

---

[36] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[37] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[38] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "or on the former Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, if a suitable site is available," to reflect the continuing availability of the former Air Reserve Station. Construction of the AFRC within the fence line of the enclave established by Recommendation 101, as amended, would avoid the redundancies inherent in maintaining two separate installations.

[39] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[40] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

37. Reserve Component Transformation in Ohio (Army 75).[41]

a. **Close the Scouten Army Reserve Center, Mansfield, OH and the Parrott Army Reserve Center, Kenton, OH,** and relocate all units to a new AFRC at Mansfield Air National Guard Base located at Mansfield-Lahm Airport. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Ohio ARNG Armories in Mansfield and Ashland, OH, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close US Army Reserve Center, Springfield OH,** and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the Springfield Air National Guard Base, Springfield, OH. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facility: Ohio ARNG Readiness Center, Springfield, OH; if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

c. **Close Fort Hayes US Army Reserve Center, Columbus, OH and Whitehall US Army Reserve Center, Whitehall, OH** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Ohio ARNG Armories Howey (Columbus), Sullivant (Columbus), Newark, Westerville and Oxford, OH, Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base, Building #943 if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

38. Reserve Component Transformation in Oklahoma (Army 77).[42]

a. **Close the Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) Broken Arrow located in Broken Arrow, OK** and relocate the Army Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve and Naval Reserve units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and consolidated maintenance facility in Broken Arrow, OK if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Broken Arrow, Eufaula, Okmulgee, Tahlequah, Haskell, Cushing, Wagoner and the Field Maintenance Shop (FMS 14) located in Okmulgee, if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close the Keathley and Burris United States Army Reserve Centers located in Lawton and Chickasha, OK; close the Wichita Falls United States Army Reserve Center in Wichita Falls, TX; close the 1st, 3d, 5th, and 6th United States Army Reserve Centers and Equipment Concentration Site (ECS) located on Fort Sill** and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Sill, OK and a new United States Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site to be collocated with the Oklahoma Army National Guard Maneuver Area Training Equipment Site on Fort Sill. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Lawton, Frederick, Anadarko, Chickasha, Marlow, Walters, and Healdton; realign B/1-158 Field Artillery (MLRS) from the Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Duncan if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

c. **Close the Floyd Parker United States Army Reserve Center in McAlester, OK** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Consolidated Field Maintenance Shop on the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, McAlester, OK. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: the Field Maintenance Shop in Durant, OK; the Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers in Atoka, Allen, Hartshorne, Madill, McAlester and Tishomingo, OK; the Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Center and Field Maintenance Shop in Edmond, OK if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

d. **Close the Ashworth United States Army Reserve Center located in Muskogee, OK** and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Muskogee, OK, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Henryetta, Muskogee, Okemah, Pryor, and Stilwell, OK if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

---

[41] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[42] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

e. **Close the Farr United States Army Reserve Center, Antlers, OK, the Roush United States Army Reserve Center, Clinton, OK, the Smalley United States Army Reserve Center, Norman, OK** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Consolidated Maintenance Facility on the Norman Military Complex, Norman, OK. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard facilities: Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers in Tonkawa, OK, Konawa, OK, Wewoka, OK, Oklahoma City (23d Street), OK, the 23d Street Field Maintenance Shop in Oklahoma City, the Consolidated Maintenance Facility on the Norman Military Complex, Norman, OK and C Co, 700th Support Battalion from the Readiness Center, Edmond, OK if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

f. **Close the Manuel Perez and Billy Krowse United States Army Reserve Centers located in Oklahoma City, OK.** Relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in West Oklahoma City, OK, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard facilities: Readiness Centers located in Southwest Oklahoma City (44th Street), El Reno, Minco, and Pawnee, the Oklahoma Army National Guard 1345 Transportation Company and the 345th Quartermaster Water Support Battalion from Midwest City if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

g. **Close the Robbins United States Army Reserve Center located in Enid, OK** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Consolidated Field Maintenance Shop on Vance Air Force Base, OK. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard facilities: Enid, Alva, Woodward, Blackwell, Cherokee, Watonga, and the National Guard Field Maintenance Shop in Enid, OK if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

39. Reserve Component Transformation in Oregon (Army 80).[43]

a. **Close Sears Hall United States Army Reserve Center in Portland, OR, and close Sharff Hall United States Army Reserve Center in Portland, OR,** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Camp Withycombe, OR. The new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) shall have the capability to accommodate Oregon National Guard units currently on Camp Withycombe and from the following Oregon ARNG armories: Lake Oswego Armory, Maison Armory, and Jackson Band Armory, OR, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

40. Reserve Component Transformation in Pennsylvania (Army 82).[44]

a. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Lewisburg, PA, the United States Army Reserve Center in Bloomsburg, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Bloomsburg, PA,** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in the Lewisburg / Bloomsburg, PA area, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Pennsylvania National Guard Units from the following Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Lewisburg, PA, Sunbury, PA, Scranton, PA,[45] and Berwick, PA, if the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania decides to relocate those units.

b. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Williamsport, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Williamsport, PA,** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in Williamsport, PA, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Pennsylvania National Guard units from the

[43] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[44] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[45] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "Scranton, PA" to correct an inconsistency between the underlying data and the text of the recommendation.

Army National Guard Readiness Center in Williamsport, PA, if the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania decides to relocate those units.

c. **Close the Reese United States Army Reserve Center in Chester, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Chester, PA, the Germantown Veterans Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Philadelphia, PA, the Horsham Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Horsham, PA, the 1LT Ray S. Musselman Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Norristown, PA, and the North Penn Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Norristown, PA,** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility at Willow Grove Joint Reserve Base, PA. The Army shall establish an enclave at Willow Grove Joint Reserve Base, PA, to retain essential facilities to support activities of the Reserve Components.

d. **Close the Wilson Kramer United States Army Reserve Center in Bethlehem, PA, and the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Bethlehem, PA,** and relocate units to a new United States Army Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in the Allentown/ Bethlehem, PA area, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

e. **Close the Philadelphia Memorial United States Armed Forces Reserve Center in Philadelphia, PA, the Philadelphia Memorial United States Armed Forces Reserve Center Organizational Maintenance Shop in Philadelphia, PA,** and relocate Army Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in Bristol, PA, on the existing Bristol Veterans Memorial Reserve Center site.

f. **Close the Serrenti Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Scranton, PA, the Serrenti Memorial United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Scranton, PA, the United States Army Reserve Center in Wilkes-Barre, PA,** the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Wilkes-Barre, PA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in Scranton, PA, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

41. Reserve Component Transformation in Puerto Rico (Army 85).[46]

a. **Close the US Army Reserve Center 1LT Paul Lavergne, Bayamon, PR** and relocate the 973d Combat Support (CS) Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on United States Army Reserve property in Ceiba, PR, and relocate all other units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on Fort Buchanan, PR. **Realign the US Army Reserve Center Captain E. Rubio Junior, Puerto Nuevo, PR,** by relocating the 807th Signal Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Buchanan, PR. The new AFRC on Fort Buchanan, PR shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Puerto Rico Army National Guard San Juan Readiness Center, San Juan, PR, if Puerto Rico decides to relocate those National Guard units. The new AFRC facility in Ceiba, PR shall have the capability to accommodate Puerto Rico National Guard units from the following PRARNG Readiness Centers: Humacao, Juncos, and Ceiba, PR, if Puerto Rico decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Realign United States Army Reserve Center Captain E. Rubio Junior, Puerto Nuevo, PR,** by relocating the 8th Brigade, 108th DIV (IT) to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Allen, PR.

c. **Realign United States Army Reserve Center Ramey, Aguadilla, PR** by relocating the 249th Quartermaster Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Mayaguez, PR, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land. The new facility shall have the capability to accommodate Puerto Rico National Guard units from the Puerto Rico Army National Guard Readiness Center Mayaguez, if Puerto Rico decides to relocate those National Guard units.

[46] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

42. Reserve Component Transformation in Rhode Island (Army 87).[47]

a. **Close the Bristol Army Reserve Center, Bristol, RI, the Harwood Army Reserve Center, Providence, RI, the Warwick Army Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop, Warwick, RI.** Relocate all units to a new Army Reserve Center on Newport Naval Base, RI.

43. Reserve Component Transformation in Tennessee (Army 89).[48]

a. **Close the Guerry United States Army Reserve Center, Chattanooga, TN, and Bonney Oaks United States Army Reserve Center, Chattanooga, TN,** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on Volunteer Army Ammunition Plant, Chattanooga, TN.

b. **Close the Kingsport Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC), the Kingsport Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS), and the Army Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA), Kingsport, TN,** and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Field Maintenance Shop on Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Kingsport, TN. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Tennessee National Guard units from the Kingsport Armed Forces Reserve Center, Kingsport, TN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

c. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center outside of Fort Campbell (located in Clarksville TN), KY,** and relocate units, along with units currently in buildings #6912 and #2907 on Fort Campbell into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS) on Fort Campbell, KY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Clarksville Army National Guard Readiness Center, Clarksville, TN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

44. Reserve Component Transformation in Texas (Army 91).[49]

a. **Close the Tharp United States Army Reserve Center, Amarillo, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Amarillo, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Amarillo, Pampa, and Hale Co, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Brownsville, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Brownsville, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Center in Brownsville, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

c. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Boswell, TX and the United States Army Reserve Center, Callaghan, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on existing Federal property on Camp Bullis, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Center in Hondo, TX, A Company and Headquarters Company, 1st of the 141st Infantry, the Fifth Army ITAAS, the Regional Training Site-Intelligence, and the Texas Army National Guard Area Support Medical Battalion, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

d. **Close the Grimes United States Army Reserve Center, Abilene, TX** and relocate B Company of the 413th Civil Affairs Battalion and the Area Maintenance Support Activity 11 Sub-Shop to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Field Maintenance Shop on Dyess Air Force Base, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Abilene, Coleman, and Snyder, TX, and the

---

[47] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[48] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[49] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop, Abilene, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

e. **Close the Roque O Segura United States Army Reserve Center, El Paso, Texas, the Benavidez United States Army Reserve Center, El Paso, Texas, the United States Army Reserve Center #3, Fort Bliss, Texas[50] and the United States Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site, McGregor Range, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Consolidated Equipment Concentration Site and Maintenance Facility on Fort Bliss, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Fort Bliss and Hondo Pass, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

f. **Close the Herzog United States Army Reserve Center, Dallas, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the existing Grand Prairie Reserve Complex, Grand Prairie, TX. **Realign the 490th Civil Affairs Battalion from the Grimes United States Army Reserve Center** and relocate the unit into the new AFRC. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Arlington, TX, and California Crossing, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

g. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Pasadena, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Field Maintenance Shop in (East) Houston, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Baytown, Pasadena, and Ellington Field, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop located on Ellington Field, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

h. **Close United States Army Reserve Center #2, Perimeter Park, TX and United States Army Reserve Center #3, Houston, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a consolidated Field Maintenance Shop in (Northwest) Houston, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Beaumont, Port Arthur, Port Neches, and Orange, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop located in Port Neches, TX if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

i. **Close the Miller United States Army Reserve Center, Huntsville, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Huntsville, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Center in Huntsville, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

j. **Close the Muchert United States Army Reserve Center, Dallas, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center Lewisville, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Denton, Irving, and Denison, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

k. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Lufkin, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Lufkin, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Lufkin and Nacogdoches, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

l. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Alice, TX and the United States Army Reserve Center, NAS Kingsville, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on NAS Kingsville, TX, if the Army determines the property is suitable for construction. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Alice and Kingsville, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

---

[50] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "**Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Seguera, TX, the United States Army Reserve Center, Benavidez, TX, the United States Army Reserve Center, Fort Bliss, TX, the United States Army Reserve Center, McGregor Range, TX**" and inserted in its place the language "**Close the Roque O Segura United States Army Reserve Center, El Paso, Texas, the Benavidez United States Army Reserve Center, El Paso, Texas, the United States Army Reserve Center #3, Fort Bliss, Texas**" to correct the identification of those facilities.

m. **Close the Watts-Guillot United States Army Reserve Center, Texarkana, TX** and realign the Hooks Army Reserve Center on Red River Army Depot by relocating units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Red River Army Depot, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Atlanta, and Texarkana, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

n. **Close Round Rock United States Army Reserve Center (leased)** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a consolidated Field Maintenance Shop in Round Rock, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Centers in Austin and Taylor, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop in Austin, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

o. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, San Marcos, TX,** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in San Marcos, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: San Marcos, Sequin, and New Braunfels, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

p. **Close the Hanby-Hayden United States Army Reserve Center, Mesquite, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Shop on United States Army Reserve property in Seagoville, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Dallas #2, Kaufman and Terrell (including the Organizational Maintenance Shop), TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

q. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Tyler, TX and the United States Army Reserve Center, Marshall, TX** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Field Maintenance Shop in Tyler, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Athens, Tyler, Henderson, Kilgore, Marshall, and Corsicana, TX, and the Field Maintenance Shop in Marshall, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

45. Reserve Component Transformation in Vermont (Army 95).[51]

a. **Close Chester Memorial Army Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop, Chester, VT and Berlin Army Reserve Center, Berlin, VT** and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Facility in the vicinity of White River Junction, VT if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and OMS shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Vermont Army National Guard Armories in Ludlow, North Springfield and Windsor, VT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close Army Reserve Center, Courcelle Brothers and associated Organizational Maintenance Shop, Rutland, VT; close Army Reserve Army Maintenance Support Activity, Rutland, VT** and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Facility in the vicinity of Rutland, VT, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and Maintenance Activity shall have the ability to accommodate units from the following facility: Vermont Army National Guard Armory Rutland, VT; if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

46. Reserve Component Transformation in Washington (Army 97).[52]

a. **Close Mann Hall Army Reserve Center, Area Maintenance Support Shop #80 and Walker Army Reserve Center in Spokane, WA** and relocate units to a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop on Fairchild Air Force Base. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following

[51] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[52] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Washington ARNG facilities: Washington ARNG Armory and Organizational Maintenance Shop, Geiger Field, WA, if the state decides to relocate those units.

b. **Close Wagenaar Army Reserve Center Pasco, WA** and relocate units to a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center on Yakima Training Center.

c. **Realign Pendleton Army Reserve Center on Yakima Training Center** by moving all assigned units to the new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Yakima Training Center. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following Washington ARNG facility: Washington ARNG Ellensburg Readiness Center, if the state decides to relocate those units.

d. **Close the Oswald United States Army Reserve Center, Everett, WA**, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the Everett, WA area if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for construction of the new facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following Washington ARNG facilities: Washington ARNG Everett Readiness Center and Snohomish Readiness Center, if the state decides to relocate those units.

47. Reserve Component Transformation in West Virginia (Army 99).[53]

a. **Close the Elkins US Army Reserve Center and its supporting Maintenance Shop in Beverly, WV** and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Elkins, WV, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate West Virginia Army National Guard Units from the Readiness Center in Elkins, WV if the State decides to relocate those National Guard units.

b. **Close the 1LT Harry Colburn US Army Reserve Center and its supporting Maintenance Shop in Fairmont, WV** and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Fairmont, WV, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate West Virginia National Guard Units from the Readiness Center in Fairmont, WV if the State decides to relocate those National Guard units.

c. **Close SSG Roy Kuhl US Army Reserve Center and Maintenance Facility in Ripley and the MAJ Elbert Bias USAR Center, Huntington, WV** and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Ripley, WV, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate West Virginia National Guard Units from the West Virginia Army National Guard Readiness Center in Spencer, West Virginia if the State of West Virginia decides to relocate those National Guard units.

48. Reserve Component Transformation in Wisconsin (Army 102).[54]

a. **Close the Truman Olson and G.F. O'Connell US Army Reserve Centers in Madison, WI** and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) in Madison, WI, if the Army can acquire suitable land for the construction of the new facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Army National Guard units from the following Wisconsin Army National Guard Armories; the Madison Armory (Bowman Street), Madison Armory / OMS 9, and the Madison Armory (2400 Wright Street), if the state decides to relocate those units.

---

[53] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[54] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

49. Reserve Component Transformation in Wyoming (Army 103).[55]

a. **Close Wyoming Army National Guard (WYARNG) Army Aviation Support Facility (AASF) in Cheyenne, WY (DA leased facility)** and relocate Army National Guard units and aviation functions to a new WYARNG AASF, Readiness Center, and Field Maintenance Shop (FMS) on F.E. Warren Air Force Base, WY. The new readiness center/FMS shall have the capability to accommodate Army National Guard units from the Joint Force Headquarters Complex in Cheyenne, WY, if the state decides to relocate those units.

50. Single Drill Sergeant School (Army 105).[56]

a. **Realign Fort Benning, GA, and Fort Leonard Wood, MO,** by relocating the Drill Sergeant School at each location to Fort Jackson, SC.

51. U.S. Army Garrison Michigan (Selfridge) (Army 106).[57]

a. **Close United States Army Garrison Michigan at Selfridge,** which is located on Selfridge Air National Guard Base. Retain an enclave to support the Dynamic Structural Load Simulator (Bridging) Laboratory and the Water Purification Laboratory on Selfridge.

52. USAR Command and Control New England (Army 107).[58]

a. **Close the Westover Armed Forces Reserve Center, Chicopee, Massachusetts, the MacArthur United States Army Reserve Center, Springfield, Massachusetts, the United States Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity, Windsor Locks, Connecticut, and realign the Malony United States Army Reserve Center on Devens Reserve Forces Training Area** by disestablishing the 94th Regional Readiness Command, and relocate all units from the closed facilities to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. Establish an Army Reserve Maneuver Enhancement[59] Brigade headquarters in the new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base.

b. **Realign Devens Reserve Forces Training Area** by relocating the 5th JTF, 654th ASG and the 382d MP Battalion to the new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. The new Armed Forces Reserve Center shall have the capability to accommodate Massachusetts Army National Guard units from the Massachusetts Army National Guard Armory in Agawam Massachusetts, if the Commonwealth of Massachusetts decides to relocate those National Guard units.

53. USAR Command and Control – Northeast (Army 109).[60]

a. **Realign Pitt USARC, Coraopolis, PA** by disestablishing the HQ 99th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Northeast Regional Readiness Command Headquarters at Fort Dix, NJ.

b. **Close Camp Kilmer, NJ** and relocate the HQ 78th Division at Fort Dix, NJ.

c. **Realign Fort Totten, NY** by disestablishing the HQ 77th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Sustainment[61] Brigade at Fort Dix, NJ.

---

[55] By Motion G-11-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[56] Motion G-9-1 found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan

[57] Motion G-1-1 found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[58] By Motion G-52-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[59] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "Sustainment" and inserted the language "Maneuver Enhancement" to correct an inconsistency between the underlying data and the text of the recommendation.

[60] By Motion G-52-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

d. **Realign Fort Sheridan IL** by relocating the 244th Aviation Brigade to Fort Dix, NJ.

e. **Realign Fort Dix, NJ** by relocating Equipment Concentration Site 27 to the New Jersey Army National Guard Mobilization and Training Equipment Site joint facility at Lakehurst, NJ.

f. **Close Charles Kelly Support Center** and relocate units to Pitt US Army Reserve Center, PA.

g. **Close Carpenter USARC, Poughkeepsie, NY, close McDonald USARC, Jamaica, NY, close Fort Tilden USARC, Far Rockaway, NY, close Muller USARC, Bronx, NY**, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center at Fort Totten, NY.

h. **Close the United States Army Reserve Center on Fort Hamilton, NY** and relocate the New York Recruiting Battalion Headquarters and Army Reserve units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Hamilton, NY. The new AFRC shall have the capacity to accommodate units from the NYARNG 47th Regiment Marcy Armory, Brooklyn and the Brooklyn Bedford Armory/OMS, Brooklyn NY if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

54. USAR Command and Control – Northwest (Army 112).[62]

a. **Close Vancouver Barracks** and relocate the 104th DIV (IT) to Fort Lewis, WA. Relocate all other units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Vancouver, WA.

b. **Close Fort Lawton** by disestablishing the 70th Regional Readiness Command, relocate all other units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Lewis, WA and establish a Maneuver Enhancement Brigade.

c. **Realign Fort Snelling, MN** by disestablishing the 88th Regional Readiness Command and establish the Northwest Regional Readiness Command Headquarters at Fort McCoy, WI.

d. **Realign the Wichita US Army Reserve Center** by disestablishing the 89th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Sustainment Unit of Action at the Wichita Army Reserve Center in support of the Northwest Regional Readiness Command at Fort McCoy, WI.

e. **Realign Fort Douglas, UT** by disestablishing the 96th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Sustainment Unit of Action in support of the Northwest Regional Readiness Command at Fort McCoy, WI.

55. USAR Command and Control – Southeast (Army 115).[63]

a. **Realign Birmingham Armed Forces Reserve Center Alabama** by disestablishing the 81st Regional Readiness Command, and establishing the Army Reserve Southeast Regional Readiness Command in a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Jackson, SC.

b. **Close Louisville United States Army Reserve Center** and relocate the 100th DIV (IT) headquarters to Fort Knox, KY.

56. USAR Command and Control – Southwest (Army 117).[64]

a. **Realign the Joint Force Training Base Los Alamitos, CA** by disestablishing the 63d Regional Readiness Command (RRC) Headquarters, Robinson Hall, USARC and activating a Southwest Regional Readiness Command headquarters at Moffett Field, CA in a new AFRC.

---

[61] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "Maneuver Enhancement" and inserted the language "Sustainment" to correct an inconsistency between the underlying data and the text of the recommendation.

[62] By Motion G-52-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[63] By Motion G-52-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[64] By Motion G-52-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Bill to Make Recommendations to the President Under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990

Chapter I. Department of the Army Recommendations

b. **Realign Camp Pike Reserve Complex, Little Rock, AR** by disestablishing the 90th RRC and activating a Sustainment Brigade.

c. **Close the Major General Harry Twaddle United States Armed Forces Reserve Center, Oklahoma City, OK,** and relocate the 95th DIV (IT) to Fort Sill, OK.

d. **Realign Camp Parks Reserve Forces Training Area, CA,** by relocating the 91st DIV (TSD) to Fort Hunter Liggett, CA.

CHAPTER II. DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY RECOMMENDATIONS

57. MARINE CORPS LOGISTICS BASE, BARSTOW, CA (DON 6)[65]

a. **Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA.** Disestablish the depot maintenance of Aircraft Other Components, Aircraft Rotary, and Strategic Missiles. Consolidate depot maintenance of Engines/Transmissions, Other Components, and Small Arms/Personal Weapons at Anniston Army Depot, AL. Consolidate the depot maintenance of Conventional Weapons, Engines/Transmissions, Material Handling, Powertrain Components, Starters/Alternators/Generators, Test Measurement Diagnostic Equipment, and Wire at Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Consolidate depot maintenance of Electronic Components (Non-Airborne), Electro-Optics/Night Vision/Forward-Looking-Infrared, Generators, Ground Support Equipment, Radar, and Radio at Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA. Consolidate depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles at Letterkenny Army Depot, PA. Realign Fleet Support Division Maintenance Center Barstow and Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow operations to increase efficiencies and reduce infrastructure.

58. (DELETED)[66]

59. NAVAL WEAPONS STATION SEAL BEACH DETACHMENT, CONCORD, CA (DON 9)[67]

a. **Close the Inland area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord CA,** except retain such property and facilities as are necessary to support operations in the Tidal area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord. The Tidal area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord, along with the retained portion of the Inland area, shall be transferred to the Army.

60. SUBMARINE BASE NEW LONDON, CT (DON 10)[68]

a. **Realign Naval Submarine Base New London, Connecticut** by consolidating Navy Region Northeast, New London, CT, with Navy Region, Mid-Atlantic, Norfolk, VA.[69]

---

[65] By Motion 57-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[66] By Motion 58-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 58, which read "***Naval Support Activity Corona, CA (DoN 7).*** **Close Naval Support Activity Corona, CA.** Relocate Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona, CA to Naval Base Ventura County (Naval Air Station Point Mugu), CA."

[67] By Motion 59-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[68] By Motion 60-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 60, which read "***Submarine Base New London, CT (DoN 10).*** **Close Naval Submarine Base New London, CT.** Relocate its assigned submarines, Auxiliary Repair Dock 4 (ARDM-4), and Nuclear Research Submarine 1 (NR-1) along with their dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Submarine Base Kings Bay, GA, and Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Relocate the intermediate submarine repair function to Shore Intermediate Repair Activity Norfolk, at Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA, and Trident Refit Facility Kings Bay, GA. Relocate the Naval Submarine School and Center for Submarine Learning to Submarine Base Kings Bay, GA. Consolidate the Naval Security Group Activity Groton, CT with Naval Security Group Activity Norfolk, VA at Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Consolidate Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory Groton, CT, with Naval Medical Research Center at Walter Reed Army Medical Center Forest Glenn Annex, MD. Relocate Naval Undersea Medical Institute Groton, CT to Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, and Fort Sam Houston, TX. Consolidate Navy Region Northeast, New London, CT, with Navy Region, Mid-Atlantic, Norfolk, VA."

[69] By Motion 60-4A, the Commission inserted the language "**Realign Naval Submarine Base New London, Connecticut** by consolidating Navy Region Northeast, New London, CT, with Navy Region, Mid-Atlantic, Norfolk, VA."

61. Officer Training Command, Pensacola, FL (DoN 12)[70]

a. **Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL** by relocating Officer Training Command Pensacola, FL to Naval Station Newport, RI, and consolidating with Officer Training Command Newport, RI.

62. Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA (DoN 13)[71]

a. **Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA.** Relocate its aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA; Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX; and Robins Air Force Base, Robins, GA. Relocate Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem, Forest Park, GA. Relocate depot maintenance Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication and Manufacturing, and Support Equipment in support of F/A-18, C-9 and C-12 aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX. Relocate intermediate maintenance in support of E-2C aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA. Consolidate the Naval Air Reserve Atlanta with Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Atlanta located at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Marietta, GA. Retain the Windy Hill Annex.

63. Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA (DoN 14)[72]

a. **Close the naval installation at Athens, GA.** Relocate the Navy Supply Corps School and the Center for Service Support to Naval Station Newport, RI. Disestablish the Supply Corps Museum.

64. Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA (DoN 15)

a. **Realign Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA.** Relocate the Navy Reserve Personnel Command and the Enlisted Placement and Management Center to Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN and consolidate with the Navy Personnel Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN. Relocate the Naval Reserve Recruiting Command to Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN and consolidate with the Navy Recruiting Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN. Relocate the Navy Reserve Command to Naval Support Activity Norfolk, VA, except for the installation management function, which consolidates with Navy Region Southwest, Naval Station San Diego, CA, Navy Region Northwest, Submarine Base Bangor, WA, and Navy Region Midwest, Naval Station Great Lakes, IL. The remaining tenants will be relocated as stated in the DoD recommendation.[73] If the State of Louisiana obtains funding and commences construction of the Federal City project proposed for the Naval Support Activity West Bank property on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to the Naval Support Activity West Bank property, New Orleans, LA. If the State of Louisiana fails to do so on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA,[74] and consolidate with Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command, which is relocating from Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City,

---

[70] By Motion G-61-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[71] By Motion 62-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[72] By Motion G-61-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[73] By Motion 64-4B, the Commission inserted the language "The remaining tenants will be relocated as stated in the DoD recommendation."

[74] By Motion 64-4A, the Commission struck the language "**Close Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA.**" and replaced it with the language "**Realign Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA.**"; struck the language "Relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA." and inserted in its place the language "If the State of Louisiana obtains funding and commences construction of the Federal City project proposed for the Naval Support Activity West Bank property on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to the Naval Support Activity West Bank property, New Orleans, LA. If the State of Louisiana fails to do so on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA"

MO. Relocate Naval Air Systems Command Support Equipment Facility New Orleans, LA, Navy Recruiting District New Orleans, LA, and the Navy Reserve Center New Orleans, LA, to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA. Relocate 8th Marine Corps District to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX. Consolidate Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA installation management function with Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA.

65. Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME (DoN 18)[75]

a. **Close Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME.** Relocate its aircraft along with dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL. Consolidate Aviation Intermediate Maintenance with Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Jacksonville, FL.

66. Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO (DoN 19)

a. **Close Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, MO.** If the State of Louisiana obtains funding and commences construction of the Federal City project proposed for the Naval Support Activity West Bank property on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to that facility on the Naval Support Activity West Bank property, New Orleans, LA, and consolidate with Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve. The remaining tenants will be retained as stated in the DoD recommendation. If the State of Louisiana fails to do so on or before September 30, 2008,[76] then relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA, [77] and consolidate with Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve. Retain an enclave for the 9th Marine Corps District and the 24th Marine Regiment.

67. Naval Station Pascagoula, MS (DoN 20)[78]

a. **Close Naval Station Pascagoula, MS.** Relocate its ships along with dedicated personnel, equipment, and support to Naval Station Mayport, FL. Relocate the ship intermediate repair function to Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity Mayport, FL.

68. Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA (DoN 21)

a. **Close Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA.** Relocate all Navy and Marine Corps squadrons, their aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to McGuire Air Force Base, Cookstown, NJ. Relocate the minimum amount of manpower and equipment to support intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Tire and Wheel, non-destruction inspections, and Aviation Life Support System equipment to McGuire Air Force Base.

---

[75] By Motion 191-4B, the Commission amended Recommendation 65, changing the realignment to a closure.

[76] By Motion 66-4B, the Commission struck the language "relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to that facility on the Naval Support Activity West Bank property, New Orleans, LA. If the State of Louisiana fails to construct an appropriate Federal City facility on or before September 30, 2008," and replaced it with "relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to that facility on the Naval Support Activity West Bank property, New Orleans, LA, and consolidate with Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve. The remaining tenants will be retained as stated in the DoD recommendation. If the State of Louisiana fails to do so on or before September 30, 2008,".

[77] By Motion 66-4A, the Commission struck the language "Relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA," and inserted in its place the language "If the State of Louisiana obtains funding and commences construction of the Federal City project proposed for the Naval Support Activity West Bank property on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to that facility on the Naval Support Activity West Bank property, New Orleans, LA. If the State of Louisiana fails to construct an appropriate Federal City facility on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA".

[78] By Motion 67-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

A Bill to Make Recommendations to the President Under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990

Chapter II. Department of the Navy Recommendations

Relocate intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication & Manufacturing, and Support Equipment to Fleet Readiness Center East, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC. Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG), the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 124th Wing (ANG), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, Idaho, the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 175th Wing (ANG), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, Maryland, and the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 124th Wing (ANG), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, Idaho
- Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 175th Wing (ANG), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, Maryland,
- Establish 24 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan.

If the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Pennsylvania Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth.[79]

---

[79] By Motion 68-4A, the Commission struck the language "Deactivate the 111th Fighter Wing (Air National Guard) and relocate assigned A-10 aircraft to the 124th Wing (Air National Guard), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, ID (three primary aircraft authorized); 175th Wing (Air National Guard), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, MD, (three primary aircraft authorized); 127th Wing (Air National Guard), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, MI (three primary aircraft authorized) and retired (six primary aircraft authorized)." and inserted in its place "Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG), the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 124th Wing (ANG), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, Idaho, the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 175th Wing (ANG), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, Maryland, and the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 124th Wing (ANG), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, Idaho
- Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 175th Wing (ANG), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, Maryland,
- Establish 24 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan.

If the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Pennsylvania Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth."

Relocate Co A/228th Aviation to Fort Dix, Trenton, NJ.[80] Relocate Reserve Intelligence Area 16 to Fort Dix. Establish a contiguous enclave for the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) and the 270th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG) sufficient to support operations of those units, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the former Naval Air Station as a civilian airport. The Army Reserve units not relocated from Willow Grove by this recommendation, as amended, and those relocated to Willow Grove by other recommendations, as amended, will be incorporated into the Armed Forces Reserve Center established by Army Recommendation 82. The property retained under Federal title to construct the AFRC shall be limited to the absolute minimum essential to construct that facility, shall be encompassed within the enclave established by the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) and the 270th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), and shall be sited to minimize interference with the Air Guard enclave and joint civilian use of the former Naval Air Station as a civilian airport. The Commission defines the authority granted to the Army by the words "retain essential facilities to support activities of the Reserve Components" where they appear in Army Recommendation 82, to be limited to the property necessary to construct AFRC itself. Should the Secretary of the Army determine that access to more property would be beneficial, a joint use agreement should be executed to obtain a tenancy from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.[81] Realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA, by relocating Marine Light Attack Helicopter Squadron 775 Detachment A, to include all required personnel, equipment, and support, to McGuire Air Force Base.

69. (DELETED)[82]

70. NAVAL STATION NEWPORT, RI (DON 25)[83]

a. **Realign Naval Station Newport, RI** by relocating the Navy Warfare Development Command to Naval Station Norfolk, VA.

---

[80] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the sentence "Relocate Armed Forces Reserve Center Expeditionary Combat Support manpower to Eglin Air Force Base, FL." at the request of the Department of Defense to correct an error in the original recommendation. IEBB Errata Sheet on Commission Recommendation (1 Sep 05 v3 w/addenda since 28 Aug).

[81] By Motion 68-4A, the Commission struck the language "Establish an enclave for the Army Reserve units remaining on or relocating to Willow Grove and the Air National Guard 270th Engineering Installation Squadron." and replaced it with the language "Establish a contiguous enclave for the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) and the 270th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG) sufficient to support operations of those units, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the former Naval Air Station as a civilian airport. The Army Reserve units not relocated from Willow Grove by this recommendation, as amended, and those relocated to Willow Grove by other recommendations, as amended, will be incorporated into the Armed Forces Reserve Center established by Army Recommendation 82. The property retained under Federal title to construct the AFRC shall be limited to the absolute minimum essential to construct that facility, shall be encompassed within the enclave established by the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) and the 270th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), and shall be sited to minimize interference with the Air Guard enclave and joint civilian use of the former Naval Air Station as a civilian airport. The Commission defines the authority granted to the Army by the words 'retain essential facilities to support activities of the Reserve Components' where they appear in Army Recommendation 82, to be limited to the property necessary to construct AFRC itself. Should the Secretary of the Army determine that access to more property would be beneficial, a joint use agreement should be executed to obtain a tenancy from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

[82] By Motion 69-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 69, which read "***Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME (DoN 23).*** **Close the Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME.** Relocate the ship depot repair function to Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA, Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility Pearl Harbor, HI and Naval Shipyard Puget Sound, WA. Relocate the Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning and Procurement Command to Naval Shipyard Norfolk. "

[83] By Motion G-61-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

71. Naval Station Ingleside, TX and Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX (DoN 26)[84]

a. **Close Naval Station Ingleside, TX.** Relocate its ships along with dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Station San Diego, CA. Relocate the ship intermediate repair function to Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity San Diego, CA. Consolidate Mine Warfare Training Center with Fleet Anti-submarine Warfare Training Center San Diego, CA.

b. **Realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX.** Relocate Commander Mine Warfare Command and Commander Mobile Mine Assembly Group to Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Center, Point Loma, CA. Relocate Helicopter Mine Countermeasures Squadron 15 (HM-15) and dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Disestablish Commander Helicopter Tactical Wing U.S. Atlantic Fleet Aviation Intermediate Maintenance Detachment Truax Field at Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX and relocate its intermediate maintenance function for Aircraft Components, Fabrication & Manufacturing, and Support Equipment to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Norfolk, VA.

72. Engineering Field Division/Activity (DoN 28)[85]

a. **Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South leased space in Charleston, SC.** Consolidate Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South, Charleston, SC, with Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Southeast, Jacksonville, FL, at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL; Naval Facilities Midwest, Great Lakes, IL, at Naval Station Great Lakes, IL; and Naval Facilities Atlantic, Norfolk, VA at Naval Station Norfolk, VA.

b. **Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast leased space in Lester, PA.** Consolidate Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast, Philadelphia, PA, with Naval Facilities Atlantic, Norfolk, VA at Naval Station Norfolk, VA and relocate Navy Crane Center Lester, PA, to Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, VA.

Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (DoN 29)[86]

a. **Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Encino, CA** and relocate the Marine Corps units to Marine Corps Reserve Center Pasadena, CA.

b. **Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Moundsville, WV** and relocate the Marine Corps units to Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Pittsburgh, PA.

c. **Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Reading, PA** and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers Lehigh Valley, PA.

d. **Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Los Angeles, CA** and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Bell, CA.

e. **Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Akron, OH and Navy Reserve Center Cleveland, OH** and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Akron, OH.

f. **Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Madison, WI, Navy Reserve Center Lacrosse, WI and Navy Reserve Center Dubuque, IA** and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Madison, WI.

g. **Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA** and relocate the Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA.

---

[84] By Motion 71-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[85] By Motion G-72-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[86] By Motion G-73-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

h. **Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Tulsa, OK** and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Broken Arrow, OK.

i. **Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Mobile, AL** and relocate the Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Mobile, AL.

j. **Close Inspector-Instructor West Trenton, NJ** and relocate Marine Corps reserve units and support staff to Navy Reserve Center Ft. Dix, NJ.

k. **Close Inspector-Instructor Rome, GA**, and relocate Marine Corps reserve units and support staff to Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Atlanta, GA.

74. Navy Recruiting Districts (DoN 34)[87]

a. **Close the following Navy Recruiting Districts: Montgomery, AL; Indianapolis, IN; Kansas City, MO; Omaha, NE; Buffalo, NY**

75. Navy Regions (DoN 35)[88]

a. **Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL**, by consolidating Navy Region Gulf Coast, with Navy Region Southeast at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL.

b. **Realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX** by consolidating Navy Region South with Navy Region Midwest at Naval Station Great Lakes, IL and Navy Region Southeast at Naval Station Jacksonville, FL.

76. Navy Reserve Centers (DoN 37)[89]

a. **Close the following Navy Reserve Centers: Tuscaloosa, AL; St. Petersburg, FL; Pocatello, ID; Forest Park, IL; Evansville, IN; Cedar Rapids, IA; Sioux City, IA; Lexington, KY; Adelphi, MD; Duluth, MN; Cape Girardeau, MO; Lincoln, NE; Glens Falls, NY; Horseheads, NY; Watertown, NY; Asheville, NC; Central Point, OR; Lubbock, TX; Orange, TX.**[90]

b. **Close the Navy Reserve Facility in Marquette, MI.**

c. **Close the following Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers: Grissom Air Reserve Base, Peru, IN, and Tacoma, WA.**

77. Navy Reserve Readiness Commands (DoN 44)[91]

a. **Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX**, by consolidating Navy Reserve Readiness Command South with Naval Reserve Readiness Command Midwest at Naval Station Great Lakes, IL.

b. **Realign Naval Station Newport, RI, and the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC**, by consolidating Naval Reserve Readiness Command Northeast with Naval Reserve Readiness Command Mid-Atlantic and relocating the consolidated commands to Naval Station, Norfolk, VA.

---

[87] By Motion G-73-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[88] By Motion G-72-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[89] By Motion G-73-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[90] By Motion 76-3A, the Commission struck the language "**Bangor, ME;**".

[91] By Motion G-72-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

CHAPTER III. DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

78. (DELETED)[92]

79. EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, AK, MOODY AIR FORCE BASE, GA, AND SHAW AIR FORCE BASE, SC (AF 6)[93]

a. **Realign Eielson Air Force Base, AK.** The 354th Fighter Wing's assigned A-10 aircraft will be distributed to the 917th Wing Barksdale Air Force Base, LA (three aircraft); to a new active duty unit at Moody Air Force Base, GA (12 aircraft); and to backup inventory (three aircraft). The Air National Guard Tanker unit and rescue alert detachment will remain as tenant on Eielson.

b. **Realign Moody Air Force Base,** by relocating base-level ALQ-184 intermediate maintenance to Shaw Air Force Base, SC, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Shaw Air Force Base, SC for ALQ-184 pods.

c. **Realign Shaw Air Force Base,** relocating base-level TF-34 engine intermediate maintenance to Moody Air Force Base, establishing a CIRF at Moody Air Force Base for TF-34 engines.

80. KULIS AIR GUARD STATION, AK, AND ELMENDORF AIR FORCE BASE, AK (AF 7)

a. Contingent on the availability of adequate military construction funds to provide the necessary facilities at Elmendorf AFB, AK, **close Kulis Air Guard Station (AGS), AK.** Relocate the 176th Wing (ANG) and associated aircraft (eight C-130Hs, three HC-130Ns, and five HH-60s) and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) to Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK.[94]

b. **Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base.** With the addition of four aircraft from another installation,[95] the 176th Wing at Elmendorf will form an ANG/active duty association with 12 C-130H aircraft. The Commission recommends 3d Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 18 of 42 assigned F-15C/D aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, VA and 6 to an Air National Guard unit.[96]

81. FORT SMITH AIR GUARD STATION, AR, AND LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, AZ (AF 8)

a. **Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport (MAP) Air Guard Station (AGS), AR and Luke Air Force Base, AZ.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) at Fort Smith Air Guard Station, Arkansas,

---

[92] By motion 78-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 78, which read "***Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station, AL (AF 5).*** **Realign Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), AL.** Distribute the 117th Air Refueling Wing's (ANG) KC-135R aircraft to the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport AGS, ME (two aircraft); the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport AGS, TN (four aircraft); and the 161st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport AGS, AZ (two aircraft). The 117th Air Refueling Wing's firefighter positions will move to Dannelly Field AGS, AL, and the remaining expeditionary combat support (ECS) will remain in place."

[93] By Motion 79-3A, the Commission struck the language "The 354th Fighter Wing's F-16 aircraft will be distributed to the 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (18 aircraft)."

[94] By Motion 80-4A, the Commission struck the language "**Close**", and replaced it with the language "Contingent on the availability of adequate military construction funds to provide the necessary facilities at Elmendorf AFB, AK, **close**".

[95] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "(see Air Force recommendation for Ellsworth Air Force Base and Dyess Air Force Base)" as mooted by the Commission action on the Ellsworth AFB recommendation.

[96] By Motion 80-4A, the Commission struck the language "The 3d Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 24 of 42 assigned F-15C/D aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, VA.", and replaced it with the language "The Commission recommends 3d Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 18 of 42 assigned F-15C/D aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, VA and 6 to an Air National Guard unit."

the 37 of the[97] F-16 aircraft assigned to the 56th Fighter Wing at Luke Air Force Base, and the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 144th Fighter Wing (ANG) at Fresno Air Terminal Air Guard Station, California to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission;

- Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG), Fort Smith Air Guard Station, Arkansas.
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 144th Fighter Wing (ANG), Fresno Air Terminal Air Guard Station, California.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport. The Home Station Training Site moves to Savannah, Georgia.

If the State of Arkansas decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Arkansas and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Arkansas Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[98]

---

[97] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the words "of the" at the request of the Department of Defense to clarify the meaning of the recommendation.

[98] By Motion 81-4A, the Commission struck the text of the entire recommendation, which read "**Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport (MAP) Air Guard Station (AGS), AR**. Distribute the 188th Fighter Wing's (ANG) F-16s to the 144th Fighter Wing (ANG) Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA (seven aircraft) and retirement (eight aircraft). The 144th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements remain in place. Fire fighter positions realign to Tulsa, OK, and the Home Station Training Site moves to Savannah, GA. **Realign Luke Air Force Base, AZ**. The 56th Fighter Wing, Luke Air Force Base, AZ, distributes its F-16 Block 25s (13 aircraft) and F-16 Block 42s (24 aircraft) to retirement. The 944th Fighter Wing distributes its F-16s to the 144th Fighter Wing at Fresno (11 aircraft).", and inserted in its place the language "**Realign Fort Smith Municipal Airport (MAP) Air Guard Station (AGS), AR and Luke Air Force Base, AZ**. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) at Fort Smith Air Guard Station, Arkansas, the 37 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 56th Fighter Wing at Luke Air Force Base, and the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 144th Fighter Wing (ANG) at Fresno Air Terminal Air Guard Station, California to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission;

- Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG), Fort Smith Air Guard Station, Arkansas.
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 144th Fighter Wing (ANG), Fresno Air Terminal Air Guard Station, California.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport. The Home Station Training Site moves to Savannah, Georgia.

If the State of Arkansas decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Arkansas and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Arkansas Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 188th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

82. Beale Air Force Base, CA, and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI (AF 10)

a. **Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA. Realign Beale Air Force** Base, California. Distribute the 940th Air Refueling Wing's (AFR) KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 940th Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place.

- Establish 12 PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, Tennessee. The KC-135E aircraft assigned to the 134th Air Refueling Wing will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft. 99

a. **Realign Selfridge Air Reserve Base, MI.**[100] Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 927th Air Refueling Wing's (AFR) and the 8 C-130E aircraft assigned to the 127th Wing (ANG) at Selfridge Air Reserve Base, Michigan to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 127th Wing will convert from C-130E to KC-135R/T aircraft.

- Establish 8 PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge Air Reserve Base, Michigan.[101]

83. March Air Reserve Base, CA (AF 11)

b. a. **Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA.** Distribute the 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG)'s KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the following KC-135R/T PAA:

- The 452nd Air Mobility Wing (AFR), March Air Reserve Base, CA (12 PAA KC-135R/T);
- The 157th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Pease International Tradeport Air Guard Station, NH (eight PAA KC-135R/T);

---

[99] By Motion 82-4A, the Commission struck the language, "**Realign Beale Air Force Base, CA.** The 940th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) will realign its KC-135R tanker aircraft while its expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place. Beale's KC-135R aircraft will be distributed to the Air National Guard at Selfridge ANGB, MI (four aircraft) and 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, TN (four aircraft)" and inserted in its place, "**Realign Beale Air Force** Base, California. Distribute the 940th Air Refueling Wing's (AFR) KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 940th Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place.

o Establish 12 PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, Tennessee. The KC-135E aircraft assigned to the 134th Air Refueling Wing will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft. "

[100] By Motion 82-3A, the Commission struck the language "15 F-16 aircraft and" and "A-10 and" from the text of the original paragraph "b", which read "The 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) at Selfridge will distribute its eight KC-135 aircraft to the 127th Wing (ANG) at Selfridge. The 127th Wing will retire its 15 F-16 aircraft and eight C-130E aircraft, and will convert to A-10 and KC-135R aircraft."

[101] By Motion 82-4A, the Commission struck the language, "**Realign Selfridge Air Reserve Base, MI.** The 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) at Selfridge will distribute its eight KC-135 aircraft to the 127th Wing (ANG) at Selfridge. The 127th Wing will retire its eight C-130E aircraft, and will convert to KC-135R aircraft" and inserted in its place, "**Realign Selfridge Air Reserve Base, MI.** Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 927th Air Refueling Wing's (AFR) and the 8 C-130E aircraft assigned to the 127th Wing (ANG) at Selfridge Air Reserve Base, Michigan to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 127th Wing will convert from C-130E to KC-135R/T aircraft.

o Establish 8 PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge Air Reserve Base, Michigan."

- The 108th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGuire Air Force Base, NJ (eight PAA KC-135R/T). The 108th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft;

If the State of California decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force:

- the 163d Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remaining in place;
- reassign a sufficient number of aircrews and maintenance personnel of the 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), a C-130 unit located at Channel Islands Air Guard Station, California, to bring that unit to a fully manned status, with the Air Force providing retraining where necessary, and;
- all other personnel allotted to the 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of California and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, rescue operations or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the California Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 163rd Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[102]

---

[102]By Motion 83-4A, the Commission struck the language, "**Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA**. The 163 d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will distribute its nine KC-135R aircraft to the 452 d Air Mobility Wing (AFR), March Air Reserve Base (four aircraft); the 157th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Pease International Tradeport Air Guard Station, NH (three aircraft); the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, TN (one aircraft); and the 22 d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell Air Force Base, KS (one aircraft). The 163 d Air Refueling Wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) will remain in place." and inserted in its place, "**Realign March Air Reserve Base, CA**. Distribute the 163 d Air Refueling Wing (ANG)'s KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the following KC-135R/T PAA:

o The 452d Air Mobility Wing (AFR), March Air Reserve Base, CA (12 PAA KC-135R/T);

o The 157th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Pease International Tradeport Air Guard Station, NH (eight PAA KC-135R/T);

o The 108th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGuire Air Force Base, NJ (eight PAA KC-135R/T). The 108th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft;

If the State of California decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force:

o the 163d Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remaining in place;

o reassign a sufficient number of aircrews and maintenance personnel of the 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to the 146th Airlift Airlift Wing (ANG), a C-130 unit located at Channel Islands Air Guard Station, California, to bring that unit to a fully manned status, with the Air Force providing retraining where necessary, and;

o all other personnel allotted to the 163d Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of California and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, rescue operations or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the California Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 163rd Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

84. Onizuka Air Force Station, CA (AF 12)[103]

a. **Close Onizuka Air Force Station, CA.** Relocate the Air Force Satellite Control Network (AFSCN) mission and tenant Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) Defense Satellite Communication System (DSCS) mission and equipment to Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA.

85. Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Air Guard Station, MD (AF 14)

a. **Realign Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT.** Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) at Bradley Field, Connecticut and the 15 A-10 aircraft at the 104th Fighter Wing (ANG), Barnes Air Guard Station, Massachusetts to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 104th Fighter Wing (ANG), Barnes Air Guard Station, MA.

The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission.

If the State of Connecticut decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 103d Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 103d Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Connecticut and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Connecticut or the Massachusetts Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 103d and 104th Fighter Wings (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state or the commonwealth.[104]

---

[103] By Motion 84-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[104] By Motion 85-4A, the Commission struck the language in paragraph "a", which read "The A-10s assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing will be distributed to the 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA (nine aircraft) and retirement (six aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission.", and inserted in its place the language "The A-10s assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing will be distributed to the 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA (nine aircraft) and retirement (six aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission." and insert in its place "Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) at Bradley Field, Connecticut and the 15 A-10 aircraft at the 104th Fighter Wing (ANG), Barnes Air Guard Station, Massachusetts to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 104th Fighter Wing (ANG), Barnes Air Guard Station, MA.

The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission.

If the State of Connecticut decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 103d Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 103d Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Connecticut and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Connecticut or the Massachusetts Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 103d and 104th Fighter Wings (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained

b. **Realign Barnes Air Guard Station, MA; Selfridge ANGB, MI; Shaw Air Force Base, SC; and Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, MD,** by relocating base-level TF-34 engine intermediate maintenance to Bradley, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Bradley for TF-34 engines.

86. New Castle Airport Air Guard Station, DE (AF 15)

a. **The 166 Airlift Wing (ANG) at New Castle County Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), Delaware,** maintains its 8 PAA C-130 aircraft. Establish 10 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 145th Airlift Wing (ANG), Charlotte/Douglas International Airport AGS, North Carolina. The 165th Airlift Wing (ANG) at Savannah International Airport Air Guard Station, Georgia maintains its 8 PAA C-130 aircraft."[105]

87. Robins Air Force Base, GA (AF 16)

a. **Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA.** Distribute the 19th Air Refueling Group's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the PAA requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 202d Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), a geographically separated unit at Middle Georgia Regional Airport, will be relocated into available space at Robins Air Force Base.[106]

88. Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID (AF 17)

a. **Realign Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station (AGS), ID.** Distribute the 4 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 124th Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 6 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG), Cheyenne, Wyoming. The 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG) will create an active duty / ANG association at Cheyenne. The Air Force will supply an additional 6 PAA C-130 aircraft to establish an optimally-sized 12 PAA C-130 aircraft active duty /ANG associate airlift wing at Cheyenne.[107]

If the State of Idaho decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 124th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 124th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Idaho and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

---

determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state or the commonwealth."

[105] By Motion 86-4A, the Commission deleted the entire text of Recommendation 86, which read **"Realign New Castle County Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), DE.** Distribute the wing's eight C-130H aircraft to the 145th Airlift Wing (ANG), Charlotte/Douglas International Airport (IAP) AGS, NC (four aircraft), and 165th Airlift Wing (ANG), Savannah IAP AGS, GA (four aircraft). Move flying related Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) to McGuire Air Force Base, NJ (Aeromedical Squadron), and Dover Air Force Base, DE (aerial port and fire fighters). Other ECS remains in place at New Castle.", and inserted in its place the language "The 166 Airlift Wing (ANG) at New Castle County Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), Delaware, maintains its 8 PAA C-130 aircraft. Establish 10 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 145th Airlift Wing (ANG), Charlotte/Douglas International Airport AGS, North Carolina. The 165th Airlift Wing (ANG) at Savannah International Airport Air Guard Station, Georgia maintains its 8 PAA C-130 aircraft."

[106] By Motion 87-4A, the Commission struck the language "The 19th Air Refueling Group's KC-135R aircraft will be distributed to the 22d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell Air Force Base, KS (nine aircraft), and to backup aircraft inventory (three aircraft)" and inserted in its place, "Distribute the 19th Air Refueling Group's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the PAA requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission."

[107] As a technical correction at the request of the Department of Defense, the Commission inserted the language "The Air Force will supply an additional 6 PAA C-130 aircraft to establish an optimally-sized 12 PAA C-130 aircraft active duty /ANG associate airlift wing at Cheyenne." to clarify the source of the additional airframes necessary to form the associate wing. IEBB Errata Sheet on Commission Recommendations, August 27, 2005.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Idaho Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 124th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[108]

89. Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK (AF 18)

a. **Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID.** Distribute the 18[109] F-15C/D aircraft and 18 F-16 aircraft[110] assigned to the 366th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-15C/D aircraft at the 125th Wing (ANG), Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, Florida.
- Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 169th Fighter Wing (ANG), McEntire Air Guard Station, South Carolina.

b. **Realign Nellis Air Force Base, NV.** Distribute 25 of[111] the F-16 aircraft assigned to the 57th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 21 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 138th Fighter Wing Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station, Oklahoma.
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 144th Fighter Wing Fresno Air Terminal Air Guard Station, California.

c. **Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK.** The 366th Fighter Wing, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID will receive F-15E aircraft from the 3d Wing, Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK (18 aircraft) and attrition reserve (three aircraft).[112]

---

[108] By Motion 88-4A, the Commission struck the language "Distribute the four C-130H aircraft of the 124th Wing (ANG) to the 153d Airlift Wing (ANG), Cheyenne, WY. The new, larger unit at Cheyenne will create an active duty/ ANG association.", and inserted in its place, "Distribute the 4 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 124th Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

o Establish 6 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG), Cheyenne, Wyoming. The 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG) will create an active duty / ANG association at Cheyenne.

If the State of Idaho decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 124th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 124th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Idaho and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Idaho Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 124th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

[109] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the figure "18" to clarify the recommendation, as amended.

[110] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "and 18 F-16 aircraft" to correct an error.

[111] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "25 of" to clarify the recommendation, as amended.

[112] By Motion 89-4A, the Commission struck the entire text of the recommendation, which read "**Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID.** Distribute the 366th Fighter Wing assigned F-15Cs (18 aircraft) to the 57th Fighter Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (nine aircraft), to the 125th Fighter Wing, Jacksonville International Airport AGS, FL (six aircraft) and to retirement (three aircraft). The 366th Fighter Wing will distribute assigned F-16 Block 52 aircraft to the 169th Fighter Wing McEntire AGS, SC (nine aircraft), the 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (five aircraft) and to backup inventory (four aircraft). **Realign Nellis Air Force Base.** The 57th Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, will distribute F-16 Block 42 aircraft to the 138th Fighter Wing Tulsa International Airport AGS, OK (three aircraft) and retire the remaining F-16 Block 42 aircraft (15 aircraft). The 57th Wing also will distribute F-16 Block 32 aircraft (six aircraft) to the 144th Fighter Wing Fresno Air Terminal AGS, CA and to retirement (one aircraft). **Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base.** The 366th Fighter Wing, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID will receive F-15E aircraft from the 3d Wing, Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK (18 aircraft) and attrition reserve (three

90. CAPITAL AIR GUARD STATION, IL, AND HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, IN (AF 20)

a. **Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 183d Fighter Wing, Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL and the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 122d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN, to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 183d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN.

The Illinois ANG State Headquarters and the 217th Engineering Installation Squadron remain in place at Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL.

If the State of Illinois decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 183d Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 183d Fighter Wing, including the wing Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Illinois and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to the Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Capital for F110 engines, air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Illinois Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 183d Fighter Wing is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

b. **Realign Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 181st Fighter Wing to meet the PAA requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 181st Fighter Wing's ECS elements remain in place.

If the State of Indiana decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 181st Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 181st Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Indiana and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Indiana Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 181st Fighter Wing is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

---

aircraft).", and inserted in its place the language "**Realign Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID.** Distribute the F-15C/D aircraft assigned to the 366th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-15C/D aircraft at the 125th Wing (ANG), Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, Florida.
- Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 169th Fighter Wing (ANG), McEntire Air Guard Station, South Carolina.

Realign Nellis Air Force Base, NV. Distribute the F-16 aircraft assigned to the 57th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 21 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 138th Fighter Wing Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station, Oklahoma.
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 144th Fighter Wing Fresno Air Terminal Air Guard Station, California.

Realign Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK. The 366th Fighter Wing, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID will receive F-15E aircraft from the 3d Wing, Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK (18 aircraft) and attrition reserve (three aircraft)."

c. **Realign Dane County Regional Air Guard Station/Truax Field, WI; Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station, SD; Des Moines Air Guard Station, IA; Fort Wayne Air Guard Station, IN; and Lackland Air Force Base, TX;** by relocating base-level F-110 intermediate maintenance to Capital Air Guard Station, IL, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Capital for F110 engines.[113]

91. NEW ORLEANS AIR RESERVE STATION, LA (AF 22)

a. **Realign NAS New Orleans ARS, LA.** Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 926th Fighter Wing (AFR) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

---

[113] By Motion 90-4A, the Commission struck the text of the entire recommendation, which read "**Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL.** Distribute the 183d Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 122d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN, (15 aircraft). The 122d Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements, the Illinois ANG State Headquarters, and the 217th Engineering Installation Squadron remain in place. **Realign Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN.** The 181st Fighter Wing's F-16s are distributed to the 122d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN (nine aircraft), and retirement (six aircraft). The 181st Fighter Wing's ECS elements remain in place. **Realign Dane County Regional Air Guard Station/Truax Field, WI; Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station, SD; Des Moines Air Guard Station, IA; Fort Wayne Air Guard Station, IN; and Lackland Air Force Base, TX**; by relocating baselevel F-110 intermediate maintenance to Capital, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Capital for F110 engines.", and inserted in its place the language "**a. Realign Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 183d Fighter Wing, Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL and the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 122d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN, to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 183d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN.

The Illinois ANG State Headquarters and the 217th Engineering Installation Squadron remain in place at Capital Airport Air Guard Station, IL.

If the State of Illinois decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 183d Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 183d Fighter Wing, including the wing Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Illinois and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to the Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Capital for F110 engines, air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Illinois Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 183d Fighter Wing is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

b. Realign Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 181st Fighter Wing to meet the PAA requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 181st Fighter Wing's ECS elements remain in place.

If the State of Indiana decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 181st Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 181st Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Indiana and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Indiana Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 181st Fighter Wing is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

c. Realign Dane County Regional Air Guard Station/Truax Field, WI; Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station, SD; Des Moines Air Guard Station, IA; Fort Wayne Air Guard Station, IN; and Lackland Air Force Base, TX; by relocating base-level F-110 intermediate maintenance to Capital Air Guard Station, IL, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Capital for F110 engines."

- Establish 24 PAA A-10 at the 442d Fighter Wing (AFR), Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri
- Establish 24 PAA A-10 at the 917th Wing (AFR) at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana.[114]

The 926th Wing HQ element [115] realigns to Nellis Air Force Base, NV and the wing Expeditionary Combat Support realigns to Buckley Air Force Base, CO.

92. Andrews Air Force Base, MD, Will Rogers Air Guard Station, OK, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, and Randolph Air Force Base TX (AF 23)

a. **Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD**, by relocating the Air Force Flight Standards Agency (AFFSA) and its two C-21 aircraft to Will Rogers World Airport Air Guard Station, OK.

b. **Realign Randolph Air Force Base, TX**, by relocating the USAF Advanced Instrument School (AIS) to Will Rogers Air Guard Station.

c. **Realign Tinker Air Force Base, OK**, by relocating the Global Air Traffic Operations Program Office (GATOPO) to Will Rogers Air Guard Station.

d. **Realign Will Rogers Air Guard Station** by relocating the 137th Airlift Wing (ANG) to Tinker Air Force Base and associate with the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR). Distribute the 137th Air Airlift Wing (ANG)'s C-130 aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

If the State of Okalahoma decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 137th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 137th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Okalahoma and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Okalahoma Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 137th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

- Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 136th Airlift Wing ANG, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.
- Establish 10 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 139th Airlift Wing (ANG), Rosecrans Memorial Airport Air Guard Station, MO.[116]

---

[114] By Motion 91-4A, the Commission struck the language "Distribute the 926th Fighter Wing's A-10 aircraft to the 442d Fighter Wing (AFR), Whiteman Air Force Base, MO (nine aircraft); and the 917th Wing (AFR) at Barksdale Air Force Base, LA (six aircraft)." and inserted in its place "Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 926th Fighter Wing (AFR) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
- Establish 24 PAA A-10 at the 442d Fighter Wing (AFR), Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri;
- Establish 24 PAA A-10 at the 917th Wing (AFR) at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana."

[115] By Motion 91-4A, the Commission struck the language "The 442d Wing HQ element" and inserted in its place "The 926th Wing HQ element".

[116] By Motion 92-4A, the Commission struck the language, "The 137th's C-130H aircraft are distributed to the 136th Airlift Wing (ANG), Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX (4 aircraft), and 139th Airlift Wing (ANG), Rosecrans Memorial Airport Air Guard Station, MO (4 aircraft)." and insert in its place, "Distribute the 137th Air Airlift Wing (ANG)'s C-130 aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

The 137th Airlift Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support remains in place at Will Rogers Air Guard Station, Oklahoma.[117]

93. MARTIN STATE AIR GUARD STATION, MD (AF 24)

c. a. **Realign Martin State Air Guard Station (AGS), MD.** Distribute the 8 C-130J aircraft assigned to the 175th Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 8 Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) C-130J at the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands AGS, California
- Establish 8 Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) C-130J at the 143d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport AGS, Rhode Island

The Aerial Port Squadron located at Martin State Air Guard Station, Maryland will move to Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland.

If the State of Maryland decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 175th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 175th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Maryland and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Maryland Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 175th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[118]

If the State of Okalahoma decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 137th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 137th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Okalahoma and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Okalahoma Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 137th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

- "Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 136th Airlift Wing ANG, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.
- Establish 10 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 139th Airlift Wing (ANG), Rosecrans Memorial Airport Air Guard Station, MO."

[117] By Motion 92-4A, the Commission struck the language, "The aerial port squadron at Will Rogers moves to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, the Aeromedical Squadron and fire fighters move to Rosecrans AGB. Other elements of the 137th Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support remain in place at Will Rogers." and inserted in its place the language "The 137th Airlift Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support remains in place at Will Rogers Air Guard Station, Oklahoma."

[118] By Motion 93-4A, the Commission struck the language "Distribute the eight C-130J aircraft of the 175th Wing (ANG) to the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands AGS, CA (four aircraft), and 143d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport AGS, RI (four aircraft). The Aerial Port Squadron will move to Andrews Air Force Base, MD. The 143d and 146th Airlift Wings will each retire two C-130E aircraft (total of four)." and inserted in its place "Distribute the 8 C-130J aircraft assigned to the 175th Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 8 Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) C-130J at the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands AGS, California
- Establish 8 Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) C-130J at the 143d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport AGS, Rhode Island

The Aerial Port Squadron located at Martin State Air Guard Station, Maryland will move to Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland.

94. Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO, and Atlantic City Air Guard Station, NJ (AF 25)

a. **Realign Otis ANGB, MA.** Distribute the fifteen F-15 aircraft assigned to the 102d Fighter Wing's (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 253d Combat Communications Group, and 267th Communications Squadron will remain in place at Otis, with 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes providing administrative support as the parent wing. An air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility will be constructed at Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.[119] Firefighter positions from Otis will move to Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.

If the Commonwealth of Massachusetts decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 102d Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 102d Fighter Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Massachusetts Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 102d Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth.

b. **Realign Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, St. Louis, MO.** Distribute the fifteen F-15 aircraft assigned to the 131st Fighter Wing to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 157th Air Operations Group (AOG) and the 218th Engineering Installation Group (EIG) will relocate from Jefferson Barracks geographically separated unit (GSU) into space at Lambert International. Jefferson Barracks real property accountability will transfer to the Army.

If the State of Missouri decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 131st Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 131st Fighter Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Missouri and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Missouri Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 131st Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

If the State of Maryland decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 175th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 175th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Maryland and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Maryland Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 175th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

[119] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT" and inserted in its place the language "Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA" to reflect the intent of the Commission. Because the air superiority fighter basing in that region was relocated from Otis ANGB to Barnes AGS, the ASA facility must also be relocated to Barnes AGS, rather than to Bradley Field.

- Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 125th Fighter Wing, Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, Florida (ANG);
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 177th Fighter Wing, Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, New Jersey (ANG);
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 158th Fighter Wing, Burlington International Airport Air Guard Station, Vermont (ANG).[120]

95. W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI (AF 27)

a. **Realign W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI.** Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 110th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and

---

[120] By Motion 94-4A, the Commission struck the entire text of recommendation 94, which read "**Close Otis ANGB, MA.** The 102d Fighter Wing's F-15s will be distributed to the 125th Fighter Wing, Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, FL (three aircraft), and 177th Fighter Wing, Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, NJ (12 aircraft). The 253d Combat Communications Group, and 267th Communications Squadron will remain in place at Otis, with 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes providing administrative support as the parent wing. An air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility will be constructed at Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT. Firefighter positions from Otis will move to Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA. **Realign Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, St. Louis, MO.** The 131st Fighter Wing's F-15s (15 aircraft) will distribute to the 57th Fighter Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (nine aircraft), and 177th Fighter Wing, Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, NJ (six aircraft). **Realign Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, NJ.** The 177th Fighter Wing's F-16s will be distributed to the 158th Fighter Wing, Burlington International Airport Air Guard Station, VT (three aircraft), and retire (12 aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place. Firefighter positions move to Scott Air Force Base, IL. The 157th Air Operations Group (AOG) and the 218th Engineering Installation Group (EIG) will relocate from Jefferson Barracks geographically separated unit (GSU) into space at Lambert International. Jefferson Barracks real property accountability will transfer to the Army.", and inserted in its place the language "**Realign Otis ANGB, MA.** Distribute the fifteen F-15 aircraft assigned to the 102d Fighter Wing's (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 253d Combat Communications Group, and 267th Communications Squadron will remain in place at Otis, with 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes providing administrative support as the parent wing. An air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility will be constructed at Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT. Firefighter positions from Otis will move to Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA. If the Commonwealth of Massachusetts decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 102d Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 102d Fighter Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Massachusetts Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 102d Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth.

Realign Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, St. Louis, MO. Distribute the fifteen F-15 aircraft assigned to the 131st Fighter Wing to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 157th Air Operations Group (AOG) and the 218th Engineering Installation Group (EIG) will relocate from Jefferson Barracks geographically separated unit (GSU) into space at Lambert International. Jefferson Barracks real property accountability will transfer to the Army. If the State of Missouri decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 131st Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 131st Fighter Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Missouri and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Missouri Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 131st Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

- Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 125th Fighter Wing, Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, Florida (ANG);
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 177th Fighter Wing, Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station, New Jersey (ANG);
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 158th Fighter Wing, Burlington International Airport Air Guard Station, Vermont (ANG)."

Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish a contiguous enclave for the 110th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport. If the State of Michigan decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 110th Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 110th Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Michigan and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Michigan Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 110th Fighter Wing is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[121]

96. Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN (AF 28)

a. **Realign Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 148th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 15 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 148th Fighter Wing (ANG), Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station.[122]

97. Key Field Air Guard Station, MS (AF 28A)

a. **Realign Key Field Air Guard Station, MS.** Distribute the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG)'s KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 12 PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 128th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), General Mitchell Air Guard Station, Wisconsin.
- If the State of Mississippi decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force:

---

[121] By Motion 95-4A, the Commission struck the language "**Close W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI.** Distribute the 110th Fighter Wing's A-10s (15 aircraft) to the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge ANGB, MI." and inserted in its place "**Realign W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI.** Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 110th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish a contiguous enclave for the 110th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport. If the State of Michigan decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 110th Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 110th Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Michigan and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Michigan Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 110th Fighter Wing is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

[122] By Motion 96-4A, the Commission struck the entire text of the recommendation, which read "**Realign Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN**, by retiring the 148th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft)", and inserted in its place the language "**Realign Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 148th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish 15 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 148th Fighter Wing (ANG), Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station."

- establish Key Field as a Regional Operations and Security Center (ROSC) location, with the 186th Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remaining in place;
- reassign a sufficient number of aircrews and maintenance personnel of the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to the 172d Airlift Wing (ANG), a C-17 unit located on Thompson Field, Mississippi to bring that unit to a fully manned status, with the Air Force providing retraining where necessary, and;
- all other personnel allotted to the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Mississippi and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Mississippi Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[123]

98. Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT (AF 30)

a. **Realign Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT.** Distribute the fifteen F-16 aircraft assigned to the 120th Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 15 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 120th Fighter[124] Wing (ANG), Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT.
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 187th Fighter[125] Wing (ANG), Dannelly Field Air Guard Station, AL.

---

[123] By Motion 97-4A, the Commission struck the text of the recommendation, which read "Distribute the 186th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 128th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), General Mitchell Air Guard Station, WI (three aircraft); the 134th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), McGhee-Tyson Airport Air Guard Station, TN (three aircraft); and 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station, ME (two aircraft). One aircraft will revert to backup aircraft inventory. The 186th Air Refueling Wing's fire fighter positions move to the 172d Air Wing at Jackson International Airport, MS, and the expeditionary combat support (ECS) will remain in place.", and inserted in its place "Distribute the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG)'s KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish 12 PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 128th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), General Mitchell Air Guard Station, Wisconsin. If the State of Mississippi decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force:

o establish Key Field as a Regional Operations and Security Center (ROSC) location, with the 186th Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remaining in place;

o reassign a sufficient number of aircrews and maintenance personnel of the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to the 172d Airlift Wing (ANG), a C-17 unit located on Thompson Field, Mississippi to bring that unit to a fully manned status, with the Air Force providing retraining where necessary, and;

o all other personnel allotted to the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Mississippi and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Mississippi Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 186th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

[124] The word "Fighter" was inserted for clarification at the request of the Department of Defense.

[125] The word "Fighter" was inserted for clarification at the request of the Department of Defense.

- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 132d Fighter[126] Wing Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (ANG).[127]

The wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remain in place.

99. Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV (AF 31)

a. **Realign Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV.** Distribute the 8 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 152d Airlift Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 9 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas.
- Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 152d Airlift Wing (ANG), Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, Nevada.[128]

100. Cannon Air Force Base, NM (AF 32)

a. **Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM** by disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing and distributing its aircraft to meet the primary Aircraft Authorization (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. After disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing, the Air Force shall establish an enclave at Cannon Air Force Base that shall remain open until December 31, 2009 during which time the Secretary of Defense shall seek other newly-identified missions with all military services[129] for possible assignment to Cannon Air Force Base, NM. If the Secretary designates a mission for Cannon Air Force Base during this period, the enclave would revert to the status appropriate for the designated mission. If the Secretary[130] does not find a mission for Cannon Air Force Base by December 31, 2009, Cannon Air Force Base and the enclave shall be closed. Nothing in this directive shall prohibit the State of New Mexico

---

[126] The word "Fighter" was inserted for clarification at the request of the Department of Defense.

[127] By Motion 98-4A, the Commission struck the language "Distribute the 120th Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 187th Fighter Wing, Dannelly Field Air Guard Station, AL (three aircraft); the 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (three aircraft); and retire (nine aircraft)." and inserted in its place "Distribute the fifteen F-16 aircraft assigned to the 120th Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 15 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 120th Wing (ANG), Great Fall International Airport Air Guard Station, MT.
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 187th Wing (ANG), Dannelly Field Air Guard Station, AL.
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 132d Wing Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (ANG)."

[128] By Motion 99-4A, the Commission struck the entire text of the recommendation, which read "**Realign Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV.** Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 152nd Airlift Wing (ANG) to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base, AR. Flying related Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) moves to Channel Islands Air Guard Station, CA (aerial port), and Fresno Air Guard Station, CA (fire fighters). The remaining ECS elements and the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) remain in place", and inserted in its place the language "**Realign Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV.** Distribute the 8 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 152d Airlift Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 9 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas.
- Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 152d Airlift Wing (ANG), Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, Nevada."

[129] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "newly-identified missions with all military services" to clarify the Commission's intent.

[130] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "Air Force" and inserted in its place the language "Secretary" to correct an inconsistency in the wording of the recommendation.

and the Department of Defense from entering into an agreement to close the enclave at Cannon Air Force Base earlier than December 31, 2009.[131]

101. Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY (AF 33)

a. **Realign Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station (ARS), NY.** Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 10 PAA KC-135R/T at the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station, Maine. The 101st Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aircraft Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.

All personnel allotted to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and form an Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve associate wing with the 914th Airlift Wing. Establish a contiguous enclave for the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operation of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Air Reserve Station as a civilian airport.[132] Guard personnel will be provided the training necessary to support the airlift mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the New York Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[133]

---

[131] By Motion 100-4B, the Commission struck the language "**Close Cannon Air Force Base, NM.** Distribute the 27th Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 115th Fighter Wing, Dane County Regional Airport, Truax Field Air Guard Station, WI (three aircraft); 114th Fighter Wing, Joe Foss Field Air Guard Station, SD (three aircraft); 150th Fighter Wing, Kirtland Air Force Base, NM (three aircraft); 113th Wing, Andrews Air Force Base, MD (nine aircraft); 57th Fighter Wing, Nellis Air Force Base, NV (seven aircraft), the 388th Wing at Hill Air Force Base, UT (six aircraft), and backup inventory (29 aircraft)." and inserted in its place "**Realign Cannon Air Force Base, NM** by disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing and distributing its aircraft to meet the primary Aircraft Authorization (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. After disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing, the Air Force shall establish an enclave at Cannon Air Force Base that shall remain open until December 31, 2009 during which time the Secretary of Defense shall seek other missions for possible assignment to Cannon Air Force Base, NM. If the Secretary designates a mission for Cannon Air Force Base during this period, the enclave would revert to the status appropriate for the designated mission. If the Air Force does not find a mission for Cannon Air Force Base by December 31, 2009, Cannon Air Force Base and the enclave shall be closed. Nothing in this directive shall prohibit the State of New Mexico and the Department of Defense from entering into an agreement to close the enclave at Cannon Air Force Base earlier than December 31, 2009."

[132] By Motion 101-4B, the Commission inserted the language "Establish a contiguous enclave for the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operation of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Air Reserve Station as a civilian airport."

[133] By Motion 101-4A, the Commission struck the entire text of the recommendation, which read, "**Close Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station (ARS), NY.** Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 914th Airlift Wing (AFR) to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR. The 914th's headquarters moves to Langley Air Force Base, VA, the Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) realigns to the 310th Space Group (AFR) at Schriever Air Force Base, CO, and the Civil Engineering Squadron moves to Lackland Air Force Base, TX. **Also at Niagara,** distribute the eight KC-135R aircraft of the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station, ME. The 101st will subsequently retire its eight KC-135E aircraft and no Air Force aircraft remain at Niagara.", and inserted in its place the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation and inserted in its place "Realign Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station (ARS), NY. Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

o Establish 10 PAA KC-135R/T at the 101st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Bangor International Airport Air Guard Station, Maine. The 101st Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aircraft Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.

All personnel allotted to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and form an Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve associate wing with the 914th Airlift Wing. Establish a contiguous

102. SCHENECTADY COUNTY AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, NY (AF 34)

a. **Realign Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station (Air Guard Station), NY.** Establish 10 Primary Authorized Aircraft (PAA) (L)C-130H at the 109th Airlift Wing (ANG), Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY.[134]

103. POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NC, PITTSBURGH INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIR RESERVE STATION, PA, AND YEAGER AIR GUARD STATION, WV (35)

a. **Realign Pope Air Force Base (Air Force Base), NC. Realign Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina.** Distribute the 25 C-130E aircraft assigned to the 43d Air Lift Wing and the 36 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 23d Fighter Group to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 16 PAA C-130H aircraft at Pope Army Air Field, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.
- Establish 48 PAA A-10 aircraft at Moody Air Force Base, Georgia.

Transfer real property accountability to the Army; disestablish the 43d Medical Group and establish a medical squadron. The Air Force will establish an Air Support Operations Group to provide unity of command of Air Force units on Pope Army Air Field, mission execution planning, and management of efficient loadout of Fort Bragg assets.[135]

b. **Realign Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas.** Distribute 39[136] of the C-130 aircraft assigned to Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 8 PAA C-130J aircraft at the 143d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station, Rhode Island;
- Establish 8 PAA C-130J aircraft at the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands Air Guard Station, California;
- Establish 9 PAA C-130 aircraft at 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base.[137]

---

enclave for the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operation of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Air Reserve Station as a civilian airport. Guard personnel will be provided the training necessary to support the airlift mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the New York Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 107th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

[134] By Motion 102-4A, the Commission struck the entire text of the recommendation, which read "The 109th Airlift Wing (ANG) will transfer four C-130H aircraft to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base, AR.", and inserted in its place the language "Establish 10 Primary Authorized Aircraft (PAA) (L)C-130H at the 109th Airlift Wing (ANG), Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY."

[135] By Motion 103-4D, the Commission struck the text of paragraph "a", which read "**Realign Pope Air Force Base (Air Force Base), NC.** Distribute the 43d Airlift Wing's C-130E aircraft (25 aircraft) to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR; realign the 23d Fighter Group's A-10 aircraft (36 aircraft) to Moody Air Force Base, GA; transfer real property accountability to the Army; disestablish the 43d Medical Group and establish a medical squadron.", and inserted in its place, "**Realign Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina.** Distribute the 25 C-130E aircraft assigned to the 43d Air Lift Wing and the 36 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 23d Fighter Group to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 16 PAA C-130H aircraft at Pope Army Air Field, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.
- Establish 48 PAA A-10 aircraft at Moody Air Force Base, Georgia.

Transfer real property accountability to the Army; disestablish the 43d Medical Group and establish a medical squadron. The Air Force will establish an Air Support Operations Group to provide unity of command of Air Force units on Pope Army Air Field, mission execution planning, and management of efficient loadout of Fort Bragg assets."

[136] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the figure "42" and inserted in its place the figure "39" to correct an error.

[137] By Motion 103-4D, the Commission struck the text of paragraph "b", which read "**At Little Rock Air Force Base, AR, realign** eight C-130E aircraft to backup inventory; retire 27 C-130Es; realign one C-130J aircraft to the 143d Airlift Wing

c. **Realign Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), West Virginia.**

- Establish 8 PAA C-130H aircraft at Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), West Virginia.[138]

d. **Realign Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), Pennsylvania.** Establish a contiguous enclave at the Pittsburgh International Air Station (ARS), Pennsylvania sufficient to support continued operations of the reserve station units, including flight operations, and compatible with combined use of the civilian airport by the Air Reserve, Air National Guard and civilian users. Within that enclave, establish a Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC) at the Pittsburgh International Air Station with the mission of providing civil-military operations, homeland security and community-based medical support to the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security National Incident Management Plan and the National Response Plan. The enclave and RJRC will be staffed at the current manning level of the ARS. The PAA and personnel allocations of Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected by this recommendation.[139]

104. Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND (AF 37)

a. **Realign Grand Forks Air Force Base (AFB), ND.** Distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the following KC-135R/T PAA:

- The 126th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Scott AFB, IL (eight PAA KC-135R/T). The 126th Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft;
- The 916th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Seymour-Johnson AFB, NC (16 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host an active duty associate unit;

(ANG), Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station, RI; two C-130Js to the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands Air Guard Station, CA; and transfer four C-130Js from the 314th Airlift Wing (AD) to the 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base.", and inserted in its place, "**Realign Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas.** Distribute 42 of the C-130 aircraft assigned to Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 8 PAA C-130J aircraft at the 143d Airlift Wing (ANG), Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station, Rhode Island;
- Establish 8 PAA C-130J aircraft at the 146th Airlift Wing (ANG), Channel Islands Air Guard Station, California;
- Establish 9 PAA C-130 aircraft at 189th Airlift Wing (ANG), Little Rock Air Force Base."

[138] By Motion 103-4D, the Commission struck the text of paragraph "c", which read "**Realign Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), WV**, by realigning eight C-130H aircraft to Pope/Fort Bragg to form a 16 aircraft Air Force Reserve/active duty associate unit, and by relocating flying-related expeditionary combat support (ECS) to Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport/Shepherd Field AGS (aerial port and fire fighters).", and inserted in its place, "**Realign Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), West Virginia.**

- Establish 8 PAA C-130H aircraft at Yeager Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), West Virginia."

[139] By Motion 103-4D, the Commission struck the text of paragraph "d", which read, "**Close Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), PA**, and relocate 911th Airlift Wing's (AFRC) eight C-130H aircraft to Pope/Fort Bragg to form a 16 aircraft Air Force Reserve/active duty associate unit. Relocate AFRC operations and maintenance manpower to Pope/Fort Bragg. Relocate flight related ECS (aeromedical squadron) to Youngstown-Warren Regional APT ARS. Relocate all remaining Pittsburgh ECS and headquarters manpower to Offutt Air Force Base, NE. Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected.", and inserted in its place, "**Realign Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), Pennsylvania.** Establish a contiguous enclave at the Pittsburgh International Air Station (ARS), Pennsylvania sufficient to support continued operations of the reserve station units, including flight operations, and compatible with combined use of the civilian airport by the Air Reserve, Air National Guard and civilian users. Within that enclave, establish a Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC) at the Pittsburgh International Air Station with the mission of providing civil-military operations, homeland security and community-based medical support to the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security National Incident Management Plan and the National Response Plan. The enclave and RJRC will be staffed at the current manning level of the ARS. The PAA and personnel allocations of Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected by this recommendation."

- The 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill AFB, FL (16 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) manpower realigned from Selfridge ANGB, MI;
- The 154th Wing (ANG), Hickam AFB, HI (12 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host an active duty associate unit, and;
- The 22d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell AFB, KS (48 PAA KC-135R/T), which currently associates with the 931st Air Refueling Group (AFR);

Modify infrastructure at Grand Forks AFB to accommodate the emerging Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) mission. The Secretary of Defense will maintain eight KC-135 aircraft at Grand Forks Air Force Base to facilitate an efficient and cost effective bed down of UAVs. The Secretary will keep the tankers in place until the UAVs are operational at Grand Forks, but not later than 31 Dec 2010 unless otherwise required by the Department of Defense for National Emergencies. 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.[140]

b. **Realign McConnell Air National Guard (ANG) Base** by distributing the 184th Air Refueling Wing's (ANG) nine KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the PAA requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish 12 Primary Aircraft Authorization KC-135R/T aircraft at the 190th Air Refueling Wing, Forbes Field AGS, KS. The 184th Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the AMARC at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.[141]

---

[140] By Motion 104-4A, the Commission struck the language "Distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 126th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Scott AFB, IL (12 aircraft), which retires its eight KC-135E aircraft; the 916th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Seymour-Johnson AFB, NC (eight aircraft), which will host an active duty associate unit; the 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill AFB, FL (four aircraft), which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) manpower realigned from Selfridge ANGB, MI; the 154th Wing (ANG), Hickam AFB, HI (four aircraft), which will host an active duty associate unit; and the 22d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell AFB, KS (eight aircraft), which currently associates with the 931st Air Refueling Group (AFR)" and inserted in its place the language, "Distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the following KC-135R/T PAA:

o The 126th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Scott AFB, IL (eight PAA KC-135R/T). The 126th Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft;

o The 916th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Seymour-Johnson AFB, NC (16 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host an active duty associate unit;

o The 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill AFB, FL (16 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) manpower realigned from Selfridge ANGB, MI;

o The 154th Wing (ANG), Hickam AFB, HI (12 PAA KC-135R/T), which will host an active duty associate unit, and;

o The 22d Air Refueling Wing, McConnell AFB, KS (48 PAA KC-135R/T), which currently associates with the 931st Air Refueling Group (AFR);

Modify infrastructure at Grand Forks AFB to accommodate the emerging Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) mission. The Secretary of Defense will maintain eight KC-135 aircraft at Grand Forks Air Force Base to facilitate an efficient and cost effective bed down of UAVs. The Secretary will keep the tankers in place until the UAVs are operational at Grand Forks, but not later than 31 Dec 2010 unless otherwise required by the Department of Defense for National Emergencies."

[141] By Motion 104-4A, the Commission struck the language "**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, KS, which will retire its eight assigned KC-135E aircraft." and inserted in its place, "**Realign McConnell Air National Guard (ANG) Base** by distributing the 184th Air Refueling Wing's (ANG) nine KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the PAA requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish 12 Primary Aircraft Authorization KC-135R/T aircraft at the 190th Air Refueling Wing, Forbes Field AGS, KS. The 184th Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the AMARC at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft."

105. Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND (AF 38)

a. **Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND.** The 119th Fighter Wing (ANG) will be redesignated as an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle wing; the Armed Forces Reserve Center planned for construction on Hector Field will be expanded to include sufficient facilities to accommodate at minimum the UAV ground control and intelligence analysis functions and expeditionary combat support elements, including fire, crash and rescue services, of the 119th Wing (ANG), in addition to the units already identified in Army Recommendation 73, **Reserve Component Transformation in North Dakota**; and the Air Force will retain, adapt or construct appropriate facilities on Grand Forks Air Force Base appropriate to launch, recover, maintain and support the Unmanned Aerial Vehicles assigned to the 119th Wing (ANG). The Commission explicitly rejects the language contained in justification to the recommendation by the Secretary of Defense that there will be 'no flying mission backfill' at Hector Field. [142] The wing's expeditionary combat support elements remain in place.

106. Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH (AF 39)

a. **Realign Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), OH.** Distribute the 179th Airlift Wing's C-130H aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 8 C-130H PAA at the 908th Airlift Wing (AFR), Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.
- Establish a contiguous enclave for the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport as a civilian airport.

If the State of Ohio decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Ohio and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

---

[142] By Motion 105-4A, the Commission struck the language the Commission strike the language "The 119th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) retire," and insert in its place "With the consent of the State of North Dakota, as expressed in the Governor's August 4th letter to the Commission, and consistent with Air Force plans, the 119th Fighter Wing (ANG) will be redesignated as an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle wing; the Armed Forces Reserve Center planned for construction on Hector Field will be expanded to include sufficient facilities to accommodate at minimum the UAV ground control and intelligence analysis functions and expeditionary combat support elements, including fire, crash and rescue services, of the 119th Wing (ANG), in addition to the units already identified in Army Recommendation 73, Reserve Component Transformation in North Dakota; and the Air Force will retain, adapt or construct appropriate facilities on Grand Forks Air Force Base appropriate to launch, recover, maintain and support the Unmanned Aerial Vehicles assigned to the 119th Wing (ANG). The Commission explicitly rejects the language contained in justification to the recommendation by the Secretary of Defense that there will be 'no flying mission backfill' at Hector Field."

The Commission also made an additional statement that "This motion, even though it deletes the language "the 119th Fighter Wing's F-16s retire," does not preclude the Air Force from executing the already programmed retirement of the aircraft currently based at Hector Field. All that deletion is intended to do is to ensure flexibility for the Air Force and to keep the Commission out of business that is purely programmatic, outside the realm of the Base Closure Act. If the Air Force isn't permitted to retire those aircraft as programmed, this action wouldn't make any sense."

As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "With the consent of the State of North Dakota, as expressed in the Governor's August 4th letter to the Commission, and consistent with Air Force plans," from the motion. The portion of the August 4, 2005 letter from the Governor and Congressional Delegation that referred to the 119th Fighter Wing first urged the Commission to strike the recommendation of Secretary of Defense, retaining the F-16 aircraft at Hector Field with the 119th Fighter Wing. Failing that, the letter asked that the Commission amend the Secretary's recommendation to strike the "no flying mission" language found in the Secretary's justification and insert language to reflect the statements of the Air Force that the 119th Fighter Wing would receive an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Ohio Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[143]

107. Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH (AF 40)

a. **Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH.** Distribute the 18 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 140th Wing (ANG), Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado.
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 149th Wing (ANG), Lackland Air Force Base, Texas.
- Establish a contiguous enclave for the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport as a civilian airport.

If the State of Ohio decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Ohio and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Ohio Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[144]

---

[143] By Motion 106-4A, the Commission struck the entire text of the recommendation, which read "**Close Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), OH.** Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) to the 908th Airlift Wing (AFR), Maxwell Air Force Base, AL (four aircraft), and the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR (four aircraft). Flying related Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) moves to Louisville International Airport AGS, KY (aerial port) and Toledo Express Airport AGS, OH (fire fighters)", and inserted in its place the language, "**Realign Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station (AGS), OH.** Distribute the 179th Airlift Wing's C-130H aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 8 C-130H PAA at the 908th Airlift Wing (AFR), Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport as a civilian airport.

If the State of Ohio decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Ohio and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Ohio Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

[144] By Motion 107-4A, the Commission struck the entire text of the recommendation, which read "**Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH.** Distribute the 178th Fighter Wing's F-16 aircraft to the 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (nine aircraft); the 140th Wing (ANG), Buckley Air Force Base, CO (three aircraft) and 149th Fighter Wing (ANG), Lackland Air Force Base, TX (six aircraft), but retain the wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements, the 251st Combat

108. PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, OR (AF 41)

a. **Realign Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR.** Realign the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR). Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Tinker Air Force Base, OK as a twelve Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) KC-135R/T wing. Operations and maintenance manpower for four PAA aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Tinker Air Force Base, OK.[145] The 939th Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) is realigned to Vandenberg Air Force Base, California.[146]

b. **Realign the 142d Fighter Wing (ANG).** Distribute the 15 F-15 aircraft assigned to the 142d Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 142d Fighter Wing (ANG), Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR.
- Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 159th Fighter Wing (ANG), New Orleans ARS, LA.

Communications Group (ANG) and 269th Combat Communications Squadron (ANG) in place, and relocate the wing's firefighter positions, which will move to Rickenbacker Air Guard Station, OH.", and inserted in its place the language "**Realign Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH.** Distribute the 18 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 140th Wing (ANG), Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado.
- Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 149th Wing (ANG), Lackland Air Force Base, Texas.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport as a civilian airport.

If the State of Ohio decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Ohio and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Ohio Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 178th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

[145] The words "Holloman AFB, NM" were deleted and replaced with "Tinker Air Force Base, OK" at the request of the Department of Defense to correct an error.

[146] By Motion 108-4A, the Commission struck the language, "Realign the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) by distributing the wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Tinker Air Force Base, OK (four aircraft); the 190th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Forbes Field Air Guard Station, KS (three aircraft); and by reverting one aircraft to backup inventory. Operations and maintenance manpower for four aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing is realigned with the aircraft to Tinker Air Force Base. The 939th Air Refueling Wing's remaining manpower, to include expeditionary combat support, is realigned to Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA." and inserted in its place, "Realign the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR). Distribute the KC-135R/T aircraft assigned to the 939th Air Refueling Wing (AFR) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR), Tinker Air Force Base, OK as a twelve Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) KC-135R/T wing. Operations and maintenance manpower for four PAA aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Holloman AFB, NM. The 939th Air Refueling Wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) is realigned to Vandenberg Air Force Base, California."

The 142d Fighter Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support elements, along with the 244th and 272d Combat Communications Squadrons (ANG), and the 304th Rescue Squadron (AFR),[147] will remain at Portland and Portland will continue to support a Homeland Defense alert commitment. The 214th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), a geographically separated unit at Jackson Barracks, LA, is relocated onto available facilities at New Orleans.[148]

109. (DELETED)[149]

110. NASHVILLE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIR GUARD STATION, TN (AF 44)

a. **Realign Nashville International Airport (IAP) Air Guard Station (AGS), TN.** Distribute the 8 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 118th Airlift Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Assigned Aircraft (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 182d Airlift Wing (ANG), Greater Peoria Airport, AGS, Illinois.
- Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 123d Airlift Wing (ANG), Louisville International Airport Air Guard Station, Kentucky.
- Establish a contiguous enclave for the 118th Airlift Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of those units, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Nashville International Airport as a civilian airport.

If the State of Tennessee decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 118th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force all personnel allotted to the 118th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Tennessee and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Tennessee Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 118th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[150]

---

[147] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "and the 304th Rescue Squadron (AFR)" and deleted the language "The 304th Rescue Squadron (AFR) at Portland is realigned to McChord Air Force Base, WA, with no aircraft involved." to correct an inconsistency and conform the recommendation to the commissioners' intent.

[148] By Motion 108-4A (F-15), the Commission struck the language "by distributing the wing's F-15 aircraft to the 177th Fighter Wing (ANG), Atlantic City, NJ (six aircraft) and the 159th Fighter Wing (ANG), New Orleans ARS, LA (nine aircraft)." and inserted in its place ". Distribute the 15 F-15 aircraft assigned to the 142d Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 142d Fighter Wing (ANG), Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR.
- Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 159th Fighter Wing (ANG), New Orleans ARS, LA."

[149] By Motion 109-2, the Commission struck recommendation 109, which read "Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD and Dyess Air Force Base, TX (AF 43). **Close Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD.** The 24 B-1 aircraft assigned to the 28th Bomb Wing will be distributed to the 7th Bomb Wing, Dyess Air Force Base, TX. **Realign Dyess Air Force Base, TX.** The C-130 aircraft assigned to the 317th Airlift Group will be distributed to the active duty 314th Airlift Wing (22 aircraft) and Air National Guard 189th Airlift Wing (two aircraft), Little Rock Air Force Base, AR; the 176th Wing (ANG), Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK (four aircraft); and the 302d Airlift Wing (AFR), Peterson Air Force Base, CO (four aircraft). Peterson Air Force Base will have an active duty/Air Force Reserve association in the C-130 mission. Elmendorf Air Force Base will have an active duty/Air National Guard association in the C-130 mission."

[150] By Motion 110-4A, the Commission struck the entire text of the recommendation, which read "This recommendation distributes the C-130H aircraft of the 118th Airlift Wing (ANG) to the 182d Airlift Wing (ANG), Greater Peoria Airport AGS, IL (four aircraft), and the 123d

111. Ellington Air Guard Station, TX (AF 45)

a. **Realign Ellington Field Air Guard Station, TX.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of Ellington Field as a civilian airport.

If the State of Texas decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Texas and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Texas Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[151] Ellington retains the

---

Airlift Wing (ANG), Louisville IAP AGS, KY (four aircraft). Flying related ECS (aerial port and fire fighters) moves to Memphis IAP AGS. The Aeromedical Squadron from Nashville moves to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth. Other ECS remains in place at Nashville.", and inserted in its place the language "Distribute the 8 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 118th Airlift Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Assigned Aircraft (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 182d Airlift Wing (ANG), Greater Peoria Airport, AGS, Illinois.
- Establish 8 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 123d Airlift Wing (ANG), Louisville International Airport Air Guard Station, Kentucky."

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 118th Airlift Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of those units, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Nashville International Airport as a civilian airport.

If the State of Tennessee decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 118th Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force all personnel allotted to the 118th Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Tennessee and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Tennessee Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 118th Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

[151] By Motion 111-4A, the Commission struck the language "The 147th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) will retire. The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place." and inserted in its place "Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of Ellington Field as a civilian airport.

If the State of Texas decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Texas and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Texas Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 147th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

capability to support the Homeland Defense mission. The 272d Engineering Installation Squadron, an ANG geographically separated unit, moves into available space on Ellington.

112. Lackland Air Force Base, TX (AF 46)[152]

a. **Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX.** Relocate the Standard Air Munitions Package (STAMP)/Standard Tank, Rack, Adaptor, and Pylon Packages (STRAPP) function from Lackland Air Force Base, Medina Annex to McConnell Air Force Base, KS, and transfer the mission to the Air National Guard.

113. Hill Air Force Base, UT, Edwards Air Force Base, CA, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Luke Air Force Base, AZ, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV (AF 47)

a. **Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 419th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission;

- Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 482d Fighter Wing, Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL.
- Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 301st Fighter Wing, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.
- The AFMC F-16s will remain in place at Hill AFB.

b. **Realign Edwards Air Force Base, CA; Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID; and Luke Air Force Base, AZ,** by relocating base-level LANTIRN intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night (LANTIRN) pods at Hill AFB.

c. **Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV,** by relocating base-level F-110 engine intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a CIRF for F-110 engines at Hill.[153]

---

[152] By Motion 112-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[153] By Motion 113-4A, the Commission deleted the entire text of the recommendation, which read "**Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT.** Distribute the 419th Fighter Wing F-16s to the 482d Fighter Wing, Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL (six aircraft) and the 301st Fighter Wing, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX (nine aircraft). The AFMC F-16s at Hill will remain in place. Realign Edwards Air Force Base, CA; Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID; and Luke Air Force Base, AZ, by relocating base-level LANTIRN intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night (LANTIRN) pods at Hill. Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV, by relocating base-level F110 engine intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a CIRF for F110 engines at Hill", and inserted in its place the language "**Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 419th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission;

- Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 482d Fighter Wing, Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL.
- Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 301st Fighter Wing, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.
- The AFMC F-16s will remain in place at Hill Air Force Base.

Realign Edwards Air Force Base, CA; Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID; and Luke Air Force Base, AZ, by relocating base-level LANTIRN intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for Low Altitute Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night (LANTIRN) pods at Hill Air Force Base

Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV, by relocating base-level F-110 engine intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a CIRF for F-110 engines at Hill."

114. Langley Air Force Base, VA (AF 49)[154]

a. **Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA.** Realign base-level F-15 avionics intermediate maintenance from Langley Air Force Base to Tyndall Air Force Base, FL, by establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) at Tyndall Air Force Base, FL, for F-15 avionics.

115. Richmond Air Guard Station, VA, and Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (AF 50)

a. **Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 192d Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 24 F-16 Primary Aircraft Authorized (PAA) aircraft 482d Fighter Wing at Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida.

Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station real property accountability will transfer to the Department of the Army. The 192d Fighter Wing's manpower will associate with the 1st Fighter Wing. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Virginia Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 192d Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth.

b. **Realign Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 132d Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 F-16 PAA at the[155] 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, Iowa.
- Establish 18 F-16 PAA at the[156] 180th Fighter Wing, Toledo Express Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio.
- Establish 21 F-16 PAA at the[157] 138th Fighter Wing, Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station, Oklahoma.[158]

---

[154] By Motion 114-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[155] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "at the" to clarify the recommendation.

[156] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "at the" to clarify the recommendation.

[157] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "at the" to clarify the recommendation.

[158] By Motion 115-4A, the Commission struck the entire text of the recommendation, which read "**Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA.** Distribute the 192d Fighter Wing's F-16s to the 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (six aircraft); 482nd Fighter Wing Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL (three aircraft) and to backup inventory (six aircraft). Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station real property accountability will transfer to the Department of the Army. The 192d Fighter Wing's manpower will associate with the 1st Fighter Wing. **Realign Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA.** The F-16 aircraft currently assigned to the 132d Fighter Wing at Des Moines are redistributed to the 180th Fighter Wing, Toledo Express Airport Air Guard Station, OH (nine aircraft) and 138th Fighter Wing, Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station, OK (six aircraft).", and inserted in its place "**Realign Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station, VA.** Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 192d Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 24 F-16 Primary Aircraft Authorized (PAA) aircraft 482d Fighter Wing at Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida.

Richmond International Airport Air Guard Station real property accountability will transfer to the Department of the Army. The 192d Fighter Wing's manpower will associate with the 1st Fighter Wing. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

116. FAIRCHILD AIR FORCE BASE, WA (AF 51)

a. **Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA.** Distribute the 141st Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish eight PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 185th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard Station, Iowa. The 185th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.
- Establish eight PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 161st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport Air Guard Station, AZ.
- If the State of Washington decides to change the organization, composition and association of the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force:
- establish the 141st Air Refueling Wing as an associate flying wing of the 92d Air Refueling Wing, Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, with the 141st[159] Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remaining in place;
- provide opportunity for 141st Air Refueling Wing personnel to operate the future tanker replacement aircraft as determined by the Secretary of Defense
- The 256th Combat Communications Squadron and 242d Combat Communications Squadron, which are ANG geographically separated units at Four Lakes and Spokane, are relocated to Fairchild Air Force Base.
- All other personnel allotted to the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Washington and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Washington Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.[160]

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Virginia Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 192d Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth.

Realign Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA. Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 132d Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 F-16 PAA 132d Fighter Wing, Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, Iowa.
- Establish 18 F-16 PAA 180th Fighter Wing, Toledo Express Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio.
- Establish 21 F-16 PAA 138th Fighter Wing, Tulsa International Airport Air Guard Station, Oklahoma."

[159] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "92d" and inserted in its place "141st " to correct an error.

[160] By Motion 116-4A, the Commission struck the text of the entire recommendation, which read "The 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will associate with the 92d Air Refueling Wing at Fairchild Air Force Base, and the 141st Air Refueling Wing's eight KC-135R aircraft are distributed to the 185th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard Station, IA. The 256th Combat Communications Squadron and 242d Combat Communications Squadron, which are ANG geographically separated units at Four Lakes and Spokane, are relocated into available facilities at Fairchild Air Force Base." and inserted in its place the language "**Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA.** Distribute the 141st Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R/T aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

117. General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI (AF 52)

a. **Close General Mitchell Air Reserve Station (ARS).** Distribute the 440th Airlift Wing's C-130H aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the following C-130H PAA:

- The 94th Airlift Wing (AFR), Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), GA (8 PAA C-130H)
- The Air Force Reserve/Active Duty unit (designation to be determined) at Pope Army Airfield, NC (16 PAA C-130H);

b. Realign the 440th Airlift Wing's operations, maintenance and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) manpower to Pope Army Airfield, NC.[161] Air National Guard units at Mitchell are unaffected by this recommendation.

118. Air Force Logistics Support Centers (AF 53)[162]

a. Realign Altus Air Force Base, OK; Hickam Air Force Base, HI; Hurlburt Field, FL; Langley Air Force Base, VA; Little Rock Air Force Base, AR; Luke Air Force Base, AZ; and Scott Air Force Base, IL. Establish Air Force Logistics Support Centers (LSCs) at Langley Air Force Base and Scott Air Force Base by combining five major command (MAJCOM) Regional Supply Squadrons (RSS) into two LSCs.

---

o Establish eight PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 185th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard Station, Iowa. The 185th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center (AMARC) at Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft.

o Establish eight PAA KC-135R/T aircraft at the 161st Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport Air Guard Station, AZ.

If the State of Washington decides to change the organization, composition and association of the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force:

o establish the 141st Air Refueling Wing as an associate flying wing of the 92d Air Refueling Wing, Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, with the 92nd's Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements remaining in place;

o provide opportunity for 141st Air Refueling Wing personnel to operate the future tanker replacement aircraft as determined by the Secretary of Defense

o The 256th Combat Communications Squadron and 242d Combat Communications Squadron, which are ANG geographically separated units at Four Lakes and Spokane, are relocated to Fairchild Air Force Base.

All other personnel allotted to the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Washington and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Washington Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state."

[161] By Motion 117-4A, the Commission struck the language "Distribute the eight C-130H aircraft of the 440th Airlift Wing to the 94th Airlift Wing (AFR), Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), GA (four aircraft), and the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR (four aircraft). Realign the 440th Airlift Wing's operations, maintenance and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) manpower to Fort Bragg, NC." and inserted in its place the language, "Distribute the 440th Airlift Wing's C-130H aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Establish the following C-130H PAA:

o The 94th Airlift Wing (AFR), Dobbins Air Reserve Base (ARB), GA (8 PAA C-130H)

o The Air Force Reserve/Active Duty unit (designation to be determined) at Pope Army Airfield, NC (16 PAA C-130H);

Realign the 440th Airlift Wing's operations, maintenance and Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) manpower to Pope Army Airfield, NC."

[162] By Motion 118-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

b. Combat Air Forces (CAF): Establish a CAF LSC at Langley Air Force Base by realigning RSS positions from Hickam Air Force Base and Sembach, Germany (non-BRAC programmatic) as well as base-level Logistics Readiness Squadron (LRS) positions from Luke Air Force Base.

c. Mobility Air Forces (MAF): Establish a MAF LSC at Scott Air Force Base by realigning RSS positions from Hurlburt Field and Sembach (non-BRAC programmatic) and LRS positions from Little Rock Air Force Base and Altus Air Force Base.

119. F100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities (AF 55)[163]

a. **Realign Langley Air Force Base, VA; Tyndall Air Force Base, FL; and Jacksonville International Airport Air Guard Station, FL.** Establish a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for F100 engines at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, NC by realigning base-level F100 engine intermediate maintenance from Langley Air Force Base. Establish a CIRF for F100 engines at New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA (Air National Guard unit) by realigning base-level F100 engine intermediate maintenance from Tyndall Air Force Base and Jacksonville Air Guard Station.

[163] By Motion 119-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

CHAPTER IV. EDUCATION AND TRAINING JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

120. (DELETED)[164]

121. COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CENTER (E&T 6)[165]

a. **Realign Fort Eustis, VA**, by relocating the Transportation Center and School to Fort Lee, VA.

b. **Realign Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD** by relocating the Ordnance Center and School to Fort Lee, VA.

c. **Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL**, by relocating the Missile and Munitions Center to Fort Lee, VA. Consolidate the Transportation Center and School and the Ordnance Center and School with the Quartermaster Center & School, the Army Logistic Management College, and Combined Arms Support Command, to establish a Combat Service Support Center at Fort Lee, VA.

122. JOINT CENTER FOR CONSOLIDATED TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT TRAINING (E&T 7)[166]

a. **Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX**, by relocating the Transportation Management training to Fort Lee, VA.

123. JOINT CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR CULINARY TRAINING (E&T 8)[167]

a. **Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX**, by relocating Culinary Training to Fort Lee, VA, establishing it as a Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training.

124. JOINT CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR RELIGIOUS TRAINING & EDUCATION (E&T 9)[168]

a. **Realign Maxwell Air Force Base, AL; Naval Air Station Meridian, MS; and Naval Station Newport, RI**, by relocating religious training and education to Fort Jackson, SC, establishing a Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education.

125. JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER INITIAL JOINT TRAINING SITE (E&T 10)[169]

a. **Realign Luke Air Force Base, AZ**, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots and operations support personnel to stand up the Air Force's portion of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

---

[164] By Motion 120-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 120, which read "***Aviation Logistics School (E&T 5).*** **Realign Fort Eustis** by relocating the Aviation Logistics School and consolidating it with the Aviation Center and School at Fort Rucker."

[165] By Motion G-121-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[166] By Motion 122-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[167] By Motion G-121-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[168] By Motion 124-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[169] By Motion 125-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

b. **Realign Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA**, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots and operations support personnel to stand up the Marine Corps' portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

c. **Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, VA**, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots, operations, and maintenance support personnel to stand up the Navy's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

d. **Realign Sheppard Air Force Base, TX**, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of front-line and instructor-qualified maintenance technicians and logistics support personnel to stand up the Air Force's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

e. **Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL**, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of front-line and instructor-qualified maintenance technicians and logistics support personnel to stand up the Department of the Navy's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

126. Net Fires Center (E&T 12)[170]

a. **Realign Fort Bliss, TX**, by relocating the Air Defense Artillery (ADA) Center & School to Fort Sill, OK. Consolidate the Air Defense Artillery Center & School with the Field Artillery Center & School to establish a Net Fires Center.

127. Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, MO (E&T 13)[171]

a. **Realign Fort Belvoir, VA**, by relocating Army Prime Power School training to Fort Leonard Wood, MO.

128. Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training (E&T 14)[172]

a. **Realign Moody Air Force Base, GA**, as follows: relocate the Primary Phase of Fixed-wing Pilot Training to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, Randolph Air Force Base, TX, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers to Columbus Air Force Base, MS, Laughlin Air Force Base, TX, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, and Vance Air Force Base, OK; and relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundaments Training for Instructor Pilots to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.

b. **Realign Randolph Air Force Base, TX**, by relocating Undergraduate Navigator Training to Naval Air Station, Pensacola, FL.

---

[170] By Motion G-121-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[171] By Motion G-121-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[172] By Motion 128-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

CHAPTER V. HEADQUARTERS AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

129. CO-LOCATE MISCELLANEOUS AIR FORCE LEASED LOCATIONS AND NATIONAL GUARD HEADQUARTERS LEASED LOCATIONS (H&SA 3)[173]

a. **Close 1501 Wilson Blvd, a leased installation in Arlington, VA.** Relocate the Air Force-Judge Advocate General to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

b. **Close 1560 Wilson Blvd, a leased installation in Arlington, VA.** Relocate the Secretary of the Air Force-Acquisition to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

c. **Close Arlington Plaza, a leased installation in Arlington, VA.** Relocate the Secretary of the Air Force-Auditor General to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

d. **Realign 1401 Wilson Blvd, the Nash Street Building, and 1919 Eads Street, leased installations in Arlington, VA,** by relocating Air Force-Operations to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign 1815 N. Fort Myer Drive, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating Air Force-Operations, the Secretary of the Air Force-Administrative Assistant, and the Secretary of the Air Force-Auditor General to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Realign Ballston Metro Center, a leased installation in Arlington, VA, by relocating the Secretary of the Air Force-Public Affairs and the Secretary of the Air Force-Small Business to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

g. **Realign Crystal Gateway 1, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating Air Force- Personnel, Air Force-Installation and Logistics, Air Force-Operations, and Air Force-Personnel Operations to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

h. **Realign Crystal Gateway 2 and Jefferson Plaza 2, leased installations in Arlington, VA,** by relocating Air Force-Installation and Logistics to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

i. **Realign Crystal Gateway North, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating Air Force-Installation and Logistics and the Secretary of the Air Force-Financial Management to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

j. **Realign Crystal Park 5 and Crystal Plaza 6, leased installations in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Secretary of the Air Force-Administrative Assistant to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

k. **Realign Crystal Plaza 5, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Air Force-Chief Information Officer and Air Force-Operations to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

l. **Realign Crystal Square 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating Air Force- Personnel and Air Force-Personnel Operations to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

m. **Realign the Webb Building, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating Air Force- Personnel and the Secretary of the Air Force/General Counsel to Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

n. **Realign Jefferson Plaza-1, Arlington, VA,** by relocating the National Guard Bureau Headquarters, the Air National Guard Headquarters, and elements of the Army National Guard Headquarters to the Army National Guard Readiness Center, Arlington, VA, and Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

130. CO-LOCATE DEFENSE/MILITARY DEPARTMENT ADJUDICATION ACTIVITIES (H&SA 5)

a. **Close 21820 Burbank Boulevard, a leased installation in Woodland Hills, CA.** Relocate all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Western Hearing Office to Fort Meade, MD.

---

[173] By Motion 129-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

b. **Realign[174] 800 Elkridge Landing Road, a leased installation in Linthicum, MD.** Relocate all components of the National Security Agency Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

c. **Realign 2780 Airport Drive, a leased installation in Columbus, OH,** by relocating all components of the Defense Industrial Security Clearance Office and the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Personal Security Division to Fort Meade, MD.

d. **Realign 1777 N. Kent Street, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating all components of the Washington Headquarters Service Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

e. **Realign 875 N. Randolph Street, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Headquarters to Fort Meade, MD.

f. **Realign 10050 North 25th Avenue, a leased installation in Phoenix, AZ,** by relocating all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Arizona office to Fort Meade, MD.

g. **Realign the Washington Navy Yard, DC,** by relocating all components of the Navy Central Adjudication Facility Fort Meade, MD.

h. **Realign Bolling Air Force Base, DC,** by relocating all components of the Air Force Central Adjudication Facility and the Defense Intelligence Agency Central Adjudication Facility Fort Meade, MD.

i. **Realign the Pentagon, Washington, DC,** by relocating all components of the Joint Staff Central Adjudication Facility to Fort Meade, MD.

j. **Realign the U.S. Army Soldiers Systems Center Garrison, Natick, MA,** by relocating all components of the Defense Office of Hearings and Appeals Boston Hearing office to Fort Meade, MD.

131. Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency (H&SA 8)

a. **Close 1919 South Eads Street, and 1801 South Bell Street, leased installations in Arlington, VA;** 1340 Braddock Place, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA; and 938 Elkridge Landing, a leased installation in Linthicum, MD. Relocate all components of the Counterintelligence Field Activity (CIFA) and Defense Security Service (DSS) to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

b. **Realign Crystal Square 2, Crystal Square 4, and 251 18th Street South, leased installations in Arlington, VA;** and 6845 and 6856 Deerpath Road, leased installations in Elkridge, MD; 1 World Trade Center, a leased installation in Long Beach, California; 2300 Lake Park Drive, a leased installation in Smyrna, GA; and 2780 Airport Drive, a leased installation in Columbus, OH, by relocating all components of CIFA and DSS to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

c. **Realign 121 Tejon, a leased installation in Colorado Springs, CO,** by relocating all components of CIFA to Peterson Air Force Base, CO.

d. **Disestablish Counterintelligence Field Activity and Defense Security Service,** and consolidate their components into the Department of Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency, if that agency is established by law or directive.[175]

e. **Realign Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC,** by relocating the Naval Criminal Investigation Service (NCIS) to Marine Corp Base Quantico, VA.

f. **Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD** by relocating the Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) to Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA.

g. **Realign Fort Belvoir, VA,** by relocating the Army Criminal Investigation Command (CID) to Marine Corp Base Quantico, VA.

---

[174] By Motion 130-4A, the Commission struck the word "Close" in paragraph "b" and replaced it with the word "Realign".

[175] By Motion 131-4A, the Commission struck the language "**Disestablish CIFA and DSS**, and consolidate their components into the newly created Department of Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency." and inserted in its place "**Disestablish Counterintelligence Field Activity and Defense Security Service**, and consolidate their components into the Department of Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency, if that agency is established by law or directive."

132. Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations (H&SA 10)[176]

a. **Realign Ballston Metro Center, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the U.S. Army Legal Agency to Fort Belvoir, VA.

b. **Realign Park Center Office 1, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA,** by relocating the U.S. Army Audit Agency to Fort Belvoir, VA.

c. **Realign Skyline VI, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA,** by relocating the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army (SAAA) to Fort Belvoir, VA.

d. **Realign the Zachary Taylor Building, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the U.S. Army G6/DISC4, the G8/Force Development, the G1/Army Research Institute, the U.S. Army Network Enterprise Technology Command, and the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army (SAAA) to Fort Belvoir, VA.

e. **Realign Crystal Square 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating U.S. Army NISAP, the U.S. Army Environmental Policy Institute, and Senior Executive Public Affairs Training to Fort Belvoir, VA.

f. **Realign Crystal Gateway 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army - Operations Research to Fort Belvoir, VA.

g. **Realign the Hoffman 1 and 2 Buildings, leased installations in Alexandria, VA,** by relocating U.S. Army G1/Civilian Personnel Office, G1/Personnel Transformation, the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army(SAAA), and the Communication and Electronics Command to Fort Belvoir, VA.

h. **Realign Rosslyn Metro Center, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army (SAAA) to Fort Belvoir, VA.

i. **Realign Jefferson Plaza 1 and 2, leased installations in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the U.S. Army Office of the Chief Army Reserve, Assistant Secretary of the Army Financial Management and Comptroller/CEAC, the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army(SAAA), and Chief of Chaplains to Fort Belvoir, VA.

j. **Realign Crystal Gateway North, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the U.S. Army G3/Army Simulation to Fort Belvoir, VA.

k. **Realign Crystal Plaza 5, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the U.S. Army Safety Office and OSAA to the Fort Belvoir, VA.

l. **Realign Crystal Mall 4, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Assistant Secretary of the Army Manpower and Reserve Affairs/Amy Review Board/Equal Opportunity Office to the Fort Belvoir, VA.

m. **Realign Crystal Gateway 1, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating U.S. Army Office of Environmental Technology to Fort Belvoir, VA.

133. Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased Locations (H&SA 12)[177]

a. **Close 1010 North Glebe Road, 1515 Wilson Boulevard, 4850 Mark Center Drive, the Crown Ridge Building at 4035 Ridgetop, and 1901 N. Beauregard, leased installations in Northern VA,** by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense to Fort Belvoir, VA.

b. **Close North Tower at 2800 Crystal Drive, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the DoD Inspector General to Fort Belvoir, VA.

c. **Close 1600 Wilson Boulevard, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

---

[176] By Motion 132-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[177] By Motion 133-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

d. **Close 1500 Wilson Boulevard and Presidential Towers, leased installations in Arlington, VA,** by relocating offices accommodating Pentagon Renovation temporary space to Fort Belvoir, VA.

e. **Close Metro Park III and IV (6350 and 6359 Walker Lane), a leased installation in Alexandria, VA,** by relocating the Defense Contract Management Agency Headquarters to Fort Lee, VA.

f. **Realign 400 Army Navy Drive, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, and the DoD Inspector General to Fort Belvoir, VA.

g. **Realign the Webb Building, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Department of Defense Education Activity and the Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

h. **Realign Rosslyn Plaza North, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating offices accommodating Pentagon Renovation temporary space, Washington Headquarters Services and the Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

i. **Realign Crystal Gateway North, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, and the DoD Inspector General to Fort Belvoir, VA.

j. **Realign 2001 North Beauregard Street, 621 North Payne Street, Ballston Metro Center, Crystal Square 4, Crystal Square 5, Crystal Plaza 6, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Skyline 5, and Skyline 6, leased installations in Northern VA,** by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense to Fort Belvoir, VA.

k. **Realign Crystal Mall 3, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Defense Finance and Accounting Service at Fort Belvoir, VA.

l. **Realign Hoffman 1, Crystal Gateway 1, Crystal Gateway 2, Crystal Gateway 3, and the James K. Polk Building, leased installations in Northern VA,** by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Washington Headquarters Services to Fort Belvoir, VA.

m. **Realign the Nash Street Building, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

n. **Realign Alexandria Tech Center IV, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA,** by relocating the Defense Technology Security Administration to Fort Belvoir, VA.

o. **Realign 1400-1450 South Eads Street, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the DoD Inspector General to Fort Belvoir, VA.

p. **Realign 1401 Wilson Boulevard, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, and Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

q. **Realign 1555 Wilson Boulevard, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating offices of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Defense Human Resources Activity to Fort Belvoir, VA.

r. **Realign Crystal Mall 2-3-4 and Skyline 4, leased installations in Northern VA,** by relocating Washington Headquarters Services to Fort Belvoir, VA.

134. Co-locate Missile and Space Defense Agencies (H&SA 15)

a. **Close the Suffolk Building, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA.** Relocate all Missile Defense Agency (MDA) functions, except the Ballistic Missile Defense System Sensors Directorate, to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

b. **Realign[178] the Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) Building, a leased installation in Huntsville, AL.** Relocate all functions of the Missile Defense Agency to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

c. **Realign Federal Office Building 2, Arlington, VA,** by relocating a Headquarters Command Center for the Missile Defense Agency to Fort Belvoir, VA, and by relocating all other functions of the Missile Defense Agency, except the Command and Control Battle Management and Communications Directorate, to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

[178] By Motion 134-4A, the Commission struck the word "**Close**" and inserted in its place the word "**Realign**".

d. **Realign Crystal Square 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating all functions of the Missile Defense Agency and the Headquarters component of the USA Space and Missile Defense Command to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

e. **Realign Crystal Mall 4, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Headquarters component of the USA Space and Missile Defense Command to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

2. 135. (Deleted)[179]

136. Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Headquarters (H&SA 18)[180]

a. **Realign Park Center Four, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA,** by relocating and consolidating Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) with its subcomponents at Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD.

137. Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices (CPOs) within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies (H&SA 19)

a. **Realign Fort Richardson, AK,** by relocating the Civilian Personnel Operations Center to Fort Huachuca, AZ, and consolidating it with the Civilian Personnel Operations Center at Fort Huachuca, AZ.

b. **(Deleted)**[181]

c. **Realign Human Resource Service Center-Northeast, 111 S. Independence Mall, East, Bourse Building, a leased installation in Philadelphia, PA,** by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to the Naval Support Activity Philadelphia, PA.

d. **(Deleted)**[182]

e. **Realign Human Resource Service Center-Southwest, 525 B Street, Suite 600, a leased installation in San Diego, CA,** by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to Naval Air Station North Island or Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

f. **Realign Human Resource Service Center-Pacific, 178 Main Street, Bldg 499, Honolulu, HI,** by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to the Human Resource Service Center-Northwest, 3230 NW Randall Way, Silverdale, WA, and Naval Air Station North Island or Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA and consolidating with the Human Resource Service Centers at Silverdale, WA and Naval Air Station North Island or Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

g. **Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH,** by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office[183] to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel

---

[179] By Motion 135-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 135, which read "Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center (H&SA 17). **Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL,** by relocating Navy Education and Training Command to Naval Support Activity Millington, TN. **Realign Saufley Field, FL,** by relocating Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center to Naval Support Activity Millington, TN."

[180] By Motion 136-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[181] By Motion 137-4A, the Commission struck paragraph "b", which read "**Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL,** by relocating the Civilian Personnel Operations Center to Fort Riley, KS, and Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and consolidating with the Civilian Personnel Operations Center at Fort Riley, KS, and Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD."

[182] By Motion 137-4A, the Commission struck paragraph "d", which read "**Realign Human Resource Service Center-Southeast, 9110 Leonard Kimble Road, a leased installation at Stennis Space Center, MS,** by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office to the Naval Support Activity Philadelphia, PA, and consolidating it with the relocated Human Resource Service Center-Northeast at the Naval Support Activity, Philadelphia, PA."

[183] By Motion 137-4A, the Commission struck the language "**Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH,** by relocating the Civilian Personnel Office", and inserted in its place the language "**Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH,** by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office."

management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH civilian workforce.[184]

h. **Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA,** by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support the Robins Air Force Base, GA civilian workforce.[185]

i. **Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT,** by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support the Hill Air Force Base, UT civilian workforce.[186]

j. **Realign Tinker Air Force Base, OK,** by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support the Tinker Air Force Base, UT civilian workforce.[187]

k. **Realign Bolling Air Force Base, DC,** by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Consolidate the relocated civilian personnel offices with the Civilian Personnel Office at Randolph Air Force Base, TX. Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support the Bolling Air Force Base, DC civilian workforce.[188]

l. **Realign 2521 Jefferson Davis Hwy, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the transactional functions of the Defense Commissary Agency Human Resource Division and the Washington Headquarters Services Civilian Personnel Office to the Defense Logistics Agency, 3990 East Broad Street, Columbus, OH, and consolidating them with the Customer Support Office of the Defense Logistics Agency.

m. **Realign the Department of Defense Education Activity, 4040 North Fairfax Drive, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to the Defense Logistics Agency 3990 East Broad Street, Columbus, OH, and consolidating them with the Customer Support Office of the Defense Logistics Agency.

---

[184] By Motion 137-4A, the Commission appended the language "Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services, the non-transactional functions, necessary to support the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH civilian workforce."

[185] By Motion 137-4A, the Commission appended the language "Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support the Robins Air Force Base, GA civilian workforce." As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "the transactional functions of" and replaced "and non-transactional functions" with the language ", the non-transactional functions," to clarify the meaning of the change, paralleling the more precise language applied to paragraph "g".

[186] By Motion 137-4A, the Commission appended the language "Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support the Hill Air Force Base, UT civilian workforce." As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "the transactional functions of" and replaced "and non-transactional functions" with the language ", the non-transactional functions," to clarify the meaning of the change, paralleling the more precise language applied to paragraph "g".

[187] By Motion 137-4A, the Commission appended the language "Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support the Tinker Air Force Base, UT civilian workforce." As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "the transactional functions of" and replaced "and non-transactional functions" with the language ", the non-transactional functions," to clarify the meaning of the change, paralleling the more precise language applied to paragraph "g".

[188] By Motion 137-4A, the Commission appended the language "Retain sufficient positions and personnel to perform the personnel management advisory services and non-transactional functions necessary to support the Bolling Air Force Base, DC civilian workforce." As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "the transactional functions of" and replaced "and non-transactional functions" with the language ", the non-transactional functions," to clarify the meaning of the change, paralleling the more precise language applied to paragraph "g".

n. **Realign the Defense Information Systems Agency, 701 S. Courthouse Road, Arlington, VA,** by relocating the transactional functions of the Civilian Personnel Office to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, 8899 E. 56th Street, Indianapolis, IN, and consolidating them with the Civilian Personnel Office of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service at Indianapolis, IN.

138. Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities (H&SA 22)[189]

a. **Realign Edwards Air Force Base, CA, Kirtland Air Force Base, NM, and Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, CA,** by relocating the correctional function of each to Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, CA, and consolidating them with the correctional function already at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA, to form a single Level II Southwest Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

b. **Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, Fort Knox, KY, and Fort Sill, OK** by relocating the correctional function of each to Fort Leavenworth, KS, and consolidating them with the correctional function already at Fort Leavenworth, KS, to form a single Level II Midwest Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

c. **Realign Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL, and Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL,** by relocating the correctional function of each to Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, and consolidating them with the correctional function already at Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, to form a single Level II Southeastern Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

d. **Realign Naval Support Activity Norfolk, VA, Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA, and Camp LeJeune, NC,** by relocating the correctional function of each and consolidating them at Naval Support Activity, Northwest Annex, Chesapeake, VA, to form a single Level II Mid-Atlantic Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

e. **Realign Fort Lewis, WA,** by relocating the management of correctional functions to Submarine Base Bangor, WA. The correctional facilities at Submarine Base Bangor, WA, and Fort Lewis, WA, will together form the Level II Northwestern Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

139. Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional, and Hopewell, VA Offices (H&SA 26)[190]

a. **Close 300 AFCOMS Way, a leased installation in San Antonio, TX; 5258 Oaklawn Boulevard, a leased installation in Hopewell, VA; and 5151 Bonney Road, a leased installation in Virginia Beach, VA.** Relocate all components of the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) to Fort Lee, VA.

140. Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR D&A Capability (H&SA 27)[191]

a. **Close 5600 Columbia Pike and Skyline Place (Skyline VII), leased installations in Falls Church, VA, and 1010 Gause Boulevard, a leased installation in Slidell, LA.** Relocate all components of the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) to Fort Meade, MD.

b. **Close the Logicon Building, a leased installation in Arlington, Virginia.** Relocate the Joint Task Force-Global Network Operation (JTF-GNO) to Fort Meade, MD.

c. **Realign Skyline IV and Skyline V, leased installations in Falls Church, VA, and GSA Franconia Warehouse Depot, a leased installation in Springfield, VA,** by relocating all components of DISA to Fort Meade, MD.

d. **Realign Arlington Service Center, VA,** by relocating all components of DISA and the JTF-GNO to Fort Meade, MD.

---

[189] By Motion G-138-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[190] By Motion G-138-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[191] By Motion G-138-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

e. **Realign Naval Support Activity Panama City, Florida** by relocating the Deployable Joint Command and Control (DJC2) Program Office of the Naval Surface Warfare Center to Fort Meade, MD.

f. **Realign Rosslyn Plaza North, a leased location in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) Program Office to Fort Meade, MD.

141. Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications (H&SA 30)[192]

a. **Realign Fort Belvoir, VA,** by relocating Soldier Magazine to Fort Meade, MD.

b. **Realign Anacostia Annex, District of Columbia,** by relocating the Naval Media Center to Fort Meade, MD.

c. **Realign 2320 Mill Road, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA,** by relocating Army Broadcasting-Soldier Radio/TV to Fort Meade, MD.

d. **Realign 103 Norton Street, a leased installation in San Antonio, TX,** by relocating Air Force News Agency-Army/Air Force Hometown News Service (a combined entity) to Fort Meade, MD.

e. **Close 601 North Fairfax Street, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA,** by relocating the American Forces Information Service and the Army Broadcasting-Soldier Radio/TV to Fort Meade, MD. Consolidate Soldier Magazine, Naval Media Center, Army Broadcasting-Soldier Radio/TV, and the Air Force News Agency-Army/Air Force Hometown News Service into a single DoD Media Activity at Fort Meade, MD.

142. Consolidate Transportation Command Components (H&SA 31)[193]

a. **Realign Fort Eustis, VA,** by relocating the Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command to Scott Air Force Base, IL, and consolidating it with the Air Force Air Mobility Command Headquarters and Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) Headquarters at Scott Air Force Base, IL.

b. **Realign Hoffman 2, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA,** by relocating the US Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command to Scott Air Force Base, IL, and consolidating it with the Air Force Air Mobility Command Headquarters and Transportation Command Headquarters at Scott Air Force Base, IL.

c. **Realign US Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command -Transportation Engineering Agency facility in Newport News, VA,** by relocating US Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command – Transportation Engineering Agency to Scott Air Force Base, IL, and consolidating it with the Air Force Air Mobility Command Headquarters and Transportation Command Headquarters at Scott Air Force Base, IL.

143. Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force (H&SA 33)

a. **Realign Army Human Resources Command leased facilities in Alexandria, VA, Indianapolis, IN, and St. Louis, MO.** Relocate and consolidate all functions at Fort Knox, KY.

b. **Realign the Air Reserve Personnel Center (Buckley Annex), CO,** by relocating the Air Reserve Personnel Center to Buckley Air Force Base, Denver, CO, [194] and by relocating the Individual Mobilization Augmentee operational management functions to Robins Air Force Base, GA, and consolidating them with the Air Force Reserve Command at Robins Air Force Base, GA.

---

[192] By Motion G-138-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[193] By Motion G-138-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[194] By Motion 143-4A, the Commission struck the language in paragraph "b", which read "by relocating the Air Reserve Personnel Center processing functions to Randolph Air Force Base, TX, and consolidating them with the Air Force Personnel Center at Randolph Air Force Base, TX," and inserted in its place "by relocating the Air Reserve Personnel Center to Buckley Air Force Base, Denver, CO."

c. **(Deleted)**[195]

144. Create Joint Mobilization Sites (H&SA 35)[196]

a. **Realign Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, Washington Navy Yard, DC, and Naval Submarine Base New London, CT**, by relocating all mobilization functions to Fort Dix, NJ, designating it as Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Site Dix/McGuire/Lakehurst.

b. **Realign Submarine Base Bangor, WA**, by relocating all mobilization processing functions to Ft Lewis, WA, designating it as Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Site Lewis/McChord.

c. **Realign Ft Huachuca, AZ**, by relocating all mobilization processing functions to Ft Bliss, TX, designating it as Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Site Bliss/Holloman.

d. **Realign Ft Eustis, VA, Ft Jackson, SC, and Ft Lee, VA**, by relocating all mobilization processing functions to Ft Bragg, NC, designating it as Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Site Bragg/Pope.

145. Defense Finance and Accounting Service (H&SA 37)

a. **Close the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) sites at Denver, CO; Rock Island IL; Pensacola Saufley Field, FL; Norfolk Naval Station, VA; Lawton, OK; Pensacola Naval Air Station, FL; Omaha, NE; Dayton, OH; St. Louis, MO; San Antonio, TX; San Diego, CA; Pacific Ford Island, HI; Patuxent River, MD; Charleston, SC; Orlando, FL; Lexington, KY; Kansas City, MO; Seaside, CA; San Bernardino, CA; and Oakland, CA.** Relocate the functions performed at these locations to the DFAS sites at Cleveland, OH, Columbus, OH, Indianapolis, IN, Limestone, ME, and Rome, NY; grow the DFAS site at Cleveland, OH to not less than 1500 Full Time Equivalents (FTE); grow the DFAS site at Limestone, ME to not less than 600 FTE, and grow the DFAS site at Rome, NY to not less than 1000 FTE; maintain not less than the current FTEs at the DFAS sites at Columbus, OH, and Indianapolis, IN. Assign functions among the DFAS sites retained to provide for strategic redundancy in all critical tasks. **Realign the Arlington**, VA site by relocating all functions to the remaining DFAS sites except the minimum essential DFAS liaison staff to support the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, Military Service Chief Financial Officers, and Congressional requirements, which will be retained in the National Capital Region.[197]

---

[195] By Motion 143-4A, the Commission struck paragraph "c", which read "**Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA**, by relocating Air Force Reserve Recruiting Service to Randolph Air Force Base, TX."

[196] By Motion G-138-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[197] By Motion 196-4B, the Commission struck Recommendation 145, which read "**Close the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) sites at Rock Island IL; Pensacola Saufley Field, FL; Norfolk Naval Station, VA; Lawton, OK; Pensacola Naval Air Station, FL; Omaha, NE; Dayton, OH; St. Louis, MO; San Antonio, TX; San Diego, CA; Pacific Ford Island, HI; Patuxent River, MD; Limestone, ME; Charleston, SC; Orlando, FL; Rome, NY; Lexington, KY; Kansas City, MO; Seaside, CA; San Bernardino, CA; and Oakland, CA.** Relocate and consolidate business, corporate and administrative functions to the Defense Supply Center-Columbus, OH, the Buckley Air Force Base Annex, Denver, CO, or the MG Emmett J. Bean Federal Center, Indianapolis, IN. **Realign DFAS Arlington, VA**, by relocating and consolidating business, corporate, and administrative functions to the Defense Supply Center-Columbus, OH, the Buckley Air Force Base Annex, Denver, CO, or the MG Emmett J. Bean Federal Center, Indianapolis, IN. Retain a minimum essential DFAS liaison staff to support the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, Military Service Chief Financial Officers, and Congressional requirements. **Realign DFAS Cleveland, OH**, by relocating and consolidating business, corporate, and administrative functions to the Defense Supply Center-Columbus, OH, the Buckley Air Force Base Annex, Denver, CO, or the MG Emmett J. Bean Federal Center, Indianapolis, IN. Retain an enclave for the Military Retired and Annuitant Pay Services contract function and government oversight. **Realign DFAS Denver, CO**, by relocating up to 25 percent of the Accounting Operation functions and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Columbus, OH, or DFAS Indianapolis, IN, and up to 35 percent of the Military Pay function and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Indianapolis, IN, for strategic redundancy. **Realign DFAS Columbus, OH**, by relocating up to 55 percent of the Accounting Operation functions and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Denver, CO, or DFAS Indianapolis, IN, and up to 30 percent of the Commercial Pay function and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Indianapolis, IN, for strategic redundancy. **Realign DFAS Indianapolis, IN**, by relocating up to 10 percent of the Accounting Operation functions and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Columbus, OH or DFAS Denver, CO, and up to 20 percent of the Commercial Pay function and associated corporate and administrative functions to DFAS Columbus, OH, for

146. JOINT BASING (H&SA 41)

a. **Realign McChord Air Force Base (AFB), WA,** by relocating the installation management functions to Fort Lewis, WA, establishing Joint Base Lewis-McChord.

b. **Realign Fort Dix, NJ, and Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst, NJ,** by relocating the installation management functions to McGuire AFB, NJ, establishing Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst.

c. **Realign Naval Air Facility Washington, MD,** by relocating the installation management functions to Andrews AFB, MD, establishing Joint Base Andrews-Naval Air Facility Washington, MD.

d. **Realign Bolling AFB, DC,** by relocating the installation management functions to Naval District Washington at the Washington Navy Yard, DC, establishing Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling[198], DC.

e. **Realign Henderson Hall, VA,** by relocating the installation management functions to Fort Myer, VA, establishing Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall, VA.

f. **Realign Fort Richardson, AK,** by relocating the installation management functions to Elmendorf AFB, AK, establishing Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, AK.

g. **Realign Hickam AFB, HI,** by relocating the installation management functions to Naval Station Pearl Harbor, HI, establishing Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI.

h. **Realign Fort Sam Houston, TX, and Randolph AFB, TX,** by relocating the installation management functions to Lackland AFB, TX.

i. **Realign Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC,** by relocating the installation management functions to Charleston AFB, SC.

j. **Realign Fort Eustis, VA,** by relocating the installation management functions to Langley AFB, VA.

k. **Realign Fort Story, VA,** by relocating the installation management functions to Commander Naval Mid-Atlantic Region at Naval Station Norfolk, VA.

---

strategic redundancy." and inserted in its place "**Close the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) sites at Denver, CO; Rock Island IL; Pensacola Saufley Field, FL; Norfolk Naval Station, VA; Lawton, OK; Pensacola Naval Air Station, FL; Omaha, NE; Dayton, OH; St. Louis, MO; San Antonio, TX; San Diego, CA; Pacific Ford Island, HI; Patuxent River, MD; Charleston, SC; Orlando, FL; Lexington, KY; Kansas City, MO; Seaside, CA; San Bernardino, CA; and Oakland, CA.** Relocate the functions performed at these locations to the DFAS sites at Cleveland, OH, Columbus, OH, Indianapolis, IN Limestone, ME, and Rome, NY; grow the DFAS site at Cleveland, OH, to not less than 1500 Full Time Equivalents (FTE); grow the DFAS site at Limestone, ME to not less than 600 FTE, and grow the DFAS site at Rome, NY to not less than 1000 FTE; maintain not less than the current FTEs at the DFAS sites at Columbus, OH and Indianapolis, IN. Assign functions among the DFAS sites retained to provide for strategic redundancy in all critical tasks. **Realign the Arlington, VA** site by relocating all functions to the remaining DFAS sites except the minimum essential DFAS liaison staff to support the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, Military Service Chief Financial Officers, and Congressional requirements, which will be retained in the National Capital Region."

[198] By Motion 146-3A, the Commission struck the language "Naval Research Laboratory (NRL)."

The Commission made the following additional statement:

> NRL is a Secretary of the Navy Working Capital Fund Activity. Real property and BOS functions integral to the research and industrial functions at NRL will remain with the Commanding Officer. Because of Navy's centralization of installation management functions, Naval District Washington provides non-mission related services to NRL already, such as Morale, Welfare, and Recreation and food services. This is not intended to alter that relationship.
>
> And further, as pertains to the entire Joint Basing recommendation, the Commission states that manpower savings shall not be directed, as they are in the DoD proposal, but must be derived from standard manpower and functional analysis studies, and cooperative joint determinations between the affected installations. Moreover, the Department of Defense must provide DoD-wide standards for delivery of services and common definitions for those services before installation management functions are relocated from the losing activities.

l. **Realign Andersen AFB, Guam,** by relocating the installation management functions to Commander, U.S. Naval Forces, Marianas Islands, Guam.

3. *Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA) (H&SA 44)*[199]

a. **Realign Rosslyn Center and the Nash Street Building, leased installations in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Air Force Real Property Agency to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, TX.

148. Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies (H&SA 46)[200]

a. **Realign the Zachary Taylor Building, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Army Installation Management Agency headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

b. **Realign Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois,** as follows: relocate the Army Installation Management Agency Northwest Region headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX, and consolidate it with the Army Installation Management Agency Southwest Region headquarters to form the Army Installation Management Agency Western Region; and relocate the Army Network Enterprise Technology Command Northwest Region headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX, and consolidate it with the Army Network Enterprise Technology Command Southwest Region headquarters to form the Army Network Enterprise Technology Command Western Region.

c. **Realign Crystal Square 2, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Army HR XXI office to Fort Knox, KY.

d. **Realign the Park Center IV Building, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA,** by relocating the Army Center for Substance Abuse to Fort Knox, KY.

e **Realign Seven Corners Corporate Center, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA, and 4700 King Street, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA,** by relocating the Army Community and Family Support Center to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

f. **Realign Rosslyn Metro Center, a leased installation in Arlington, VA,** by relocating the Army Family Liaison Office to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

g. **Realign Skyline Six, a leased installation in Falls Church, VA,** by relocating the Army Contracting Agency headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

h. **Realign the Hoffman 1 Building, a leased installation in Alexandria, VA,** by relocating the Army Contracting Agency E-Commerce Region headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

i. **Realign Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico,** by relocating the Army Contracting Agency Southern Hemisphere Region headquarters to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

j. **Realign Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD,** by relocating the Army Environmental Center to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

k. **Realign Fort Belvoir, VA** by relocating Army Materiel Command (AMC) and the Security Assistance Command (USASAC, an AMC major subordinate command) to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

149. Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations (H&SA 49)[201]

a. **Close Crystal Park 3 and Crystal Square 3, leased installations in Arlington, VA, and 214191 Great Mills Road and 21535 Pacific Drive, leased installations in Lexington Park, MD.** Relocate all Department of the Navy organizations

---

[199] By Motion G-138-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[200] By Motion G-138-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[201] The Commission vote to find the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan failed.

currently located in Crystal Park 3 and Crystal Square 3 to DoD owned space in the National Capital Region; relocate all Department of the Navy organizations currently located in 214191 Great Mills Road and 21535 Pacific Drive, leased installations in Lexington Park, MD to Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD.[202]

b. **Realign Crystal Gateway 3, Crystal Gateway 4, Crystal Mall 2, Crystal Mall 3, Crystal Park 1, Crystal Park 5, Crystal Square 2, 1400-1450 S. Eads Street, and 2300 Clarendon Blvd, all leased installations in Arlington, VA, and any other Department of the Navy occupied leased space in the National Capital Region,** by relocating all Department of the Navy organizations to DoD owned space in the National Capital Region.

c. **Realign Federal Office Building 2, Arlington, VA,** by relocating all Department of the Navy organizations to DoD owned space in the National Capital Region.

[202] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the language "currently located in Crystal Park 3 and Crystal Square 3" and "; relocate all Department of the Navy organizations currently located in 214191 Great Mills Road and 21535 Pacific Drive, leased installations in Lexington Park, MD to Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD" at the request of the Department of Defense to correct a technical error in the Secretary's recommendation. The organizations located in Lexington Park, Maryland are part of Naval Air Systems Command, which is consolidating its headquarters operations at NAS Patuxent River. DoD BRAC Clearinghouse Document BI-0115 (CT-0446), 12 July 2005.

CHAPTER VI. INDUSTRIAL JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

150. NAVAL WEAPONS STATION SEAL BEACH, CA (IND 4)

a. **Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA,** as follows: relocate the depot maintenance of Electronic Components (Non-Airborne), Fire Control Systems and Components, Radar, and Radio to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA; relocate the depot maintenance of Material Handling to Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA; and relocate the depot maintenance of Other Components to Anniston Army Depot, AL.[203]

151. RIVERBANK ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, CA (IND 5)[204]

a. **Close Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA.** Relocate the artillery cartridge case metal parts functions to Rock Island Arsenal, IL.

152. SIERRA ARMY DEPOT, CA (IND 6)[205]

a. **Realign Sierra Army Depot, CA.** Relocate Storage to Tooele Army Depot, UT[206] and Demilitarization to Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN, and McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK.

153. ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL, IL (IND 7)[207]

a. **Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL,** by relocating the depot maintenance of Combat Vehicles and Other to Anniston Army Depot, AL, and the depot maintenance of Other Equipment and Tactical Vehicles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA.

154. NEWPORT CHEMICAL DEPOT, IN (IND 8)

a. On completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with Treaty obligations, **close Newport Chemical Depot, IN.**[208]

---

[203] By Motion 150-4A, the Commission struck the language "; relocate the depot maintenance of Other Components to Anniston Army Depot, AL; and relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA.", and replaced it with the language "; and relocate the depot maintenance of Other Components to Anniston Army Depot, AL.

[204] By Motion G-151-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[205] By Motion G-151-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[206] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the abbreviation "NV" and replaced it with "UT" to correct the recommendation.

[207] By Motion G-151-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[208] By Motion 154-4A, the Commission struck the language "Close" and inserted in its place the language "On completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with Treaty obligations, close".

155. KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, KS (IND 9)[209]

a. **Close Kansas Army Ammunition Plant (AAP), KS.** Relocate Sensor Fuzed Weapon/Cluster Bomb function and Missile warhead production to McAlester AAP, OK; 155MM ICM Artillery and 60MM, 81MM, and 120MM Mortar functions to Milan AAP,[210] TN; 105MM HE, 155MM HE, and Missile Warhead functions to Iowa AAP, IA; and Detonators/relays/delays to Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN.

156. (DELETED)[211]

157. MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, MS (IND 11)[212]

a. **Close Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS.** Relocate the 155MM ICM artillery metal parts functions to Rock Island Arsenal, IL.

158. (DELETED)[213]

159. WATERVLIET ARSENAL, NY (IND 13)[214]

a. **Realign Watervliet Arsenal, NY,** by disestablishing all capabilities for Other Field Artillery Components.

160. UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT, OR (IND 14)

a. On completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with Treaty obligations, **close Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR.**[215]

161. (DELETED)[216]

---

[209] By Motion G-151-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[210] As a technical correction, the Commission inserted the abbreviation "AAP" to clarify the reference.

[211] By Motion 156-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 156, which read "***Lima Tank Plant, OH (Ind 10).*** **Realign Lima Tank Plant, OH.** Retain the portion required to support the manufacturing of armored combat vehicles to include Army Future Combat System (FCS) program, Marine Corps Expeditionary Force Vehicle (EFV) chassis, and M1 Tank recapitalization program."

[212] By Motion G-151-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[213] By Motion 158-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 158, which read "***Hawthorne Army Depot, NV (Ind 12).*** **Close Hawthorne Army Depot, NV.** Relocate Storage and Demilitarization functions to Tooele Army Depot, UT."

[214] By Motion G-151-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[215] By Motion 160-4A, the Commission struck the language "**Close**" and inserted in its place the language "On completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with Treaty obligations, **close**".

[216] By Motion 161-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 161, which read "***Lackland Air Force Base, TX (Ind 15).*** **Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX,** by relocating the depot maintenance of Computers, Crypto, Electronic Components (Non-Airborne), and Radio to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA; and disestablishing all depot maintenance capabilities."

162. Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX (Ind 16)[217]

a. **Close Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant (AAP), TX.** Relocate the Storage and Demilitarization functions to McAlester AAP, OK.[218] Relocate the 105MM and 155MM ICM Artillery, MLRS Artillery, Hand Grenades, 60MM and 81MM Mortars functions to Milan AAP, TN. Relocate Mines and Detonators/Relays/Delays functions to Iowa AAP, IA. Relocate Demolition Charges functions to Crane Army Ammunition Activity (AAA), IN.

163. Deseret Chemical Depot, UT (Ind 17)

a. On completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with Treaty obligations and if, after completion of a comprehensive study to evaluate Deseret Chemical Depot, Utah as a site for conventional weapons demilitarization it is shown that such a use is not feasible, **close Deseret Chemical Depot, UT.** Transfer the storage igloos and magazines to Tooele Army Depot, UT.[219]

164. Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA (Ind 18)[220]

a. **Realign Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity (SIMA) Norfolk, VA,** by relocating intermediate ship maintenance function to Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA.

165. Fleet Readiness Centers (Ind 19)

a. **Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, VA,** by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Oceana, the Naval Air Depot Cherry Point Detachment, and the Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment; establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic, Naval Air Station Oceana, VA; and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic, Naval Air Station Oceana, VA.

b. **Realign Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD,** by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department at Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division; establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic Site Patuxent River, Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD; and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic Site Patuxent River, Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD.

c. **Realign Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA,** by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Norfolk VA, the Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment, and Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division Lakehurst Detachment; establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic Site Norfolk, Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA; and transferring all intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic Site Norfolk, Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA.

d. **Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA,** by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, establishing Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic Site New Orleans, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA; and transfer all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic Site New Orleans, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA.

e. **Realign Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC,** as follows: disestablish Naval Air Depot Cherry Point; establish Fleet Readiness Center East, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 39 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 69 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 8 K DLHs), Aircraft Other

---

[217] By Motion G-151-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[218] As a technical change, the Commission deleted the abbreviation "IL" and substituted in its place the abbreviation "OK".

[219] By Motion 163-4B, the Commission struck the language "Close" and inserted in its place the language "On completion of the chemical demilitarization mission in accordance with Treaty obligations, and if, after completion of a comprehensive study to evaluate Deseret Chemical Depot, Utah as a site for conventional weapons demilitarization it is shown that such a use is not feasible, close".

[220] By Motion G-151-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Components (approximately 23 K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 126 K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic, Naval Air Station Oceana, VA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 11 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 19 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 2 K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 35 K DLHs), and Aircraft Other Components (approximately 6 K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic Site Norfolk, Naval Air Station Norfolk, VA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 10 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 1 K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 3 K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 18 K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Mid Atlantic Site Patuxent River, Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 2 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 3 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 0.4K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 1 K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 6 K DLHs) to FRC Mid Atlantic Site New Orleans, Naval Air Station JRB New Orleans, LA.; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 9 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 16 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 2 K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 6 K DLHs) and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 30 K DLHs) to the Fleet Readiness Center East Site Beaufort, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, SC; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 11 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 20 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 2 K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 6 K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 36 K DLHs), Aircraft Rotary (approximately 1 K DLHs), Aircraft VSTOL (approximately 2 K DLHs), Aircraft Cargo/Tanker (approximately 0.02K DLHs,), Aircraft Other (approximately 18 K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 0.001K DLHs), Calibration (approximately 0.15 K DLHs) and "Other" Commodity (approximately 0.3 K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center East Site New River, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station New River, Camp Lejeune, NC; and transfer all remaining depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center East, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC.

f. **Realign Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, SC**, by disestablishing Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment Beaufort and transferring all depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center East Site Beaufort, Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, SC.

g. **Realign Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL**, as follows: disestablish Naval Air Depot Jacksonville, Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment Jacksonville, and Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Jacksonville; establish Fleet Readiness Center Southeast, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, FL; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 8 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 6 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3 K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 27 K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 9 K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Site Mayport, hereby established at Naval Air Station, Mayport, FL; transfer all remaining intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southeast, Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL.

h. **Realign Naval Air Station Mayport, FL**, by disestablishing Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, Naval Air Depot Jacksonville Detachment Mayport, and Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division Lakehurst Voyage Repair Team Detachment Mayport and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Site Mayport, Naval Air Station Mayport, FL.

i. **Realign Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA**, by disestablishing Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Lemoore and Naval Air Depot North Island Detachment; establishing Fleet Readiness Center West, Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA; and transferring all intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center West, Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA.

j. **Realign Naval Air Station Fallon, NV**, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Fallon and the Naval Air Depot North Island Detachment Fallon; establishing Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fallon, Naval Air Station Fallon, NV; and transferring all intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fallon, Naval Air Station Fallon, NV.

k. **Realign Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division China Lake, CA**, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department and relocating its maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft (approximately 3 K DLHs), Aircraft Components (approximately 45 K DLHs), Fabrication & Manufacturing (approximately 6 K DLHs) and Support Equipment (approximately 16 K DLHs) to Fleet Readiness Center West, Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA.

l. **Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX**, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, establishing Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth, Naval Air Station Fort Worth, TX, and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.

m. **Realign Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA**, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, establishing Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA, and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA.

n. (Deleted)[221]

o. **Realign Naval Air Station North Island, Naval Base Coronado, CA**, as follows: disestablish Naval Air Depot North Island, COMSEACONWINGPAC (AIMD), and NADEP North Island Detachment North Island; establish Fleet Readiness Center Southwest, Naval Air Station North Island, Naval Base Coronado, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3 K DLHs), aircraft Other Components (approximately 13 K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 4 K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Point Mugu, hereby established at Naval Air Station Point Mugu, Naval Base Ventura, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 26 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Component (approximately 8 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 13 K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 55 K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 16 K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Miramar, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 8 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 4 K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 17 K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 5 K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Pendleton, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, CA; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3 K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 12 K DLHs), Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 3 K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Southwest Site Yuma, hereby established at Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, AZ; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 6 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 2 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 3 K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 12 K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 3 K DLHs) from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth, Fort Worth TX; relocate depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Avionics/Electronics Components (approximately 25 K DLHs), Aircraft Hydraulic Components (approximately 8 K DLHs), Aircraft Landing Gear Components (approximately 13 K DLHs), Aircraft Other Components (approximately 53 K DLHs), and Aircraft Structural Components (approximately 15 K DLHs), from Naval Air Depot North Island to Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA; and transfer all remaining intermediate and depot maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest, Naval Air Station North Island, Naval Base Coronado, CA.

p. **Realign Naval Air Station Point Mugu, Naval Base Ventura, CA**, by disestablishing the Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department and transferring all intermediate maintenance workload and capacity to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Point Mugu, Naval Base Ventura, CA.

---

[221] By Motion 165-3A, the Commission struck paragraph "n", which read "**Realign Naval Support Activity Crane, IN**, by relocating the depot maintenance workload and capacity for ALQ-99 Electronic Warfare to Fleet Readiness Center Northwest, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA."

q. **Realign Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA,** by transferring depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Other (approximately 28 K DLHs) and Aircraft Fighter/Attack (approximately 39 K DLHs) and intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication & Manufacturing and Support Equipment from Marine Aviation Logistics Squadron (MALS)-11 and 16 to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Miramar, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA.

r. **Realign Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, CA,** by transferring depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Other (approximately 22 K DLHs) and Aircraft Rotary (approximately 102 K DLHs) and intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication & Manufacturing and Support Equipment from MALS-39 to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Camp Pendleton, Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, CA.

s. **Realign Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, AZ,** by transferring depot maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Fighter/Attack, Aircraft Other and Aircraft Rotary and intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Communication/Electronics Equipment, Ordnance Weapons & Missiles, Software and Support Equipment from MALS-13 to Fleet Readiness Center Southwest Site Yuma, Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, AZ.

166. Naval Shipyard Detachments (Ind 26)[222]

a. **Realign Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Detachment Boston, MA,** by relocating the ship repair function to Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, WA.

b. **Realign Naval Station Annapolis, MD,** by relocating the Norfolk Naval Shipyard Detachment, Naval Sea Systems Command Plant Equipment Support Office ship repair function to Norfolk Naval Shipyard, VA.

c. **Realign the Navy Philadelphia Business Center, PA,** by relocating the Norfolk Naval Shipyard Detachment, Naval Sea Systems Command Shipbuilding Support Office ship repair function to Norfolk Naval Shipyard, VA.

[222] By Motion G-151-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

CHAPTER VII. INTELLIGENCE JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

167. DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY (A CLASSIFIED VERSION OF THIS RECOMMENDATION IDENTIFIES SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS TO BE MOVED.) (INT 3)[223]

a. **Realign Defense Intelligence Analysis Center, Bolling Air Force Base, DC**, by relocating select Defense Intelligence Agency intelligence analysis functions to a new facility at Rivanna Station, VA.

b. **Realign Crystal Park 5, a leased facility in Arlington, VA**, by relocating the Defense Intelligence Agency analysis function to the Defense Intelligence Analysis Center, Bolling Air Force Base, DC.

168. NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACTIVITIES (INT 4)[224]

a. **Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) Dalecarlia and Sumner sites, Bethesda, MD; Reston 1, 2 and 3, leased installations in Reston, VA; Newington buildings 8510, 8520, and 8530, Newington, VA; and Building 213 a leased installation at the South East Federal Center, Washington, DC.** Relocate all functions to a new facility at Fort Belvoir, VA. Realign the National Reconnaissance Office facility, Westfields, VA, by relocating all NGA functions to a new facility at the Fort Belvoir, VA. Consolidate all NGA National Geospatial-Intelligence College functions on Fort Belvoir into the new facility at Fort Belvoir, VA.

[223] By Motion G-167-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[224] By Motion G-167-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

CHAPTER VIII. MEDICAL JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

WALTER REED NATIONAL MILITARY MEDICAL CENTER, BETHESDA, MD (MED 4)

a. **Realign Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, DC,** as follows: relocate all tertiary (sub-specialty and complex care) medical services to National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD, establishing it as the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center Bethesda, MD; relocate Legal Medicine to the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center Bethesda, MD; relocate sufficient personnel to the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center Bethesda, MD, to establish a Program Management Office that will coordinate pathology results, contract administration, and quality assurance and control of DoD second opinion consults worldwide; relocate all non-tertiary (primary and specialty) patient care functions to a new community hospital at Ft Belvoir, VA; relocate the Office of the Secretary of Defense supporting unit to Fort Belvoir, VA; disestablish all elements of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology except the National Medical Museum and the Tissue Repository; relocate the Armed Forces Medical Examiner, DNA Registry, and Accident Investigation to Dover Air Force Base, DE; AFIP capabilities not specified in this recommendation will be absorbed into other DoD, Federal, or civilian facilities, as necessary; relocate enlisted histology technician training[225] to Fort Sam Houston, TX; relocate the Combat Casualty Care Research sub-function (with the exception of those organizational elements performing neuroprotection research) of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (Forest Glen Annex) and the Combat Casualty Care Research sub-function of the Naval Medical Research Center (Forest Glen Annex) to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX; relocate Medical Biological Defense Research of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (Forest Glen Annex) and Naval Medical Research Center (Forest Glen Annex) to Fort Detrick, MD, and consolidate it with US Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases; relocate Medical Chemical Defense Research of the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (Forest Glen Annex) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and consolidate it with the US Army Medical Research Institute of Chemical Defense; and **close the main post.**

170. BROOKS CITY BASE, TX (MED 6)

a. **Close Brooks City Base, San Antonio, TX.** Relocate the Air Force Audit Agency and 341st Recruiting Squadron to Randolph AFB. Relocate the United States Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine, the Air Force Institute of Operational[226] Health, and the Human Systems Development and Acquisition function to Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH. Relocate the Naval Health Research Center Electro-Magnetic Energy Detachment and the Directed Energy portion of the Human Effectiveness Directorate of the Air Force Research Laboratory to Fort Sam Houston, TX.[227] Consolidate the Human Effectiveness Directorate with the Air Force Research Laboratory, Human Effectiveness Directorate at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH. Relocate the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, the Air Force Medical Support Agency, Air Force Medical Operations Agency, Air Force Element Medical Defense Agency, Air Force Element Medical-DoD, Air Force-Wide Support Element, 710th Information Operations Flight and the 68th Information Operations Squadron to Lackland Air Force Base, TX. Relocate the Army Medical Research Detachment to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX. Relocate the Non-Medical Chemical Biological

[225] By Motion 169-4A, the Commission struck the language "Accident Investigation to Dover Air Force Base, DE; relocate enlisted histology technician training" and inserted in its place "Accident Investigation to Dover Air Force Base, DE; AFIP capabilities not specified in this recommendation will be absorbed into other DoD, Federal, or civilian facilities, as necessary; relocate enlisted histology technician training".

[226] By Motion 170-4B, the Commission struck the word "Occupational", and substituted in its place the word "Operational".

[227] By Motion 170-4B, the Commission struck the Commission strike the language "the Naval Health Research Center Electro-Magnetic Energy Detachment, the Human Systems Development and Acquisition function, and the Human Effectiveness Directorate of the Air Force Research Laboratory to Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH.", and substituted in its place the language "and the Human Systems Development and Acquisition function to Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH. Relocate the Naval Health Research Center Electro-Magnetic Energy Detachment and the Directed Energy portion of the Human Effectiveness Directorate of the Air Force Research Laboratory to Fort Sam Houston, TX."

Defense Development and Acquisition to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Disestablish any remaining organizations.

b. **Realign Holloman AFB** by disestablishing the high-onset gravitational force centrifuge and relocating the physiological training unit (49 ADOS/SGGT) to Wright-Patterson AFB.

171. McChord Air Force Base, WA (Med 9)

a. **Realign McChord Air Force Base, WA,** by reorganizing medical functions under Madigan Army Medical Center, Fort Lewis, WA. McChord Air Force Base medical functions will be reorganized and relocated as directed by the Commander, Madigan Army Medical Center.[228]

172. San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX (Med 10)[229]

a. **Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX,** by relocating the inpatient medical function of the 59th Medical Wing (Wilford Hall Medical Center) to the Brooke Army Medical Center, Ft Sam Houston, TX, establishing it as the San Antonio Regional Military Medical Center, and converting Wilford Hall Medical Center into an ambulatory care center.

b. **Realign Naval Air Station Great Lakes, IL, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, Naval Medical Center Portsmouth, Naval Medical Center San Diego, CA,** by relocating basic and specialty enlisted medical training to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

173. Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics (Med 12)

a. **Realign Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC** by disestablishing the inpatient mission at Naval Hospital Cherry Point; converting the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

b. **Realign Fort Eustis, VA,** by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the Fort Eustis Medical Facility; converting the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

c. **Realign the United States Air Force Academy, CO,** by relocating the inpatient mission of the 10th Medical Group to Fort Carson Medical Facility, CO; converting the 10th Medical Group into a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

d. **Realign Andrews Air Force Base, MD,** by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 89th Medical Group; converting the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

e. **Realign MacDill Air Force Base, FL,** by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 6th Medical Group; converting the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

f. **Realign Keesler Air Force Base, MS,** by converting the medical center to a community hospital.[230]

g. **Realign Scott Air Force Base, IL,** by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 375th Medical Group; converting the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

h. **Realign Naval Station Great Lakes, IL,** by disestablishing the inpatient mission at Naval Hospital Great Lakes; converting the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center.

i. **(Deleted)**[231]

---

[228] By Motion 171-4B, the Commission struck the language "**Realign McChord Air Force Base, WA,** by relocating all medical functions to Fort Lewis, WA." and inserted in its place "**Realign McChord Air Force Base, WA,** by reorganizing medical functions under Madigan Army Medical Center, Fort Lewis, WA. McChord Air Force Base medical functions will be reorganized and relocated as directed by the Commander, Madigan Army Medical Center."

[229] By Motion 172-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[230] By Motion 173-3B, the Commission struck paragraph "f", which read "**Realign Keesler Air Force Base, MS,** by disestablishing the inpatient mission at the 81st Medical Group; converting the medical center to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center." and replaced it with the language "**Realign Keesler Air Force Base, MS,** by converting the medical center to a community hospital."

174. Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biological, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisition (Med 15)

a. **Realign Building 42, 8901 Wisconsin Ave, Bethesda, MD**, by relocating the Combat Casualty Care Research sub-function of the Naval Medical Research Center to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX.

b. **Realign Naval Station Great Lakes, IL**, by relocating the Army Dental Research Detachment, the Air Force Dental Investigative Service, and the Naval Institute for Dental and Biomedical Research to the Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX.

c. **Realign 13 Taft Court and 1600 E. Gude Drive, Rockville, MD**, by relocating the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Division of Retrovirology to the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Walter Reed Army Medical Center – Forest Glen Annex, MD, establishing it as a Center of Excellence for Infectious Disease.

d. **Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL**, by relocating the Naval Aeromedical Research Laboratory to Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

e. **Realign 12300 Washington Ave, Rockville, MD**, by relocating the Medical Biological Defense Research sub-function to the U. S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases, Ft. Detrick, MD.

f. **Realign Potomac Annex-Washington, DC**, by relocating Naval Bureau of Medicine, Code M2, headquarters-level planning, investment portfolio management and program and regulatory oversight of DoD Biomedical Science and Technology programs and FDA-regulated medical product development within the biomedical RDA function to a new Joint Biomedical Research, Development and Acquisition Management Center at Fort Detrick, MD.

g. **Realign 64 Thomas Jefferson Drive, Frederick, MD**, by relocating the Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical Biological Defense, Joint Project Manager for Chemical Biological Medical Systems headquarters-level planning, investment portfolio management and program and regulatory oversight of DoD Biomedical Science and Technology programs and FDA-regulated medical product development within the RDA function to a new Joint Biomedical Research, Development and Acquisition Management Center at Fort Detrick, MD.

h. **Realign Fort Belvoir, VA**, by relocating the Chemical Biological Defense Research component of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

i. **(Deleted)**[232]

j. **(Deleted)**[233]

k. **(Deleted)**[234]

l. **Realign Skyline 2 and 6, Falls Church, VA**, by relocating the Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical Biological Defense to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

---

[231] By Motion 173-3B, the Commission struck paragraph "i", which read "**Realign Fort Knox, KY**, by disestablishing the inpatient mission at Fort Knox's Medical Facility; converting the hospital to a clinic with an ambulatory surgery center."

[232] By Motion 174-3A, the Commission struck paragraph "i", which read, "**Realign Tyndall AFB, FL**, by relocating Non-medical Chemical Biological Defense Research to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and consolidating it with Air Force Research Laboratory."

[233] By Motion 174-3A, the Commission struck paragraph "j", which read, "**Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division, VA**, by relocating Non-medical Chemical Biological Defense Research and Development & Acquisition to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD."

[234] By Motion 174-3A, the Commission struck paragraph "k", which read, "**Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division, IN**, by relocating the Non-medical Chemical Biological Defense Development and Acquisition to Edgewood Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD."

CHAPTER IX. SUPPLY AND STORAGE JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

175. COMMODITY MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION (S&S 5)[235]

a. **Realign Detroit Arsenal, MI,** by relocating the supply contracting function for tires to the Inventory Control Point at Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and disestablishing all other supply functions for tires.

b. **Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT,** as follows: relocate the supply contracting function for tires to the Inventory Control Point at Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH; disestablish all other supply functions for tires; and disestablish the storage, and distribution functions for tires, packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants, and compressed gases.

c. **Realign Naval Support Activity, Mechanicsburg, PA,** by relocating the supply contracting function for packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants to the Inventory Control Point at Defense Supply Center, Richmond, VA, and disestablishing all other supply functions for packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants.

d. **Realign Defense Supply Center, Richmond, VA** by disestablishing storage and distribution functions for tires, and the supply, storage, and distribution functions for packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants, and compressed gases. Retain the supply contracting function for packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants, and compressed gases.

e. **Realign Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA, Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna, PA, Naval Station Norfolk, VA, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC, Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, GA, Robins Air Force Base, GA, Anniston Army Depot, AL, Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX, Naval Station Bremerton, WA, Naval Station San Diego, CA, Defense Distribution Depot Barstow, CA, Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin, CA, and Naval Station Pearl Harbor, HI,** by disestablishing storage and distribution functions for tires, packaged petroleum, oils, and lubricants, and compressed gases at each location.

DEPOT LEVEL REPARABLE PROCUREMENT MANAGEMENT CONSOLIDATION (S&S 7)

a. **(Deleted)**[236]

b. **Realign Soldier Systems Center, Natick, MA,** by relocating the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Philadelphia, PA, and reestablishing them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions and by disestablishing the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables and designating them as Defense Supply Center Philadelphia, PA, Inventory Control Point functions.

c. **Realign Detroit Arsenal, MI,** by relocating the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for

---

[235] By Motion G-175-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[236] By Motion 176-3A, the Commission struck paragraph "a", which read "**Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX,** as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables to Robins Air Force Base, GA, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Robins Air Force Base, GA."

Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablishing them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions, and by disestablishing the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables and designating them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions.

d. **Realign Rock Island Arsenal, IL,** as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables to Detroit Arsenal, MI, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Detroit Arsenal, MI.

e. **Realign Ft. Huachuca, AZ,** as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and designate them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

f. **Realign Naval Support Activity Mechanicsburg, PA,** as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items, except those Navy items associated with Nuclear Propulsion Support, Level 1/Subsafe and Deep Submergence System Program (DSSP) Management, Strategic Weapon Systems Management, Design Unstable/Preproduction Test, Special Waivers, Major End Items and Fabricated or Reclaimed items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

g. **Realign Marine Corps Base, Albany, GA,** as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for any residual Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

h. **Realign Naval Support Activity Philadelphia, PA, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Hill Air Force Base, UT, and Robins Air Force Base, GA,** by relocating the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items, except those Navy items associated with Design Unstable/Preproduction Test, Special Waivers and Major End Items to Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, and reestablishing them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point

functions, and by disestablishing the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables and designating them as Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, Inventory Control Point functions.

i. **Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL**, as follows: relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Aviation Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Aviation Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for Aviation Depot Level Reparables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA, Aviation Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Missile Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH; reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Missile Inventory Control Point functions; disestablish the procurement management and related support functions for Missile Depot Level Reparables and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Missile Inventory Control Point functions; and realign a portion of the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions necessary to oversee the Inventory Control Point activities at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, Detroit Arsenal, MI, Soldier System Center, Natick, MA, and Redstone Arsenal, AL, to Headquarters Army Materiel Command (AMC).

j. **Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH**, by relocating the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

k. **Realign Fort Belvoir, VA**, by assigning the oversight of Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items and the oversight of procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Reparables to the Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA.

177. Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration (S&S 13)[237]

a. **Realign Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH**, by disestablishing the Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, OH. Relocate the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna, PA, hereby designated the Susquehanna Strategic Distribution Platform.

b. **Realign Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Tobyhanna, PA, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Tobyhanna Army Depot to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Tobyhanna Army Depot, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Susquehanna Strategic Distribution Platform.

c. **Realign Naval Station Norfolk, VA**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Norfolk, VA, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Norfolk Naval Base and at Norfolk Naval Shipyard to support shipyard operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Norfolk Naval Shipyard operations, maintenance and production, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Susquehanna Strategic Distribution Platform.

[237] By Motion G-175-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

d. **Realign Defense Supply Center Richmond, VA**, by relocating the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Richmond, VA, to the Susquehanna Strategic Distribution Platform. Retain the minimum necessary storage and distribution functions and associated inventories at Defense Distribution Depot Richmond, VA, to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point.

e. **Realign Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, NC** by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, Cherry Point, NC, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Naval Aviation Depot Cherry Point, NC, to support depot operations, maintenance and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Naval Air Depot Cherry Point, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Defense Distribution Depot Warner Robins, GA, hereby designated the Warner Robins Strategic Distribution Platform.

f. **Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories supporting depot operations, maintenance, and production at the Warner Robins Air Logistics Center with the supply, storage, and distribution functions at the Warner Robins Strategic Distribution Platform.

g. **Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, GA**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Albany, GA, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at the Maintenance Center Albany, GA, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support the Maintenance Center Albany, GA, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Warner Robins Strategic Distribution Platform.

h. **Realign Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, Jacksonville, FL, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at the Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville, FL, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support the Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville, FL, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Warner Robins Strategic Distribution Platform.

i. **Realign Anniston Army Depot, AL**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Anniston, AL, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Anniston Army Depot, AL, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Anniston Army Depot, AL, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Warner Robins Strategic Distribution Platform.

j. **Realign Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, Corpus Christi, TX, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Defense Distribution Depot Oklahoma City, hereby designated the Oklahoma City Strategic Distribution Platform.

k. **Realign Tinker AFB, OK**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories supporting depot operations, maintenance, and production at the Air Logistics Center, Oklahoma City, OK, with the supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories at the Oklahoma City Strategic Distribution Platform.

l. **Realign Hill AFB, UT**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, Hill, UT, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at the Ogden Air Logistics Center, UT, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support the Ogden Air Logistics Center, UT, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and

distribution functions and associated inventories to the Defense Distribution Depot, San Joaquin, CA, hereby designated the San Joaquin Strategic Distribution Platform.

m. **Realign Naval Station Bremerton, WA**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, Puget Sound, WA, with all other supply, storage and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, WA, to support shipyard operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, WA, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the San Joaquin Strategic Distribution Platform.

n. **Realign Naval Station, San Diego, CA**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot, San Diego, CA, with all other supply, storage and distribution functions and inventories that exist at Naval Aviation Depot, North Island, CA, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories required to support Naval Aviation Depot, North Island, CA, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the San Joaquin Strategic Distribution Platform.

o. **Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA**, by consolidating the supply, storage, and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot Barstow CA, with all other supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories that exist at the Maintenance Center Barstow, CA, to support depot operations, maintenance, and production. Retain the minimum necessary supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories at Defense Distribution Depot Barstow, CA, that are required to support the Maintenance Center Barstow, CA, and to serve as a wholesale Forward Distribution Point. Relocate all other wholesale storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the San Joaquin Strategic Distribution Platform.

CHAPTER X. TECHNICAL JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

178. (DELETED)[238]

179. (DELETED)[239]

180. CONSOLIDATE GROUND VEHICLE DEVELOPMENT & ACQUISITION IN A JOINT CENTER (TECH 7)[240]

a. a. **Realign Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, AL**, by relocating the joint robotics program development and acquisition activities to Detroit Arsenal, Warren, MI, and consolidating them with the Program Executive Office Ground Combat Systems, Program Executive Office Combat Support and Combat Service Support and Tank Automotive Research Development Engineering Center.

b. b. **Realign the USMC Direct Reporting Program Manager Advanced Amphibious Assault (DRPM AAA) facilities in Woodbridge, VA**, by relocating the Ground Forces initiative D&A activities to Detroit Arsenal, Warren, MI.

181. CONSOLIDATE MARITIME C4ISR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT & ACQUISITION, TEST & EVALUATION (TECH 9)

a. **Realign Washington Navy Yard, DC**, by disestablishing the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Washington Navy Yard and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA.

b. **Realign Naval Station, Norfolk, VA**, by disestablishing the Space Warfare Systems Center Norfolk, VA, and the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Norfolk, VA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA.

c. **Realign Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC**, as follows: relocate Surface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Surface Warfare Center Division, Dahlgren, VA; relocate Subsurface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Station Newport, RI; and relocate the Command Structure of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA, and consolidate it with billets from Space Warfare Systems Command San Diego to create the Space

---

[238] By Motion 178-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 178, which read "*Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers (Tech 5).* Close the Office of Naval Research facility, Arlington, VA; the Air Force Office of Scientific Research facility, Arlington, VA; the Army Research Office facilities, Durham, NC, and Arlington, VA; and the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency facility, Arlington, VA. Relocate all functions to the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD. Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating the Army Research Office to the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD. Realign the Defense Threat Reduction Agency Telegraph Road facility, Alexandria, VA, by relocating the Extramural Research Program Management function (except conventional armaments and chemical biological defense research) to the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD."

[239] By Motion 179-2, the Commission struck entire recommendation, which read "***Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation (Tech 6).*** **Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, Maxwell Air Force Base, AL, and Lackland Air Force Base, TX**, by relocating Air & Space Information Systems Research and Development & Acquisition to Hanscom Air Force Base, MA. **Realign Eglin Air Force Base, FL**, by relocating Air & Space Sensors, Electronic Warfare & Electronics and Information Systems Test & Evaluation to Edwards Air Force Base, CA."

[240] By Motion G-180-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Warfare Systems Command Atlantic, Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA. The remaining Maritime Information Systems Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation functions at Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC, are assigned to Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic, Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA.

d. **(Deleted)**[241]

e. **Realign Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA,** as follows: relocate Surface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Surface Warfare Center Division, Dahlgren, VA; relocate Subsurface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Space Warfare Center to Naval Station Newport, RI; disestablish Space Warfare Systems Center Norfolk, VA, detachment San Diego, CA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Pacific, Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA; disestablish Naval Center for Tactical Systems Interoperability, San Diego, CA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Pacific, Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA; and disestablish Space Warfare Systems Command San Diego, CA, detachment Norfolk, VA, and assign functions to the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic, Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek , VA.

f. **Realign Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD,** by relocating Subsurface Maritime Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division to Naval Station Newport, RI.

g. **Realign Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL,** by disestablishing the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Jacksonville, FL.

h. **Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL,** by relocating the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Pensacola, FL, to Naval Weapons Station Charleston, SC.

i. **Realign Naval Weapons Station Yorktown, VA,** by relocating the Space Warfare Systems Center Charleston, SC, detachment Yorktown, VA, to Naval Station Norfolk, VA, and consolidating it into the new Space Warfare Systems Command Atlantic detachment, Naval Station Norfolk, VA.

182. (Deleted)[242]

183. Consolidate Sea Vehicle Development & Acquisition (Tech 13)[243]

a. **Realign Detroit Arsenal, MI,** by relocating Sea Vehicle Development and Acquisition to Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division, Bethesda, MD, and Program Management and Direction of Sea Vehicle Development and Acquisition to Naval Sea Systems Command, Washington Navy Yard, DC.

---

[241] By Motion 181-3A, the Commission struck paragraph "d", which read "**Realign Naval Base Ventura County, CA, Naval Surface Warfare Center Division, Dahlgren, VA, and Naval Station Newport, RI,** by relocating Maritime Information Systems Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation to Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA, and consolidating with the Space Warfare Center to create the new Space Warfare Systems Command Pacific, Naval Submarine Base Point Loma, San Diego, CA."

[242] By Motion 182-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 182, which read "***Consolidate Navy Strategic Test & Evaluation (Tech 12).*** **Realign Patrick Air Force Base, Cape Canaveral, FL,** by relocating Nuclear Test and Evaluation at the Naval Ordnance Test Unit to Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic, Kings Bay, GA."

[243] By Motion G-180-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

184. Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center (Tech 15)[244]

a. **Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane, IN**, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except gun/ammo, combat system security, and energetic materials to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

b. **Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head, MD**, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except gun/ammo, underwater weapons, and energetic materials, to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

c. **Realign Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD**, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except the Program Executive Office and Program Management Offices in Naval Air Systems Command, to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

d. **Realign Naval Base Ventura County, Point Mugu, CA**, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

e. **Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA**, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except underwater weapons and energetic materials, to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

f. **Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center, Yorktown, VA**, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation to Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head, MD.

g. **Realign Naval Base Ventura County, Port Hueneme, CA**, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except weapon system integration, to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

h. **Realign Fleet Combat Training Center, CA** (Port Hueneme Detachment, San Diego, CA), by relocating all Weapons and Armaments weapon system integration Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation to Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren, VA.

i. **Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren, VA**, by relocating all Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except guns/ammo and weapon systems integration to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

185. Create an Air Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center (Tech 18)[245]

a. **Realign Hill Air Force Base, UT**, by relocating Weapons and Armaments In-Service Engineering Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation to Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

b. **Realign Fort Belvoir, VA**, by relocating Defense Threat Reduction Agency National Command Region conventional armament Research to Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition (Tech 19)

a. **Realign the Adelphi Laboratory Center, MD**, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

b. **Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Crane, IN**, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ, except energetics and[246] RD&A and T&E in support of Special Operations.[247]

---

[244] By Motion 184-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[245] By Motion G-180-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[246] The Commission inserted the word "and" as a technical correction to clarify the language of the amended recommendation.

c. **Realign the Fallbrook, CA, detachment of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Crane, IN**, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

d. **(Deleted)**[248]

e. **Realign the Louisville, KY, detachment of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Port Hueneme, CA**, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

f. **Realign Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division China Lake, CA**, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition except energetics to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.[249]

g. **Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Indian Head, MD**, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition except energetics to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ. Consolidate energetics RD&A and T&E at Indian Head, MD except the RD&A and T&E performed at China Lake[250] CA and Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.[251]

h. **Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Earle, NJ**, by relocating weapon and armament packaging Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

187. Defense Research Service Led Laboratories (Tech 22)

a. **Close the Air Force Research Laboratory, Mesa City, AZ.** Relocate all functions to Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH.

b. **Realign Air Force Research Laboratory, Hanscom, MA**, by relocating the Sensors Directorate to Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and the Space Vehicles Directorate to Kirtland Air Force Base, NM.

c. **Realign Rome Laboratory, NY**, by relocating the Sensor Directorate to Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH, and consolidating it with the Air Force Research Laboratory, Sensor Directorate at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH.

d. **Realign Air Force Research Laboratory, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH**, by relocating the Information Systems Directorate to Rome Laboratory, NY.[252]

e. **Realign Army Research Laboratory Langley, VA, and Army Research Laboratory Glenn, OH**, by relocating the Vehicle Technology Directorates to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

f. **(Deleted)**[253]

---

[247] By Motion 186-4A, the Commission appended the language ", except energetics RD&A and T&E in support of Special Operations."

[248] By Motion 186-4A, the Commission struck paragraph "d", which read "**Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Dahlgren, VA**, by relocating gun and ammunition Research and Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ."

[249] By Motion 186-4A, the Commission struck the language "Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal" and inserted in its place "Development & Acquisition except energetics to Picatinny Arsenal".

[250] By Motion 186-4A, the Commission struck the language "Development & Acquisition to Picatinny Arsenal" from paragraph "g" of Chapter X, Section 186 of the Bill and inserted in its place "Development & Acquisition except energetics to Picatinny Arsenal, NJ. Consolidate energetics RD&A and T&E at Indian Head, MD except the RD&A and T&E performed at China Lake."

[251] By Motion 186-4D, the Commission added the language ", CA and Picatinny Arsenal, NJ."

[252] By Motion 187-4A, the Commission struck the language "Information Systems Directorate to Hanscom Air Force Base, MA" and inserted in its place "Information Systems Directorate to Rome Laboratory, NY."

[253] By Motion 187-4A, the Commission struck paragraph "f", which read "**Realign the Army Research Laboratory White Sands Missile Range, NM**, by relocating all Army Research Laboratory activities except the minimum detachment required to maintain the Test and Evaluation functions at White Sands Missile Range, NM, to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD."

188. Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation (Tech 24)[254]

a. **Realign Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Robins, Air Force Base, GA, and Hill Air Force Base, UT**, by relocating fixed wing related Air Platform Development and Acquisition to Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH.

b. **Realign Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH**, by relocating fixed wing related Live Fire Test and Evaluation to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.

189. Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation (Tech 26)[255]

a. **Realign Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH**, by relocating Air Force Materiel Command V-22 activities in rotary wing air platform development and acquisition to Patuxent River, MD.

b. **Realign the Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst, NJ**, by relocating activities in rotary wing air platform development, acquisition, test and evaluation to Patuxent River, MD.

c. **Realign Ft. Rucker, AL**, by relocating the Aviation Technical Test Center to Redstone Arsenal, AL, and consolidating it with the Technical Test Center at Redstone Arsenal, AL.

d. **Realign Warner-Robins Air Force Base, GA**, by relocating activities in rotary wing air platform development and acquisition to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

190. (Deleted)[256]

[254] By Motion 188-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[255] By Motion G-180-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[256] By Motion 190-2, the Commission struck Recommendation 190, which read "***Navy Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation (Tech 28).*** **Realign Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, Point Mugu, CA.** Relocate the Sensors, Electronic Warfare (EW), and Electronics Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation (RDAT&E) functions to Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, China Lake, CA."

CHAPTER XI. ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

192. (NOT USED)

191. NAVY BROADWAY COMPLEX, SAN DIEGO, CA[257]

a. If the Secretary of the Navy does not enter into a long-term lease on or before January 1, 2007 that provides for the redevelopment of the Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, California, under the authority granted by Section 2732 of Public Law 99-661, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987, **close Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, California**, and relocate the units and functions on Navy Broadway Complex to other Department of the Navy-owned sites in San Diego.

[257] By Motion 192-4A, the Commission added the recommendation "***Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, CA.*** If the Secretary of the Navy does not enter into a long-term lease on or before January 1, 2007 that provides for the redevelopment of the Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, California, under the authorities granted by Section 2732 of Public Law 99-661, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987, **close Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, California**, and relocate the units and function on Navy Broadway Complex to other Department of the Navy-owned sites in San Diego."

193. NAVAL AIR STATION OCEANA, VIRGINIA BEACH, VA[258]

a. **Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida**, if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, fail to enact and enforce legislation to prevent further encroachment of Naval Air Station Oceana by the end of March 2006, to wit, enact state-mandated zoning controls requiring the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to adopt zoning ordinances that require the governing body to follow Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) guidelines in deciding discretionary development applications for property in noise levels 70 dB Day-Night, average noise Level (DNL) or greater; enact state and local legislation and ordnance to establish a program to condemn and

---

[258] By Motion 193-4A, the Commission added the recommendation "*Naval Air Station, Oceana, VA.* Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida, if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, fail to enact and enforce legislation to prevent further encroachment of Naval Air Station Oceana by the end of March 2006, to wit, enact state-mandated zoning controls requiring the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to adopt zoning ordinances that require the governing body to follow Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) guidelines in deciding discretionary development applications for property in noise levels 70 dB Day-Night, average noise Level (DNL) or greater; enact state and local legislation and ordnance to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the property located within the Accident Potential Zone 1 areas for Naval Air Station Oceana, as depicted for 1999 AICUZ pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy; codify the 2005 final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study recommendations; legislate requirements for the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to evaluate undeveloped properties in noise zones 70 dB DNL or greater for rezoning classification that would not allow uses incompatible under AICUZ guidelines; establish programs for purchase of development rights of the inter-facility traffic area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress; enact legislation creating the Oceana-Fentress Advisory Council; and if the State of Florida appropriates sufficient funds to relocate commercial tenants presently located at Cecil Field, Florida, appropriates sufficient funds to secure public-private ventures for all the personnel housing required by the Navy at Cecil Field to accomplish this relocation and turns over fee simple title to the property comprising the former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, including all infrastructure improvements that presently exist, to the Department on or before December 31, 2006, if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, decline from the outset to take the actions required above or within six months of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, failing to carry through with any of the actions set out above, whichever is later. The State of Florida may not encumber the title by any restrictions other than a reversionary clause in favor of the State of Florida and short-term tenancies consistent with the relocation of the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field.

If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, fail to take all of the prescribed actions and the State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation, the units and functions that shall relocate to Cecil Field will include but are not limited to all of the Navy F/A-18 strike fighter wings, aviation operations and support schools, maintenance support, training, and any other additional support activities the Navy deems necessary and appropriate to support the operations of the Master Jet Base"

By Motion 193-4A, the Commission also made an "Additional Statement of the Commission," directing that:

> The BRAC 2005 report language shall state: "It is the sense of the Commission that the Secretary of Defense deviated from the BRAC criteria by failing to consider NAS Oceana for closure or realignment. The long-standing and steadily worsening encroachment problem around NAS Oceana, without strong support from state and city governments to eliminate current and arrest future encroachment, will in the long term create a situation where the military value of NAS Oceana will be unacceptably degraded. The remedies presented to the Commission thus far have been unconvincing. It is also the sense of the Commission that the future of naval aviation is not Naval Air Station Oceana. The Commission urges the Navy to begin immediately to mitigate the noise encroachment and safety issues associated with flight operations around the Virginia Beach area by transitioning high-density training evolutions to other bases that are much less encroached, such as Naval Outlying Field Whitehouse, Florida, or Kingsville, Texas.
>
> The Secretary of Defense is directed to cause a rapid, complete due diligence review of the offer of the State of Florida to reoccupy the former NAS Cecil Field and to compare this review against any plan to build a new master jet base at any other location. This review is to be completed within six months from the date that the BRAC legislation enters into force and is to be made public to the affected states for comment. After review of the states' comments, which shall be submitted within 120 days after publishing the review, the Secretary of Defense shall forward to the oversight committees of Congress the review, the state comments, and his recommendation on the location of the Navy's future Atlantic Fleet Master Jet Base."

purchase all the incompatible use[259] property located within the Accident Potential Zone 1 areas for Naval Air Station Oceana, as depicted for 1999 AICUZ pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy and to fund and expend no less than $15 million annually in furtherance of the aforementioned program;[260] codify the 2005 final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study recommendations; legislate requirements for the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to evaluate undeveloped properties in noise zones 70 dB DNL or greater for rezoning classification that would not allow uses incompatible under AICUZ guidelines; establish programs for purchase of development rights of the inter-facility traffic area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress; enact legislation creating the Oceana-Fentress Advisory Council; it shall be deemed that the actions prescribed to be taken by the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Cities of Virginia Beach, and Chesapeake respectively, by the end of March 2006 have not been taken in their entirety, unless the Department of Defense Inspector General[261] so certifies in writing to the President and oversight committees of Congress by June 1, 2006[262]; and if the State of Florida appropriates sufficient funds to relocate commercial tenants presently located at Cecil Field, Florida, appropriates sufficient funds to secure public-private ventures for all the personnel housing required by the Navy at Cecil Field to accomplish this relocation and turns over fee simple title to the property comprising the former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, including all infrastructure improvements that presently exist, to the Department on or before December 31, 2006, if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, decline from the outset to take the actions required above or within six months of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, failing to carry through with any of the actions set out above, whichever is later. The State of Florida may not encumber the title by any restrictions other than a reversionary clause in favor of the State of Florida and short-term tenancies consistent with the relocation of the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field. It shall be deemed that the actions prescribed to be taken by the State of Florida and the City of Jacksonville respectively by the end of 31 December 2006 have not been taken in their entirety unless the Department of Defense Inspector General[263] so certifies in writing to the President and oversight committees of Congress by June 1, 2007.[264]

If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, fail to take all of the prescribed actions and the State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation, the units and functions that shall relocate to Cecil Field will include but are not limited to all of the Navy F/A-18 strike fighter wings, aviation operations and support schools, maintenance support, training, and any other additional support activities the Navy deems necessary and appropriate to support the operations of the Master Jet Base.

---

[259] By a motion offered by Commissioner Hill on August 26, 2005, the Commission struck the language "nonconforming use" and inserted in its place "incompatible use".

[260] By a motion offered by Commissioner Skinner August 24, 2005, the Commission inserted the language "and to fund and expend no less than $15 million annually in furtherance of the aforementioned program".

[261] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office" from the additional recommendation and inserted in its place the language "Department of Defense Inspector General," to correct a legal error. The language that would have required the Comptroller General to certify the fulfillment of the conditions established by this recommendation conflicted with Bowsher v. Synar, 478 U.S. 714 (1986), and INS v. Chadha, 462 U.S. 916 (1983). By designating the Department of Defense Inspector General, in the place of the Comptroller General, the intent of the recommendation will be fulfilled.

[262] Amendment by Chairman Principi August 26, 2005 "It shall be deemed that the actions prescribed to be taken by the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Cities of Virginia Beach, and Chesapeake respectively, by the end of March 2006 have not been taken in their entirety, unless the Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office certifies in writing to the President and oversight committees of Congress by June 1, 2006."

[263] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office" from the additional recommendation and inserted in its place the language "Department of Defense Inspector General" to correct a legal error. The language that would have required the Comptroller General to certify the fulfillment of the conditions established by this recommendation conflicted with Bowsher v. Synar, 478 U.S. 714 (1986), and INS v. Chadha, 462 U.S. 916 (1983). By designating the Department of Defense Inspector General in the place of the Comptroller General, the intent of the recommendation will be fulfilled.

[264] Amendment by Chairman Principi 26 August 2005 "It shall be deemed that the actions prescribed to be taken by the State of Florida and the City of Jacksonville respectively by the end of 31 December 2006 have not been taken in their entirety unless the Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office certifies in writing to the President and oversight committees of Congress by June 1, 2007."

194. (Not Used)

195. Galena Forward Operating Location, AK[265]

a. **Close Galena Forward Operating Location, Alaska.**

196. (Not Used)

197. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, and the Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH[266]

a. **Realign the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, and the Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio,** by forming a new and permanent oversight board responsible for curriculum review and approval, and program development for the resident and non-resident degree-granting programs at both schools. This Board, consisting of an equal number of members from the governing boards of each school, civilian education authorities recommended by the U.S. Secretary of Education, and other education officials as designated by the Secretary of Defense, will be chartered by the office of the Secretary of Defense and will provide a formal report of its actions and accomplishments to that office bi-annually. The Board's duties will consist of those actions listed as 'Goals' in the Memorandum of Agreement that formed an Educational Alliance between the Secretaries of the Air Force and Navy on December 4, 2002. This Board will be located in the National Capital Region. By this recommendation, the newly formed board will also have the authority to:

- take action to eliminate unnecessary curricula and program duplication;
- identify, approve, and implement programs of collaboration in research and instruction between the schools, and;
- expand nonresident programs and arrangements with private institutions of higher learning to meet common curriculum and non-Department of Defense focused class requirements.

---

[265] By Motion 195-4A, the Commission added the recommendation "***Galena Forward Operating Location, AK.*** **Close Galena Forward Operating Location, Alaska.**"

[266] By Motion 197-4A, the Commission added the recommendation "***Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, and the Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH.*** **Realign the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, and the Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio,** by forming a new and permanent oversight board responsible for curriculum review and approval, and program development for the resident and non-resident degree-granting programs at both schools. This Board, consisting of an equal number of members from the governing boards of each school, civilian education authorities recommended by the U.S. Secretary of Education, and other education officials as designated by the Secretary of Defense, will be chartered by the office of the Secretary of Defense and will provide a formal report of its actions and accomplishments to that office bi-annually. The Board's duties will consist of those actions listed as 'Goals' in the Memorandum of Agreement that formed an Educational Alliance between the Secretaries of the Air Force and Navy on December 4, 2002. This Board will be located in the National Capital Region. By this recommendation, the newly formed board will also have the authority to:

- take action to eliminate unnecessary curricula and program duplication;
- identify, approve, and implement programs of collaboration in research and instruction between the schools, and;
- expand nonresident programs and arrangements with private institutions of higher learning to meet common curriculum and non-Department of Defense focused class requirements.

198. RELOCATE MEDICAL COMMAND HEADQUARTERS[267]

a. **Realign[268] the Potomac Annex, in the District of Columbia. Realign Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia. Realign Skyline, leased space in Falls Church, Virginia.** Collocate the Navy Bureau of Medicine, Office of the Surgeon General of the Air Force, the Air Force Medical Operating Activity, and the Air Force Medical Support Activity, Office of the Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs), Tricare Management Activity, Office of the Army Surgeon General and U.S. Army Medical Command to a single, contiguous site that meets the current Department of Defense Anti-Terrorism Force Protection standards for new construction at either the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland; Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, or federally owned or leased space in the National Capital Region and consolidate common support activity.

[267] By Motion 198-4A, the Commission added the recommendation "**Relocate Medical Command Headquarters. Close the Potomac Annex, in the District of Columbia. Realign Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia. Realign Skyline, leased space in Falls Church, Virginia.** Collocate the Navy Bureau of Medicine, Office of the Surgeon General of the Air Force, the Air Force Medical Operating Activity, and the Air Force Medical Support Activity, Office of the Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs), Tricare Management Activity, Office of the Army Surgeon General and U.S. Army Medical Command to a single, contiguous site that meets the current Department of Defense Anti-Terrorism Force Protection standards for new construction at either the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland; Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, or federally owned or leased space in the National Capital Region and consolidate common support activity."

[268] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the word "**Close**" and inserted in its place the word "**Realign**" to correct an error. The Potomac Annex contains more than the Navy Bureau of Medicine (BUMED). The relocation of BUMED will not result in a closure.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX R

PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE CHANGES TO THE 2005 DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACT OF 1990

(PUBLIC LAW 101-510), AS CODIFIED AT 10 U.S.C. 2687 NOTE, AS AMENDED BY FY 2002 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 107-107)

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

The 2005 Defense Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission is including proposed legislative changes to the current statute, the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended (the "BRAC statute"), in order to consolidate and conform related sections of the statute and eliminate redundancies and inconsistencies in the text. The discussion below provides a strategic overview of certain structural changes that have been proposed, and also suggests minor revisions in order to streamline and rationalize the BRAC process in the future.

STRATEGIC OVERVIEW

TIMING AND SEQUENCING

The foundation for the BRAC process is grounded in an overall strategic vision for a national defense strategy. The strategic backdrop for the 2005 BRAC round was based on the National Military Strategy (2004) that both supports the National Security Strategy (September 2002), and implements the National Defense Strategy (2004). Other key elements included the November 15, 2002 memorandum issued by the Secretary of Defense (the "Secretary"), "Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure," and the Department of Defense's Integrated Global Posture and Basing Strategy (IGPBS) as set forth in the Department's Report to Congress entitled, "Strengthening U.S. Global Defense Posture," (September 2004).1

Under Section 2912 of the current BRAC statute, the Secretary is required to certify the need for an additional BRAC round, as necessary, along with his submission of the Department of Defense (the "Department") proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2005. This budget submission includes the force structure plan that is based on a 20-year threat assessment, and an infrastructure inventory.

---

[1] Indeed, Secretary Rumsfeld underscored the importance of linking the BRAC process to the global military basing posture by testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee that:

> The global posture decision process and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) are tightly linked, indeed, they depend on each other. They are both key components of the President's transformation agenda, and they both will be critical instruments for stability in the lives of service members and their families. Together, they will help to provide more predictability in assignments and rotations. Testimony of Secretary Rumsfeld Before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Global Posture (September 23, 2004).

In the view of the Commission, the threat assessment could be strengthened by requiring the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Department and other defense intelligence agencies, to produce a separate, stand-alone threat assessment *before* the Department issues the force structure plan. If Congress adopts this approach as set forth in Section 2903(a)(1)(A)(i) of the proposed legislation, the threat assessment submitted by the Director of National Intelligence will permit Congress to obtain an independent view of the strategic threats confronting the nation which takes into account overarching military, economic and diplomatic factors. This will help broaden the analytic foundation for the Department's force structure plan, thereby strengthening the entire BRAC process.

In sum, while the force structure plan and the infrastructure inventory were very important tactical considerations in the 2005 BRAC round, the strategic considerations supporting the current BRAC process could have been strengthened if the 2005 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) had been in place.

Quadrennial Defense Review

Specifically, the 2005 QDR will be issued by the Secretary after the completion of the Commission's work, and the issuance of the BRAC's final recommendations to the President. In other words, the Commission's final recommendations are issued on September 8, 2005, and thus precede the Secretary's release of the QDR. The last QDR was issued on September 30, 2001, and the Secretary of Defense is statutorily required to submit a new QDR every four years. (See 10 U.S.C. § 118 (2005)). Thus, if the 2005 QDR is issued September 30, 2005, the BRAC Commission's work and recommendations will have been finalized and enacted into law (barring a joint resolution disapproving the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission), well before then.

The QDR is important in this context because the QDR is required to provide a comprehensive examination of several key elements, including the national defense strategy, force structure, force modernization plans, infrastructure, and budget plan of the defense program and policies of the Department of Defense, with a view to establishing the U.S. defense strategy and program for the next 20 years. Although the submission of the force structure plan and infrastructure inventory by the Secretary pursuant to Section 2912(a) of the current BRAC statute is designed to provide a concrete basis for the Commission's review, these are only a few elements of the overarching view provided by the QDR.

Since the BRAC Commission is also designed to eliminate excess force structure in order to establish a realigned military force and infrastructure, a more comprehensive review of the underlying strategic issues that is to be set forth in the QDR may have better informed and assisted the Commission in making its final recommendations. This is particularly true since the Commission is tasked, as the QDR review is, with taking a 20-year prospective view of a national defense strategy. The detailed and comprehensive approach of the QDR may have provided a more solid analytical foundation to the Commission's work.

Thus, if there is an additional BRAC round in the future, the Commission respectfully suggests that the QDR be put in place before the next round is initiated. In fact, initiating a new BRAC round should be considered by the Secretary of Defense in eight-year intervals following every alternate QDR. Since the QDR is required by statute, it should be the first element in place in a domino of necessary actions triggering the next BRAC round.

Accordingly, in the proposed changes to the BRAC statute that follow, the timing and sequencing of initiating a new BRAC round hinges on the issuance of the QDR on September 30, 2013, as required by statute. Based on the expectation that the Secretary will submit the Department's budget submission for FY 2015 in February 2014, or thereabouts, the Secretary is required under the current statutory scheme to submit the force structure plan along with the budget. This element has been preserved in the proposed legislation.

While the draft legislation preserves the current law describing the elements of the force structure plan, it is very probable that it will change substantively in the future. Therefore, this language appears in the draft legislation, but it may easily be deleted and amended later to include a revised description of what the force structure plan should contain. Further, the draft legislation provides that the force structure plan may be finalized by the Secretary of Defense no later than October 1, 2014.

The proposed legislation then requires the Secretary to certify the need for a new round by March 15, 2014. This is followed by draft selection criteria being published in the *Federal Register* no later than April 15, 2014, with final criteria being released on June 30, 2014. The proposed revised Act also provides for amending it to include the new selection criteria.

The President will then be required under the proposed legislation to nominate the new Commissioners for an additional BRAC round no later than September 30, 2014. The BRAC list will then be required to be issued by the Secretary on November 30, 2014. A final report shall be issued by the Commission on June 30, 2015, giving the Commission, in effect, seven months in which to complete its work. This is in contrast to the current statutory scheme where the Commission had

to produce its report to the President in less than four months from the Secretary's release of the BRAC list. The new timeline in the proposed legislation takes into consideration the difficulty of meeting the statutory deadlines during the 2005 BRAC round, and extends the timeframe in order for both the GAO and the Commission the opportunity to meet their internal timelines with greater ease. A full timeline of the entire BRAC process, as proposed, is set forth below in Section C.

In conclusion, the initiation of an additional BRAC round, the timing and sequencing of events, and the strategic foundation of the BRAC process has been modified by the proposed legislation to strengthen the BRAC process and facilitate the greater administrative ease of the Commission and the agencies involved, while preserving the salient elements of the overall statutory scheme.

Extending the Life of the BRAC Commission

Another difficulty faced by the 2005 BRAC Commission was meeting its staffing needs in a timely manner in order to fulfill its statutory duties. Since the 1995 BRAC Commission had been disbanded, there was no pre-existing support structure to manage the administrative start-up needs of the Commission such as recruiting and hiring, leasing space and equipment, and other administrative issues. Since the Commission was already operating under a foreshortened timeframe, the complex task of establishing the Commission from the ground up was exceedingly difficult.

Thus, assuming that Congress does not enact a joint resolution disapproving the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, the proposed legislation suggests keeping the Commission in place until March 15, 2014, or the date by which the Secretary of Defense must certify whether there is a need for an additional BRAC round. This will allow two objectives to be met. First, it will keep a structured Commission in place (with a Chairman,2 Executive Director, and a limited staff) to allow greater ease in assembling a new augmented BRAC staff should another round be initiated; and second, to permit the Commission to produce annual, special and final reports to Congress and the President on the implementation of the 2005 BRAC recommendations, as described in the proposed legislation. This will enable both the Department and Congress to better gauge the progress made on these recommendations, and to determine whether further changes to the U.S. military basing posture need to be made in the future.

Further, the proposed legislation expands and clarifies the role of the Executive Director in new Section 2902(h). While the proposed legislation in Section 2902(d) permits the Commissioners to stay with the Commission for a period not to exceed eight months from the date the final Commission report is submitted to the President (as may be modified), they are expected to depart. This means that the Commission will not have a full complement of eight Commissioners, excluding the Chairman, unless another BRAC round is authorized.

However, during that period and under the guidance of the Chairman, the Commission will be able to examine and report on implementation issues. This will provide, in effect, "one-stop shopping" for the Congress and the President in terms of tracking, monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the implementation of the 2005 BRAC Commission's final recommendations. Although the Comptroller General of the United States and the Department's military service branches all have implementation responsibilities and in some cases, reporting requirements, this information is scattered, diffuse and uneven.

Reports

The annual and final reports of the Commission, if this new statutory scheme is accepted by Congress, will, *inter alia*, track and, where appropriate, monitor the following: (1) the uses of the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 as described in section 2906A of the BRAC statute;[3] (2) the implementation by each branch of the armed services of the recommendations made by the Commission, including any annual net savings thereof; (3) the implementation of privatizations-in-place by local redevelopment authorities or private entities; (4) the environmental remediation undertaken by the Department of Defense, and the costs thereof; and (5) the impact of closures or realignments on international treaty obligations of the United States, if any.

The tracking of the implementation of the 2005 BRAC round may be especially important since the Secretary issued 190 recommendations with over 1,000 actions affecting 33 major (and hundreds of smaller) military installations, each one of

[2] If this approach is accepted and acted upon by Congress, please note that Section 2902((d)(2) of the current BRAC statute provides that, "The Chairman of the Commission shall serve until the confirmation of a successor."

[3] The proposed legislation does not advocate tracking the uses of the 1990 BRAC Account, as described in Section 2906 of the current BRAC statute, by the Commission. However, if in the view of Congress this would be a worthwhile endeavor, the scope of the proposed legislation could be expanded to cover this aspect of implementing the recommendations of prior BRAC rounds.

which involves a great deal of detailed movements of military missions, personnel and related functions. In fact, certain recommendations have conditions precedent attached to them whereby if the conditionality is not met by the concerned parties, the recommendation shall revert to the Secretary's original recommendation. There is no true oversight for this type of recommendation. Other examples include recommendations that may be the subject of third party litigation whose outcome has not been finally determined by the end of the BRAC process. Again, there is no tracking of this process to make a final determination on whether the Commission's recommendations were implemented or not.

Moreover, the number and complexity of the recommendations involved in the 2005 BRAC round make its implementation and the accountability for full implementation, including fiscal accountability, more difficult to achieve. If Congress entrusts the Commission to track the full implementation of the 2005 BRAC round, this will be a focused means of imposing accountability in the BRAC process on the Department, its service branches, the local redevelopment authorities, and other involved parties. Ultimately, this may be a significant cost-saving measure that will help ensure that further public resources are not devoted to making duplicative or conflicting recommendations in future BRAC rounds.

Special Report

Further, the proposed legislative language requires the Commission, presuming that Congress does not enact a joint resolution disapproving the recommendations of the 2005 BRAC Commission, to produce a special report. If enacted by Congress, the Commission will be tasked with issuing, no later than June 30, 2007, a special report that describes an overall strategic approach to implementing BRAC closures and realignments.

This special report will take into consideration and analyze the differing nature and needs of the military properties that are the subject of BRAC closures or realignments. The discussion below divides such properties into three basic categories: (1) those properties that are attractive for immediate re-use or local redevelopment purposes; (2) properties that need financial intermediation in order to prepare for a transfer to the private sector; and (3) "challenged" properties that pose long-term remediation issues and problems.

(1) Local Redevelopment Authorities. In the first instance, military properties that are subject to closure (and partial realignment in certain cases) may be attractive for re-use or redevelopment purposes. In such cases, local redevelopment authorities may be given, for example, up to two years from actual closure to negotiate a satisfactory early transfer agreement with the Department and accept legal title in the property concerned. It is for this reason that the proposed legislation advocates making the existing two-year authority for the Department to enter into environmental cooperative agreements into a permanent authority. (See Section 2905(f)). However, once this two-year time period expires, the Department will no longer be required to work with or through the local redevelopment authority, and may seek other private sector partners with whom to enter into negotiations to transfer title and undertake other tasks.

If environmental clean-up or remediation, if required, is completed within a reasonable time period of say, five to seven years, then the Department may then enter into contracts with private environmental insurance carriers to mitigate its risk of financing further environmental clean-up if problems are discovered after the initial clean-up has been completed. Although the Department assumes full legal liability throughout the process and continues to remain legally liable after the environmental remediation process is completed, the use of private insurance may nevertheless mitigate its risk. The idea of developing an insurance program for the Department's use, and exploring the possibility of bundling policies for greater economic efficiencies, is one issue that may explored by the Commission.

(2) Privatizations-in-Place. Another issue that may be the subject of the Commission's special report is to develop a financial "toolbox" for the Department to use in creating economic incentives to close, realign and otherwise dispose of properties that are the subject of the Commission's recommendations. This toolbox could include, for example, giving the Department special authorities to enter into contracts, leases, loans, loan guarantees and investments in the form of an acquisition of a limited partnership interest to purchase stock, equity positions or other equitable instruments, bonds or other debt instruments by the United States.

Indeed, forming strong public-private partnerships between the Department and private entities may facilitate the process of base closures. The Commission's special report could explore the feasibility of entering into such privatizations-in-place as a pilot program. If legislation for this were approved by Congress, with appropriate Congressional Notification requirements in place, this could be a pilot program limited to one service branch and a select number of military installations scheduled for closure under the 2005 BRAC round.

In fact, Congress could consider creating a separate government corporate entity to exercise these functions, and the Department, for example, could assign and transfer its title and interests in military installations scheduled for closure and realignment under this BRAC round to this stand-alone corporation. Of course, this corporation, if established by Congress,

would have its own governing board of directors that would manage and oversee the use of financial options to remediate or otherwise prepare military properties for transfer to the private sector. If such a stand-alone corporation were established by Congress, legal title to such military properties (if not the actual legal liability for environmental remediation) could be shifted from the Department to this new corporate entity. Thus, the Department would be relieved of the burden of the day-to-day management of these military properties.

The financial "toolbox" discussed above may also provide structured finance options that can be used to support the environmental remediation and transfers of closed military installations to the private sector. For example, if the Department is prepared to remediate the military property in question to meet industrial use standards yet the local community would like to rezone it for residential use, the Department may find it very useful to have a financial "toolbox" available to it. In that situation, the Department may seek to enter into public-private partnerships to finance (through the issuance of environmental bonds or other options) the additional clean-up costs.

By sourcing a private developer that is willing to assume greater commercial risk than a local redevelopment authority, the Department may be authorized by Congress to enter into a limited liability corporate structure that will enable it to seek private financing to issue bonds or other debt (or even equity) instruments. The bond proceeds (held by a trustee) may finance the excess clean-up costs and create an income stream to qualified institutional investors once the property starts to generate income from commercial and/or residential uses.

For example, both the States of New York and Pennsylvania have issued state-issued municipal Superfund bonds and brownfield bonds to encourage public participation in the clean-up of superfund sites. In the 2005 BRAC rounds, at least 14 of the military installations are National Priorities List (NPL) sites. Perhaps the Commission's special report could explore the feasibility of issuing tax-free revenue Superfund environmental bonds. Indeed, tax credits for such bond purchases may already be available for this purpose.

The Department could also be authorized to issue loan guarantees to enable the private developer to obtain better terms (i.e., interest rates and repayment terms) on financing such a redevelopment project. Title to the property could be assumed by the limited liability, special purpose venture established for this purpose. The Department could also, via the special purpose vehicle, take an equity position in the venture as an additional financing option. These are but a few of the options that may be considered by the Commission in enlarging the financial "toolbox" made available for the Department's use in implementing 2005 BRAC closures and realignments.

(3) Establishing a Trusteeship. Finally, for military properties that are scheduled for closure or realignment in this round, or that have failed to close from previous BRAC rounds, the Commission's special report could explore the possibility of setting up an independent trusteeship to function as a receivership. The trusteeship could help prevent encroachment on these "challenged" military properties that have unexploded ordinances on them, or chemical and other dangerous weapons that have not been demilitarized. While it may be unlikely that such properties can ever be readied or transfer to the public domain or for private use, a trusteeship to manage these properties for conservation or related purposes may be an option to further the BRAC process.

Moreover, the trusteeship, if established, may assume legal title from the Department (e.g., the Army) and assume land management and conservation responsibilities, in coordination with the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, as necessary. In fact, the trusteeship could be organized as a government foundation with significant grant-making authority to fund conservation and natural habitat creation in partnership with not-for-profit organizations. This, of course, is a long-term (if not permanent) commitment, and a corporate structure that exceeds the current authority of the Commission would have to be established by Congress in order for such an arrangement to be possible.

International Treaty Obligations

On a different note, one other aspect that seems to have been overlooked in the BRAC process is tracking the compliance of the United States with its international treaty obligations as it may be impacted by the BRAC process. In certain cases, closures and demilitarization of chemical and other weapons are actually being executed pursuant to international treaty obligations. The proposed legislation advocates coordination between the Commission and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) to help track, monitor and report on the interface of such international obligations with the BRAC process. This report will provide Congress with a fuller picture of the underlying international law issues and aspects that may be connected to the BRAC process.

TACTICAL CONCERNS

Finally, some elements of the current BRAC statute, e.g., a supermajority vote of the Commissioners to add military installations for consideration, and to add to the Secretary's list of recommended closures or realignments, have been retained. However, the proposed language does address some concerns that specifically derived from the 2005 BRAC round.

Most importantly, if the Department does not release the certified data justifying the recommendations in a timely fashion, the BRAC process will automatically terminate. (*See* Section 2903(2)(B)). This proved to be a difficult issue in the 2005 BRAC round and could have had a deleterious effect on the Commission's ability to complete the analysis underlying its recommendations in a timely manner. The Commission has also been granted subpoena power in case it cannot procure the information it needs by other means. (*See* Section 2902(q)).

The draft legislation makes the Commission's General Counsel its sole ethics counselor, thus, eliminating the need for the Office of Government Ethics, the Department's Office of the General Counsel, and the White House Counsel's office to provide ethics support to the Commission when Commissioners are being nominated, and afterwards. Since the Commission will have a General Counsel on staff, there should be no need to use outside sources of ethics counseling.

Under the proposed legislation, the new BRAC Commission will be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act, but will conform to the requirements, in substance, of the Freedom of Information Act and the Government in the Sunshine Act. (*See* Sections 2902 (n), (o) and (e)).

In sum, the draft proposed legislation is designed to eliminate redundancies and inconsistencies and to consolidate the current legislation. The proposed legislation, by tasking the Commission with producing a special report to Congress, explores the options of providing more financial flexibility to the Department in implementing 2005 BRAC round recommendations. Finally, the proposed legislative revisions address strategic and tactical concerns, and enlarge the scope of the advisory function of the Commission. Overall, these changes are being proposed with a view towards ensuring greater accountability and transparency in the BRAC process for Congress and the general public.

TIMELINE OF PROPOSED FUTURE BRAC PROCESS

30 September 2013	Secretary Issues the QDR
31 January 2014	Director of National Intelligence Issues Threat Assessment Report
27 February 2014	Secretary Submits Budget, with Force Structure and Infrastructure Inventory
15 March 2014	Secretary Certification for Additional BRAC Round
15 April 2014	Secretary Publishes Draft Selection Criteria Published in *Federal Register*
30 May 2014	GAO Report on Force Structure
30 June 2014	Final Selection Criteria Published in *Federal Register*
30 September 2014	President Nominates BRAC Commissioners, or BRAC Process Terminates
01 October 2014	Secretary Submits Final Version of Force Structure Plan
30 November 2014	Secretary Issues BRAC List
07 December 2014	Secretary Issues Certified Data, or BRAC Process Terminates
15 January 2015	GAO Transmits Report on BRAC List to Congress and the BRAC Commission
30 June 2015	BRAC Commission Issues Report
15 July 2015	President Approves/Disapproves of Commission's Recommendations, and Informs Congress
45 Legislative Days	If BRAC Recommendations Are Approved by the President, Congress May Issue a Vote of Disapproval and the BRAC Process Terminates
15 August 2015	If BRAC Recommendations Are Disapproved by President, Commission Submits Revised Recommendations to the President
30 August 2015	President Transmits Revised Recommendations to Congress, or the BRAC Process Terminates
45 Legislative Days	If BRAC Recommendations Are Approved by the President, Congress May Issue a Vote of Disapproval, and the BRAC Process Terminates

PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE CHANGES TO THE 2005 DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACT OF 1990

(PUBLIC LAW 101-510) AS CODIFIED AT 10 U.S.C. 2687 NOTE, AS AMENDED BY FY 2002 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 107-107)

To amend the Defense Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to provide for the continuance of the Commission established therein, and to expand its authorities and functions.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 is amended–

SECTION 2901. SHORT TITLE AND PURPOSE.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.** By striking 'This part may be cited as the "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990" and inserting 'This Act may be cited as the "Defense Base Realignment and Closure Authorization Act of 2008."'

'SECTION 2902. THE COMMISSION

In section (a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**–By striking '"Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission"' and inserting '"Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission."'

In section (c) **APPOINTMENT.**–(1)(A) By renumbering it as section (1) and striking 'eight members' and inserting 'nine members,' and by deleting section (1)(B) and section (1)(C). In section (c)(3) by striking 'for each session of Congress referred to in paragraph (1)(B).' In section (c) by inserting a new provision, '(c)(4) The General Counsel of the Commission shall provide exclusive ethics guidance and counseling to the Chairman and the Commissioners before, during and after the nomination process. The General Counsel shall also have all other duties appurtenant to the office.'

In section (d) **TERMS.**–By deleting it and replacing it with 'Each member of the Commission, not including the Chairman, shall serve up to eight months from the date of submitting the Commission's report to the President, unless reappointed.'

(e) **MEETINGS.**–(1) By deleting this subsection, and renumbering the following section as '(1)(A)' and inserting 'If another round is authorized pursuant to section 2903, the Commission shall conduct meetings and hearings open to the public, unless the Chairman determines that such hearings should be closed to the public for reasons of national security. The Commission shall issue public notices of its meetings and hearings by publication in the *Federal Register* not less than ten days before the dates or such meetings and hearings, except for emergency meetings in which case notice may be issued not less than three days before the date of such a meeting with an explanation on why an emergency meeting is necessary under the circumstances. Where such meetings or hearings are closed to the public, the public notice shall specify the reasons therefor. All testimony presented at open public hearings before the Commission shall be made under oath. Official transcripts, certified by the Chairman, of such public meetings and hearings shall be made available to the public within 90 days of the meeting or hearing taking place.'

(h) **DIRECTOR OF STAFF.**–By inserting '(h)(3) The Director shall be authorized to continue performing the duties of the office until the termination of the Commission, and may designate the necessary staff of not more than 50 persons, to conduct the affairs of the Commission as long as Congress fails to enact a joint resolution of disapproval as provided in Section 2904(b).'

'(h)(4) The Director may request the head of any Federal department or agency to detail any of the personnel of that department or agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act, and shall request the Comptroller General of the United States, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) to detail one or more employees, at the Director's discretion, to assist the Commission in discharging its duties, pursuant to an agreement entered into by the Comptroller General of the United States, EPA and ACDA, respectively, with the Commission. The detailee(s) assigned by the Comptroller General of the United States shall be responsible for tracking and monitoring, as appropriate, uses of the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005, as set forth in section 2906A; the EPA detailee(s) shall be responsible for tracking and monitoring, as appropriate, environmental restoration, remediation and compliance, as set forth in section 2905; and the ACDA detailee(s) shall monitor compliance of international treaty obligations of the United States as may be affected by realignments and closures recommended by the Commission.'

(i) **STAFF.**—by deleting (i)(5) and (i)(6).

(k) **FUNDING.**—(1) By striking 'part' and inserting 'Act.'

(2) By deleting (k)(2) and inserting 'If no funds are appropriated to the Commission by the end of the second session of the 114th Congress for the activities of the Commission in 2015, the Secretary may transfer to the Commission for purposes of its activities until its termination, as specified in this part, such funds as the Commission may require to carry out such activities. The Secretary may transfer these funds from any funds that may be available to the Secretary. Funds so transferred shall remain available until expended.'

(3) By deleting (k)(3) and inserting 'If another round is authorized, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such funds as are necessary to carry out its duties. Such funds shall remain available until expended.'

(l) **TERMINATION.**—by striking 'shall terminate on December 31, 1995' and inserting 'shall terminate on March 31, 2014, or the date by which the Secretary of Defense must certify that an additional BRAC round is needed under section 2903(b)(1).'

In Section 2902, by inserting 'SECTION 2902(n). **EXEMPTION FROM FACA.** The Commission shall be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. app. (2005).'

In Section 2902, by inserting 'SECTION 2902(o). **RECORDS AND RECORDKEEPING.** (1) The records, reports, transcripts, minutes, correspondence, working papers, drafts, studies or other documents that were furnished to or made available to the Commission shall be available for public inspection and copying at one or more locations to be designated by the Commission. Copies may be furnished to members of the public at cost upon request, may also be provided via electronic media in a form that may be designated by the Commission.

(2) The Commission shall keep records and fully disclose the disposition of any funds, including travel funds, which are made available to the Commission in discharging its duties.

(3) The disposition, retention and destruction of all official records of the Commission, electronic and otherwise, shall be made pursuant to the Federal Records Act, 44 U.S. Code, Chapter 33.'

In Section 2902, by inserting 'SECTION 2902(p). **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.** (1) **ANNUAL REPORTS.** The Commission shall furnish annual reports to Congress and the President no later than October 31 of each calendar year concerning the implementation of the Commission's final recommendations made to Congress on September 8, 2005, [insert date of final recommendations if revisions were provided to the President] providing that Congress has not enacted a joint resolution of disapproval pursuant to section 2904(b). Such report shall track and monitor the uses of the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 as described in section 2906A; the implementation by each branch of the armed services of the recommendations made by the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, including any annual net savings thereof; the implementation of privatizations-in-place by local redevelopment authorities; environmental remediation under taken by the Department of Defense, and the costs thereof, and the impact of closures or realignments on international treaty obligations of the United States.'

'(2) **SPECIAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION.**—The Commission shall be authorized to conduct a thorough study and detailed analysis of the implementation of the 2005 Defense Closure and Realignment Commission's recommendations as long as Congress fails to enact a joint resolution of disapproval as provided in Section 2904(b). The study, to be issued at the discretion of the Commission but, in any case no later than June 30, 2007, to Congress and the President shall identify and discuss the feasibility of categorizing military installations scheduled for closure and realignment, where appropriate, into properties: (a) that are the subject of negotiations with local redevelopment authorities or other parties for re-use or rezoning and may require special finance vehicles such as loans, loan guarantees, investments, environmental bonds and insurance, or other options to successfully transfer title and use to municipal, State or private sector entities; and (b) that are National Priorities List (NPL) sites or that have significant environmental remediation problems requiring long-term management and oversight. The Commission shall consult with the Department of Defense and its military service branches, the Comptroller General of the United States and the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, in making its study.

'(3) **FINAL REPORT.** The Commission shall furnish a final report to Congress and the President no later than October 31, 2011, concerning the implementation of the Commission's final recommendations made to Congress on September 8, 2005, [insert date of final recommendations if revisions were provided to the President] as long as Congress has not enacted a joint resolution of disapproval pursuant to section 2904(b).'

In Section 2902, by inserting 'SECTION 2902(q). **SUBPOENA POWER.** The Commission shall have the power to issue subpoenas to compel the disclosure of testimony, documentary, electronic or other types of evidence and the testimony of the custodians thereof. Such subpoenas shall be enforceable by a federal district court with jurisdiction over the matter.

In Section 2903 by striking **'PROCEDURE FOR MAKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS'** and inserting **'PROCEDURE FOR INITIATING AN ADDITIONAL ROUND OF BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS.'**

By deleting section 2903(a) and inserting **'SECTION 2903(a) FORCE-STRUCTURE PLAN AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVENTORY.–**

'(1) **PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION.**–As part of the budget justification documents submitted to Congress in support of the budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015, the Secretary shall include the following:

'(A) A force-structure plan for the Armed Forces based on (i) an assessment provided to the Secretary by the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary and other national intelligence agencies, no later than January 31, 2014, of the probable threats to the national security during the 20-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014, taking into account military, economic and diplomatic factors; (ii) the probable end-strength levels and major military force units (including land force divisions, carrier and other major combatant vessels, air wings, and other comparable units) needed to meet these threats; (iii) mobility capabilities and (iv) the anticipated levels of funding that will be available for national defense purposes during such period.

'(B) A comprehensive inventory of military installations world-wide for each military department, with specifications of the number and type of facilities in the active and reserve forces of each military department.

'(2) **RELATIONSHIP OF PLAN AND INVENTORY.**–Using the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory prepared under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall prepare (and include as part of the submission of such plan and inventory) the following:

'(A) A description of the infrastructure necessary to support the force structure described in the force-structure plan.

'(B) A discussion of categories of excess infrastructure and infrastructure capacity.

'(C) An economic analysis of the effect of the closure or realignment of military installations to reduce excess infrastructure.

'(3) **SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS.**–In determining the level of necessary versus excess infrastructure under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall consider the following:

'(A) The anticipated continuing need for and availability of military installations outside the United States, taking into account current restrictions on the use of military installations outside the United States and the potential for future prohibitions or restrictions on the use of such military installations.

'(B) Any efficiencies that may be gained from joint tenancy by more than one branch of the Armed Forces at a military installation.

'(4) **REVISION.**–The Secretary may revise the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory; If the Secretary makes such a revision, the Secretary shall submit the revised plan or inventory to Congress not later than October 1, 2014. For purposes of selecting military installations for closure or realignment under this Act in 2014, no revision of the force-structure plan or infrastructure inventory is authorized after that date.

'(b) **CERTIFICATION OF NEED FOR FURTHER CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS.**–In order to initiate an additional round of base closures and realignments on the basis of the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory and the economic analysis of the effect of the closure or realignment of military installations to reduce excess infrastructure prepared under subsection (a), and as part of the submission of the plan and inventory, the Secretary of the Department of Defense shall certify no later than March 15, 2014 –

(1) That a need exists for the closure or realignment of additional military installations;

(2) That an additional round of closures and realignments would result in annual net savings for each military department beginning not later than fiscal year 2021; and,

(3) That the certification is based on the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory, including a 20-year projected threat assessment, and consideration of the Quadrennial Defense Review for 2013, issued by the Secretary pursuant to 10 U.S.C. Section 118(a), and the overseas global basing posture.

'(c) **EFFECT OF FAILURE TO CERTIFY.**—If the Secretary does not certify the need for closures or realignments of military installations as referred to in paragraph (b), the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this Act shall be terminated.'

In Section 2903 by renumbering section (b) as '(d) **SELECTION CRITERIA.**—(1) and striking 'December 31, 1990,' and inserting 'April 15, 2014.' In section 2903(2)(A) by striking 'February 15, 1991' and inserting 'June 30, 2014', and by striking 'March 1991' and inserting 'as long as Congress fails to enact a joint resolution of disapproval as provided in Section 2904(b) herein.' And, in section 2903(2)(B) by striking 'January 15 of the year concerned' and inserting 'August 15, 2015' and by striking 'enacted on or before February 15 of the year concerned' and inserting 'as long as Congress fails to enact a joint resolution of disapproval as provided in Section 2904(b) herein.' And by inserting as a new sentence at the end of section 2903(2)(B) 'This Act shall be further amended to add the final selection criteria, as published in the *Federal Register*, within 120 days of such publication.'

In section 2903, by inserting section '(e) **COMPTROLLER GENERAL EVALUATION.**—

'(1) **EVALUATION REQUIRED.**—If the certification is provided under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall prepare an evaluation of the following:

'(A) The force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory prepared under subsection (a) and the final selection criteria referenced in subsection (d), including an evaluation of the accuracy and analytical sufficiency of such plan, inventory, and criteria.

'(B) The need for the closure or realignment of additional military installations.

'(2) **SUBMISSION.**—The Comptroller General shall submit the evaluation to Congress not later than 60 days after the date on which the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory are submitted to Congress.'

In section 2903, by inserting section '(f)(1) **APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONERS FOR AN ADDITIONAL ROUND.**—Subject to the issuance of certifications by the Secretary as required under subsection (b), the President may commence an additional round for the selection of military installations for closure and realignment under this Act by transmitting to the Senate, not later than September 30, 2014, nominations pursuant to section 2902(c) for the appointment of new members to the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission.

'(2) **EFFECT OF FAILURE TO NOMINATE.**—If the President does not transmit to the Senate the nominations for the Commission by September 30, 2014, the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this Act in 2014 shall be terminated.'

In section 2903 by striking '(c)' and inserting '(g) **DOD RECOMMENDATIONS.**—(1) If the Secretary makes the certifications required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall publish in the *Federal Register* and transmit to the congressional defense committees and the Commission, not later than November 30, 2014, a list of the military installations inside the United States that the Secretary recommends for closure or realignment on the basis of the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory prepared by the Secretary under subsection (a)(1), and the final selection criteria specified in subsection (d).

'(2)(A) The Secretary shall include, with the list of recommendations published and transmitted pursuant to paragraph (1), a summary of the selection process that resulted in the recommendation for each installation, including a detailed justification for each recommendation. This justification shall include sufficient detail, including minutes of meetings for Department of Defense executive group sessions, including presentations made to the Department of Defense Infrastructure Executive Council and the Infrastructure Steering Group, along with complete cost data in order to enable the Commission to consider and propose alternatives to the recommendations proposed by the Secretary.

(B) The Secretary shall certify and transmit to the congressional defense committees and the Commission the summary and detailed justification matters referred to in paragraph (A) in full, complete and accurate form, fully disaggregated, as necessary, into unclassified and classified databases, not later than 7 days after the date of the transmittal to the congressional defense committees and the Commission of the list referred to in paragraph (1). Additionally, the Secretary shall make available to the public a copy of the unclassified portions of the summary and detailed justification within 7 days after the Secretary transmits the list referred to paragraph (1). If the Secretary does not certify and transmit the summary and

justification for the list of recommendations as described in this section, the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this Act shall be terminated.

'(3)(A) **CONSIDERATION OF U.S. MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.**—In considering military installations for closure or realignment, the Secretary shall consider all military installations inside the United States equally without regard to whether the installation has been previously considered or proposed for closure or realignment by the Department.

'(B) In considering military installations for closure or realignment, the Secretary may not take into account for any purpose any advance conversion planning undertaken by an affected community with respect to the anticipated closure or realignment of an installation.

'(C) For purposes of subparagraph (B), in the case of a community anticipating the economic effects of a closure or realignment of a military installation, advance conversion planning-

(i) shall include community adjustment and economic diversification planning undertaken by the community before an anticipated selection of a military installation in or near the community for closure or realignment; and

(ii) may include the development of contingency redevelopment plans, plans for economic development and diversification, and plans for the joint use (including civilian and military use, public and private use, civilian dual use, and civilian shared use) of the property or facilities of the installation after the anticipated closure or realignment.

'(4) **CONSIDERATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT VIEWS.**—(A) In making recommendations to the Commission in 2014, the Secretary shall consider any notice received from a local government in the vicinity of a military installation that the government would approve of the closure or realignment of the installation. '(B) Notwithstanding the requirement in subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall make the recommendations referred to in that subparagraph based on the force-structure plan, infrastructure inventory, and final selection criteria otherwise applicable to such recommendations.

'(C) The recommendations shall include a statement of the result of the consideration of any notice described in subparagraph (A) that is received with respect to a military installation covered by such recommendations. The statement shall set forth the reasons for the result.'

'(5) **SECRETARY'S USE OF INFORMATION.**—In addition to making all information used by the Secretary to prepare the recommendations under this subsection available to Congress (including any committee or member of Congress), the Secretary shall also make such information available to the Commission and the Comptroller General of the United States.

'(6)(A) **CERTIFICATION OF INFORMATION.**—Each person referred to in subparagraph (B), when submitting information to the Secretary of Defense or the Commission concerning the closure or realignment of a military installation, shall certify that such information is accurate and complete to the best of that person's knowledge and belief.

(B) Subparagraph (A) applies to the following persons:

(i) The Secretaries of the military departments.

(ii) The heads of the Defense Agencies.

(iii) Each person who is in a position the duties of which include personal and substantial involvement in the preparation and submission of information and recommendations concerning the closure or realignment of military installations, as designated in regulations which the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe, regulations which the Secretary of each military department shall prescribe for personnel within that military department, or regulations which the head of each Defense Agency shall prescribe for personnel within that Defense Agency.

'(7) **TRANSMITTAL OF CERTIFIED INFORMATION.**—Any information provided to the Commission by a person described in paragraph (6)(B) shall also be submitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives to be made available to the Members of the House concerned in accordance with the rules of that House. The information shall be submitted to the Senate and House of Representatives within 48 hours after the submission of the information to the Commission.'

In section 2903, by striking '(d)' and inserting '(h) **REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE COMMISSION.**—(1) After receiving the recommendations from the Secretary pursuant to subsection (g), the Commission shall conduct public hearings on the recommendations. All testimony before the Commission at a public hearing conducted under this paragraph shall be presented under oath.

'(2)(A) The Commission shall, by no later than June 30, 2015, transmit to the President a report containing the Commission's findings and conclusions based on a review and analysis of the recommendations made by the Secretary as

transmitted on November 30, 2014, together with the Commission's recommendations for closures and realignments of military installations inside the United States.

(B) Subject to subparagraph (g), in making its recommendations, the Commission may make changes in any of the recommendations made by the Secretary if the Commission determines that the Secretary deviated substantially from the force-structure plan and final criteria referred to in subsection (a) in making recommendations.

(C) In the case of a change described in subparagraph (D) in the recommendations made by the Secretary, the Commission may make the change only if the Commission—

(i) makes the determination required by subparagraph (B);

(ii) determines that the change is consistent with the force-structure plan and final criteria referred to in subsection (c)(1);

(iii) publishes a notice of the proposed change in the *Federal Register* not less than 30 days before transmitting its recommendations to the President pursuant to paragraph (2); and

(iv) conducts public hearings on the proposed change.

(D) Subparagraph (C) shall apply to a change by the Commission in the Secretary's recommendations that would—

(i) add a military installation to the list of military installations recommended by the Secretary for closure;

(ii) add a military installation to the list of military installations recommended by the Secretary for realignment; or

(iii) increase the extent of a realignment of a particular military installation recommended by the Secretary.

(E) In making recommendations under this paragraph, the Commission may not take into account for any purpose any advance conversion planning undertaken by an affected community with respect to the anticipated closure or realignment of a military installation.

'(3) **AVAILABILITY OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS.**—After June 30, 2011, the Commission shall promptly provide, upon request, to any Member of Congress information used by the Commission in making its recommendations.

'(4) **LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY TO CONSIDER ADDITIONS TO CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT LISTS.**—The Commission may not consider making a change in the recommendations of the Secretary that would add a military installation to the Secretary's list of installations recommended for closure or realignment unless, in addition to the requirements of section 2903(h)(2)(C)—

'(A) the Commission provides the Secretary with at least a 15-day period, before making the change, in which to submit an explanation of the reasons why the installation was not included on the closure or realignment list by the Secretary; and

'(B) the decision to add the installation for Commission consideration is supported by at least seven members of the Commission.

'(5) **TESTIMONY BY SECRETARY.**—The Commission shall invite the Secretary to testify at a public hearing, or a closed hearing if classified information is involved, on any proposed change by the Commission to the Secretary's recommendations.

'(6) **REQUIREMENTS TO EXPAND CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT RECOMMENDATIONS.**—In the report required under section 2903(h)(2)(A) that is to be transmitted under paragraph (1), the Commission may not make a change in the recommendations of the Secretary that would close a military installation not recommended for closure by the Secretary, would realign a military installation not recommended for closure or realignment by the Secretary, or would expand the extent of the realignment of a military installation recommended for realignment by the Secretary unless—

'(A) at least two members of the Commission visit the military installation before the date of the transmittal of the report; and

'(B) the decision of the Commission to make the change to recommend the closure of the military installation, the realignment of the installation, or the expanded realignment of the installation is supported by at least seven members of the Commission.

'(7) The Commission shall explain and justify in its report submitted to the President on June 30, 2014, any recommendation made by the Commission that is different from the recommendations made by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (g). The Commission shall transmit a copy of such report to the congressional defense committees on the same date on which it transmits its recommendations to the President.

'(8) When the Commission transmits recommendations to the President under this subsection, the Commission shall promptly provide, upon request, to any Member of Congress information used by the Commission in making its recommendations.

'(9) The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(A) assist the Commission, to the extent requested, in the Commission's review and analysis of the recommendations made by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (C); and

(B) by no later than January 15, 2015, transmit to the Congress and to the Commission a report containing a detailed analysis of the Secretary's recommendations and selection process.'

In section 2903 by striking '(e)' and inserting '(i) **REVIEW BY THE PRESIDENT.**—(1) The President shall, by no later than July 15, 2015, transmit to the Commission and to the Congress a report containing the President's approval or disapproval of the Commission's recommendations.

'(2) If the President approves all the recommendations of the Commission, the President shall transmit a copy of such recommendations to the Congress, together with a certification of such approval.

'(3) If the President disapproves the recommendations of the Commission, in whole or in part, the President shall transmit to the Commission and the Congress the reasons for that disapproval. The Commission shall then transmit to the President, by no later than August 15, 2015, a revised list of recommendations for the closure and realignment of military installations.

'(4) If the President approves all of the revised recommendations of the Commission transmitted to the President under paragraph (3), the President shall transmit a copy of such revised recommendations to the Congress, together with a certification of such approval no later than August 30, 2015.

'(5) If the President does not transmit to the Congress an approval and certification described in paragraph (2) or (4) by August 30, 2015, the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this Act shall be terminated.

'(6) A report of the President under this subsection containing the President's approval of the Commission's recommendations is deemed to be a report under section 2903(e) for purposes of sections 2904 and 2908.'

In section 2904(a)(3) by striking '2005 report' and inserting '2015 report,' and striking 'section 2903(e)' and inserting 'section 2903(i).'

In section 2905(b)(4)(B)(ii) by deleting 'a reasonable period of time' and inserting two years,' and by inserting a new sentence to follow the first sentence, 'If the requirements of this subsection are not met, the Department shall be free to negotiate with parties other than the redevelopment authority.'

In section 2905 by inserting new section '(f) **ENVIRONMENTAL COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—By making section 311 of the Fiscal Year 2003 National Defense Authorization Act (Public Law 107-314) a permanent authority permitting the Secretary of Defense to enter into and fund cooperative agreements for environmental purposes with Federal, State and local agencies as well as Indian tribes, in carrying out the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 2701).'

In section 2909(a), by striking 'during the period beginning on November 5, 1990, and ending on April 15, 2006, this part' and inserting 'this Act.'

By deleting section 2909(c)(1).

In section 2910(1), by striking 'the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1)' and inserting 'the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005, established in section 2906A.'

By deleting Sections 2912-2914.

APPENDIX S

"LIFE AFTER BRAC" RESOURCE FINDER

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recognizes that closing and realigning military installations inherently results in significant economic dislocation for workers and communities. Assistance for BRAC-impacted communities is coordinated across the Federal Government through the President's Economic Adjustment Committee (EAC). This appendix describes *some, but by no means all,* of the federal resources available to assist communities and individuals in alleviating the socioeconomic effects of military base closures and realignments.

SELECTED ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITIES

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT (OEA) (WWW.OEA.GOV)

400 Army Navy Drive, Suite 200

Arlington, VA 22202-4704

Phone: 703-604-6020 Fax: 703-604-5843

Additional resource information is available at www.oea.gov/oeaweb.nsf/BRAC?readform or by calling OEA at (703)-604-6020.

The Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) at http://www.oea.gov, is the primary DoD source of assistance to communities affected by both increases and decreases in military spending. *It also serves as a focal point for assistance from other federal agencies.* In previous BRAC rounds OEA has provided $280 million, primarily to fund strategy development for communities seeking local development and other federal funding.

OEA provides planning and implementation assistance to communities, regions, and states impacted by defense program changes, such as base closings or expansions. OEA maintains close working relationships with other federal agencies that operate programs that can assist communities adversely affected by defense cutbacks or realignments. By design, the OEA plays a facilitating role in the economic adjustment process. The affected community, however, must play the principal role in initiating and carrying out the adjustment and conversion plan.

Currently, OEA operates with a staff of approximately 50 persons. Most communities affected by a BRAC round receive OEA assistance averaging $400,000 to $500,000 a year for three to five years, depending on circumstances.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS (CDBG)

451 7th Street S.W., Washington, DC 20410

Phone: (202) 708-1112

http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/communitydevelopment/programs/index.cfm .

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) provides Federal funds for community and economic development projects. The program supports job creation and retention efforts, local government efforts to provide affordable infrastructure systems, and community efforts to improve the quality of life for low-to-moderate-income citizens. CDBG grants are based on a community's population.

Department of Commerce

Economic Development Administration (EDA)

1401 Constitution Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20230

http://www.eda.gov/xp/EDAPublic/Contacts/Contacts.xml

The list of programs administered by EDA can be found at http://www.eda.gov/AboutEDA/Programs.xml

EDA has provided grants to leverage private sector and local public sector dollars for targeted investments to alleviate the sudden economic dislocation caused by base closures. Total EDA grants from additional appropriations made for bases closed in 1988, 1991, 1993 and 1995 exceeded $640 million. Additionally, EDA received approximately $274 million from the Department of Defense and $8 million from the Department of Energy for specially targeted defense adjustment projects. These grants provided substantial funds for services, including infrastructure development, technology initiatives, revolving loan funds and other economic development strategies. EDA's Economic Adjustment Program predominantly supported three types of grant activities: strategic planning, project implementation, and Revolving Loan Funds (RLFs). Implementation grants supported one or more activities identified in an EDA-approved Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS).

Communities economically impacted by major base closures or realignments may be eligible for funding under EDA's Planning, Technical Assistance and Public Works programs.

Department of Labor

Employment and Training Agency

Frances Perkins Building

200 Constitution Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20210

1-877-US-2JOBS

Resources for States and Communities affected by BRAC can be found at http://www.doleta.gov/neg/Faqs.cfm

Workforce Investment Act (WIA) National Emergency BRAC Planning Grants

National Emergency Grants fund planning for layoffs resulting from BRAC 2005. States likely to face the largest impact get priority. A first round of grants totaling $28 million was issued to States on June 28, 2005. BRAC questions from local communities can be sent to DOL at bracquestions@dol.gov.

Selected Assistance for Workers

DoD Employees

Civilian Personnel Management Services (CPMS)

http://www.cpms.osd.mil/bractransition/index.htm

CPMS administers the Civilian Assistance and Re-Employment (CARE) Program, which oversees the management of draw-downs and transition assistance programs. The CARE Program consists of job placement programs such as the DoD Priority Placement Program (PPP), separation incentives such as Voluntary Separation Incentive Pay, and other benefits and services for civilian employees in career transition. CARE also provides direct program assistance to DoD activities affected by downsizing or reorganization.

OTHER RESOURCES FOR WORKERS AND BUSINESSES

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Toll-Free Hotline 1-877-US2-JOBS

http://www.brac-coach.org/

The BRAC Coach Web Site assists workers, businesses, and workforce professionals affected by a base realignment or closure. Operators refer callers to local programs, including One-Stop Career Centers for assistance. These Centers can be found at www.servicelocator.org and are the focal point of the workforce investment system, supporting the employment needs of job seekers and the human resource needs of businesses. Transitioning workers can access career guidance, information on available jobs, job search assistance, information on training availability, training and educational opportunities, and job placement services. Laid-off workers may also access temporary income support and more intensive services to assist with child-care and transportation needs.

RELATED FORMS OF ASSISTANCE

A number of other federal agencies and activities offer assistance to communities and individuals adversely affected by base closures and realignments. They include:

FOR COMMUNITIES

- DoD-funded environmental review and cleanup at closing military facilities may support local jobs after a base is designated for closure but before federal land is actually transferred. More information can be obtained at http://www.epa.gov/swerffrr/stakeholder.htm.
- DoD transfer of closed military base land for less than market value.
- The potential transfer of military airports to civilian use under the Federal Airport Improvement Program of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).
- Programs to promote economic development in rural communities with populations of fewer than 50,000, administered by the Rural Development Administration of the Department of Agriculture. Assistance includes: community facilities loans, rural business enterprise grants, business and industrial guaranteed loans, and intermediary relending programs.

FOR INDIVIDUALS:

- Post-secondary education and training assistance for students under Title IV of the Higher Education Act and vocational education programs under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act.
- Benefits related to past employment: Unemployment Compensation and temporary health insurance continuation.
- Benefits related to financial need: Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, Food Stamps, subsidized school meals, Medicaid, and housing assistance furnished by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- Benefits for service-disabled veterans who are small business owners. New laws and regulations now provide more opportunities for businesses owned by service-disabled veterans to contract with federal agencies. For more information, consult the following website: http://www.vetbiz.gov/fpp/fpp.htm.
- A list of agency-by-agency contacts for this VA service-disabled veterans small business owner program: http://www.vetbiz.gov/fpp/designees.pdf.

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

APPENDIX T MAPS



2005 Defense Base Closure & Realignment Commission Actions

United States Northeastern Seaboard





2005 Defense Base Closure & Realignment Commission Actions

United States Southeastern Seaboard

2005 Defense Base Closure & Realignment Commission Actions

United States Great Lakes Region





South Central United States

2005 Defense Base Closure & Realignment Commission Actions

2005 Defense Base Closure & Realignment Commission Actions

United States Northwest Region



2005 Defense Base Closure & Realignment Commission Actions

United States West Coast Region



(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

INDEX BY STATE

STATE BY STATE LISTING OF BASES, RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS, AND PAGE NUMBER

ALABAMA

ABBOTT US ARMY RESERVE CENTER TUSKEGEE

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
11	Army 25	RC Transformation, AL	20

ANDERSON US ARMY RESERVE CENTER TROY

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
11	Army 25	RC Transformation, AL	20

ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
7	Army 16	Red River Army Depot, TX	14
57	DoN 6	Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA	81
150	Ind 4	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	229
153	Ind 7	Rock Island Arsenal, IL	232
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277

ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER MOBILE

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

BG WILLIAM P. SCREWS US ARMY RESERVE CENTER MONTGOMERY

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
11	Army 25	RC Transformation, AL	20

BIRMINGHAM ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
55	Army 115	USAR Command and Control Southeast	77

BIRMINGHAM INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AIR NATIONAL GUARD STATION

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
78	Air Force 5	Birmingham International Airport Air National Guard Station, AL	111

Dannelly Field Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
78	Air Force 5	Birmingham International Airport Air National Guard Station, AL	111
98	Air Force 30	Great Falls International Airport Air National Guard Station	141

Fort Ganey Army National Guard Reserve Center Mobile

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
11	Army 25	RC Transformation, AL	20

Fort Hanna Army National Guard Reserve Center Birmingham

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
11	Army 25	RC Transformation, AL	20

Fort Rucker

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
120	E&T 5	Aviation Logistics School	179
189	Tech 26	Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development and Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	301

Gary US Army Reserve Center Enterprise

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
11	Army- 25	RC Transformation, AL	20

Maxwell Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
106	Air Force- 39	Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station, OH	154
124	E&T 9	Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education	183
179	Tech 6	Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	282

Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Montgomery

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
74	DoN 34	Navy Recruiting Districts	103

Navy Reserve Center Tuscaloosa AL

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Mobile AL

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Redstone Arsenal

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
2	Army 6	Fort Gillem, GA	6
5	Army 11	Fort Monmouth, NJ	10
121	E&T 6	Combat Service Support Center	180
134	H&SA 15	Co-locate Missile and Space Defense Agencies	201
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
180	Tech 7	Consolidate Ground Vehicle Development & Acquisition in a Joint Center	284
189	Tech 26	Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development and Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	301

The Adjutant General Bldg, AL Army National Guard Montgomery

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
11	Army 25	RC Transformation, AL	20

US Army Reserve Center Vicksburg

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
11	Army 25	RC Transformation, AL	20

Wright US Army Reserve Center

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
11	Army 25	RC Transformation, AL	20

Alaska

Eielson Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
79	Air Force 6	Eielson Air Force Base, AK, Moody Air Force Base, GA, and Shaw Air Force Base, SC	112

Elmendorf Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
80	Air Force 7	Kulis Air National Guard Station, AK, and Elmendorf AFB, AK	114
89	Air Force- 18	Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK	126
109	Air Force- 43	Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD and Dyess Air Force Base, TX	159

Fort Greely

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
1	Army 5	Fort Wainwright, AK	5

Fort Richardson

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219

Fort Wainwright

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
1	Army 5	Fort Wainwright, AK	5

Galena Airport Forward Operating Location

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
195	Add 5	Close or Further Realign Galena Airport FOL, AK	174

Kulis Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
80	Air Force 7	Kulis Air National Guard Station, AK, and Elmendorf AFB, AK	114

Arizona

Air Force Research Lab, Mesa City

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
187	Tech 22	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	297

Allen Hall Armed Forces Reserve Center, Tucson

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
12	Army 28	RC Transformation, AZ	22

Fort Huachuca

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272

Leased Space AZ

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
130	H&SA 5	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	193

Luke Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
81	Air Force- 8	Fort Smith Air National Guard Station, AR, and Luke AFB, AZ	115
113	Air Force- 47	Hill Air Force Base, UT, Edwards AFB, CA, Mountain Home AFB, ID, Luke AFB, AZ, Nellis Air Force Base, NV	165
118	Air Force- 53	Air Force Logistics Support Centers	172
125	E&T 10	Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site	184

Marine Corps Air Station Yuma

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
78	Air Force 5	Birmingham International Airport Air National Guard Station, AL	111

Arkansas

Camp Pike (90th)

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
56	Army 117	USAR Command and Control Southwest	78

El Dorado Armed Forces Reserve Center

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
13	Army 30	RC Transformation, AR	23

Fort Smith Regional

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
81	Air Force 8	Fort Smith Air National Guard Station, AR, and Luke AFB, AZ	115

Little Rock Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
99	Air Force 31	Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air National Guard Station, NV	142
101	Air Force 33	Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	145
102	Air Force 34	Schenectady County Airport Air National Guard Station	147
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148
106	Air Force 39	Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station, OH	154
109	Air Force 43	Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD and Dyess Air Force Base, TX	159
117	Air Force 52	General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	170
118	Air Force 53	Air Force Logistics Support Centers	172

Stone US Army Reserve Center, Pine Bluff

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
13	Army 30	RC Transformation, AR	23

California

Armed Forces Reserve Center Bell

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Army National Guard Reserve Center Bell

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
14	Army 33	RC Transformation, CA	25

Armed Forces Reserve Center Moffett Field

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
56	Army 117	USAR Command and Control Southwest	78

Beale Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
82	Air Force 10	Beale AFB, CA and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI	117

Broadway Complex San Diego

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
192	Add 2	Close or Realign Broadway Complex San Diego, CA	107

Camp Parks (91st)

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
56	Army 117	USAR Command and Control Southwest	78

Channel Islands Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
93	Air Force 24	Martin State Air National Guard Station, MD	133
99	Air Force 31	Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air National Guard Station, NV	142
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148

Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Oakland

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, San Bernardino

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, San Diego

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Seaside

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Edwards Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
113	Air Force 47	Hill AFB, UT, Edwards AFB, CA, Mountain Home AFB, ID, Luke AFB, AZ, Nellis AFB, NV	165
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Corrections Facilities	208
179	Tech 6	Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	282

Fort Hunter Liggett

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
56	Army 117	USAR Command and Control Southwest	78

Fresno Air Terminal

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
81	Air Force 8	Fort Smith Air National Guard Station, AR, and Luke AFB, AZ	115
89	Air Force 18	Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK	126
99	Air Force 31	Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV	142

Human Resources Support Center Southwest

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205

Leased Space—CA

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
130	H&SA 5	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	193
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195

Los Alamitos (63rd)

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
56	Army 117	USAR Command and Control Southwest	78

March Air Reserve Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
83	Air Force 11	March Air Force Base, CA	118

Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Corrections Facilities	208
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
192	Add 2	Close or Realign Broadway Complex San Diego, CA	107

Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
57	DoN 6	Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA	81
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277

Marine Corps Base Miramar

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
125	E&T 10	Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site	184
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Corrections Facilities	208
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

Marine Corps Reserve Center Pasadena CA

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Naval Air Station Lemore

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
184	Tech 15	Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	290
186	Tech 19	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition	294
190	Tech 28	Navy Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development and Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	302

Naval Base Coronado

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

Naval Base Point Loma

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
71	DoN 26	Naval Station Ingleside, TX, and Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX	99
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285
184	Tech 15	Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	290

Naval Base Ventura County

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
58	DoN 7	Naval Support Activity Corona, CA	82
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285
184	Tech 15	Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	290
190	Tech 28	Navy Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	302

Naval Medical Center San Diego

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
172	Med 10	San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX	262

Naval Station San Diego

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
71	DoN 26	Naval Station Ingleside, TX, and Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX	99
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277

Naval Support Activity Corona

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
58	DoN 7	Naval Support Activity Corona, CA	82

Naval Weapons Station Fallbrook

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
186	Tech 19	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition	294

Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
150	Ind 4	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	229
184	Tech 15	Create an Integrated Naval Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	290

Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
59	DoN 9	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, CA	83

Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
197	Add 7	Close or Realign Professional Development Education	188

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Encino

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Los Angeles

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Onizuka Air Force Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
84	Air Force 12	Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	120

Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
151	Ind 5	Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA	230

Sierra Army Depot

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
152	Ind 6	Sierra Army Depot, CA	231

US Army Reserve Center, Moffett Field

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
14	Army 33	RC Transformation, CA	25

Vandenberg Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
84	Air Force 12	Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	120
108	Air Force 41	Portland International Airport Air National Guard Station, OR	157

Colorado

Air Reserve Personnel Center

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
143	H&SA 33	Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force	214
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217
196	Add 6	Close or Realign Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Buckley Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
91	Air Force 22	New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	130
107	Air Force 40	Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station, OH	156

Fort Carson

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
6	Army 15	Fort Hood, TX	13
173	Med 12	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264

Leased Space CO

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195

Peterson Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
109	Air Force 43	Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD and Dyess Air Force Base, TX	159
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195

Schriever Air Force Base, CO

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
101	Air Force 33	Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	145

United States Air Force Academy

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
173	Med 12	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264

Connecticut

Bradley International Airport Air National Guard Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
85	Air Force 14	Bradley International Airport Air National Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air National Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Air National Guard Station, MD	121
94	Air Force 25	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert–St. Louis International Airport Air National Guard Station, MO, Atlantic City Air National Guard Station, NJ	134

SGT Libby US Army Reserve Center, New Haven

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
15	Army 35	RC Transformation, CT	26

Submarine Base New London

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
144	H&SA 35	Create Joint Mobilization Sites	216

Turner US Army Reserve Center, Fairfield

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
15	Army 35	RC Transformation, CT	26

US Army Reserve Center Area Maintenance Support Facility Middletown

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
15	Army 35	RC Transformation, CT	26

Delaware

Dover Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
86	Air Force 15	New Castle Airport Air National Guard Station, DE	122
169	Med 4	Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD	257

Kirkwood US Army Reserve Center, Newark

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
16	Army 37	RC Transformation, DE	27

New Castle County Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
86	Air Force 15	New Castle Airport Air National Guard Station, DE	122

District of Columbia

Bolling Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
130	H&SA 5	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	193
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219
147	H&SA 44	Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA)	222
198	Add 8	Close or Realign Joint Medical Command HQs	226

Leased Space DC

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
141	H&SA 30	Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications	212

149	H&SA 49	Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations	225
168	Int 4	National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency	254

Naval District Washington

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
77	DoN 44	Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	105
130	H&SA 5	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	193
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195
149	H&SA 49	Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations	225
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285
183	Tech 13	Consolidate Sea Vehicle Development & Acquisition	289

Potomac Annex

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266
198	Add 8	Close or Realign Joint Medical Command HQs	226

Walter Reed Army Medical Center

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
169	Med 4	Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD	257
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisition	266

Florida

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Orlando

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Eglin Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
4	Army 10	Fort Bragg, NC	9
125	E&T 10	Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site	184
179	Tech 6	Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	282
185	Tech 18	Create an Air Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	293

Homestead Air Reserve Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
113	Air Force 47	Hill AFB, UT, Edwards AFB, CA, Mountain Home AFB, ID, Luke AFB, AZ, Nellis AFB, NV	165
115	Air Force 50	Richmond Air National Guard Station, VA, Des Moines International Airport Air National Guard Station, IA	167

Hurlburt Field

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
118	Air Force 53	Air Force Logistics Support Centers	172

Jacksonville International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
89	Air Force 18	Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK	126
94	Air Force 25	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air National Guard Station, MO, Atlantic City Air National Guard Station, NJ	134
119	Air Force 55	F-100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities	173

MacDill Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
82	Air Force 10	Beale Air Force Base, CA and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI	117
104	Air Force 37	Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	151
173	Med 12	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264

Naval Air Station Jacksonville

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
65	DoN 18	Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	91
72	DoN 28	Engineering Field Division/Activity	100
75	DoN 35	Navy Regions	103
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285

Naval Air Station Pensacola

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
61	DoN 12	Officer Training Command, Pensacola, FL	86
75	DoN 35	Navy Regions	103
125	E&T 10	Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site	184
128	E&T 14	Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training	187
135	H&SA 17	Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center	203
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285

Naval Station Mayport

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
67	DoN 20	Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	94
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

Naval Support Activity Panama City

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
140	H&SA 27	Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR	210

Navy Reserve Center St. Petersburg

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Patrick Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
182	Tech 12	Consolidate Navy Strategic Test & Evaluation	288

Tyndall Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
114	Air Force 49	Langley Air Force Base, VA	166
119	Air Force 55	F-100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities	173
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266

Georgia

Dobbins Air Reserve Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
62	DoN 13	Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	87
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101
117	Air Force 52	General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	170

Fort Benning

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
2	Army 6	Fort Gillem, GA	6
9	Army 20	Maneuver Training	17
50	Army 105	Single Drill Sergeant	71

Fort Benning Bldg 15

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
17	Army 39	RC Transformation, GA	29

Fort Gillem

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
2	Army 6	Fort Gillem, GA	6
62	DoN 13	Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	87

Fort McPherson

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
3	Army 8	Fort McPherson, GA	8

Inspector/Instructor Rome GA

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Leased Space GA

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195

Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
7	Army 16	Red River Army Depot, TX, TX	14
57	DoN 6	Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA	81
150	Ind 4	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	229
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277

Moody Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
79	Air Force 6	Eielson Air Force Base, AK, Moody Air Force Base, GA, and Shaw Air Force Base, SC	112
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148
128	E&T 14	Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training	187

Naval Air Station Atlanta

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
62	DoN 13	Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	87

Naval Supply Corps School Athens

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
63	DoN 14	Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA	88

Naval Air Station Atlanta

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
62	DoN 13	Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	87

Naval Supply Corps School Athens

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
63	DoN 14	Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA	88

Peachtree Leases Atlanta

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
3	Army 8	Fort McPherson, GA	8

Robins Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
62	DoN 13	Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	87

87	Air Force 16	Robins Air Force Base, GA	124
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
143	H&SA 33	Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force	214
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277
188	Tech 24	Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	299
189	Tech 26	Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	301

Savannah International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
81	Air Force 8	Fort Smith Air National Guard Station, AR, and Luke AFB, AZ	115
86	Air Force 15	New Castle Airport Air National Guard Station, DE	122

Submarine Base Kings Bay

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
182	Tech 12	Consolidate Navy Strategic Test & Evaluation	288

US Army Reserve Center Columbus

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
17	Army 39	RC Transformation, GA	29

Guam

Andersen Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219

Hawaii

Army National Guard Reserve Center Honokaa

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
18	Army 40	RC Transformation, HI	30

Hickam Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
104	Air Force 37	Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	151
118	Air Force 53	Air Force Logistics Support Centers	172
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219

Naval Station Pearl Harbor

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
69	DoN 23	Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME	97
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

175 S&S 5 Commodity Management Privatization 271

Idaho

Boise Air Terminal Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
88	Air Force 17	Boise Air Terminal Air National Guard Station, ID	125
98	Air Force 30	Great Falls International Airport Air National Guard Station, MT	141

Mountain Home Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	PAGE #	RECOMMENDATION FINAL REPORT PAGE #	
89	Air Force 18	Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK	126
113	Air Force 47	Hill AFB, UT, Edwards AFB, CA, Mountain Home AFB, ID, Luke AFB, AZ, Nellis AFB, NV	165

Navy Reserve Center Pocatello

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Illinois

Army National Guard Reserve Center Carbondale

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
19	Army 42	RC Transformation, IL	31

Capital Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
90	Air Force 20	Capital Air National Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air National Guard Station, IN	128

Fort Sheridan

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
53	Army 109	USAR Command and Control Northeast	74

Greater Peoria Regional Airport

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
110	Air Force 44	Nashville International Airport Air National Guard Station, TN	161

Naval Station Great Lakes

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
72	DoN 28	Engineering Field Division/Activity	100
75	DoN 35	Navy Regions	103
77	DoN 44	Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	105
172	Med 10	San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX	262
173	Med 12	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266

Navy Reserve Center Forest Park

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Rock Island Arsenal

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
2	Army 6	Fort Gillem, GA	6
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223
153	Ind 7	Rock Island Arsenal, IL	232
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272

Scott Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
104	Air Force 37	Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	151
118	Air Force 53	Air Force Logistics Support Centers	172
142	H&SA 31	Consolidate Transportation Command Components	213
173	Med 12	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264

Indiana

Crane Army Ammunition Plant

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
152	Ind 6	Sierra Army Depot, CA	231

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Indianapolis

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217
196	Add 6	Close or Realign Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Fort Wayne International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
90	Air Force 20	Capital Air National Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air National Guard Station, IN	128

Hulman Regional Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
90	Air Force 20	Capital Air National Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air National Guard Station, IN	128

Leased Space IN

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
143	H&SA 33	Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force	214

Naval Support Activity Crane

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266
184	Tech 15	Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	290
186	Tech 19	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition	294

Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Grissom Air Reserve Base, Bunker Hill

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Indianapolis

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
74	DoN 34	Navy Recruiting Districts	103

Navy Reserve Center Evansville

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Newport Chemical Depot

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
154	Ind 8	Newport Chemical Depot, IN	233

US Army Reserve Center Lafayette

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
20	Army 44	RC Transformation, IN	32

US Army Reserve Center Seston

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
20	Army 44	RC Transformation, IN	32

Iowa

Army National Guard Reserve Center Camp Dodge

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
21	Army 46	RC Transformation, IA	33

Des Moines International Airport Air National Guard Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
90	Air Force 20	Capital Air National Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air National Guard Station, IN	128
98	Air Force 30	Great Falls International Airport Air National Guard Station, MT	141
107	Air Force 40	Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station, OH	156
115	Air Force 50	Richmond Air National Guard Station, VA, Des Moines International Airport Air National Guard Station, IA	167

Navy Reserve Center Cedar Rapids

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Navy Reserve Center Sioux City

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Dubuque

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Sioux Gateway Airport Air National Guard

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
116	Air Force 51	Fairchild Air Force Base, WA	169

Kansas

Forbes Field Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
104	Air Force 37	Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	151
108	Air Force 41	Portland International Airport Air National Guard Station, OR	157

Fort Leavenworth

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208

Fort Riley

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
10	Army 22	Operational Army (IGPBS)	18
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205

Kansas Army Ammunition Plant

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
155	Ind 9	Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS	234

McConnell Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
83	Air Force 11	March Air Force Base, CA	118
87	Air Force 16	Robins Air Force Base, GA	124
104	Air Force 37	Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	151
112	Air Force 46	Lackland Air Force Base, TX	164

Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Kansas

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
74	DoN 34	Navy Recruiting Districts	103

US Army Reserve Center Wichita

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
54	Army 112	USAR Command and Control Northwest	76

Kentucky

Army National Guard Reserve Center Paducah

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
22	Army 48	RC Transformation, KY	35

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Lexington

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Fort Campbell

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
2	Army 6	Fort Gillem, GA	6
10	Army 22	Operational Army (IGPBS)	18

Fort Knox

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
5	Army 11	Fort Monmouth, NJ	10
8	Army 19	Fort Monroe, VA	16
9	Army 20	Maneuver Training	17
55	Army 115	USAR Command and Control Southeast	77
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Corrections Facilities	208
143	H&SA 33	Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force	214
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223
173	Med 12	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264

Louisville International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
106	Air Force 39	Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station, OH	154
110	Air Force 44	Nashville International Airport Air National Guard Station, TN	161

Navy Recruiting Command Louisville

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
186	Tech 19	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition	294

Navy Reserve Center Lexington

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

US Army Reserve Center Louisville

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
55	Army 115	USAR Command and Control Southeast	77

US Army Reserve Center Maysville

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
22	Army 48	RC Transformation, KY	35

Louisiana

Army National Guard Reserve Center Baton Rouge

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
23	Army 50	RC Transformation, LA	36
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Barksdale Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
79	Air Force 6	Eielson Air Force Base, AK, Moody Air Force Base, GA, and Shaw Air Force Base, SC	112
91	Air Force 22	New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	130

Baton Rouge Armed Forces Reserve Center

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Leased Space Slidell

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
140	H&SA 27	Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR	210

Naval Air Station New Orleans

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
62	DoN 13	Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	87
64	DoN 15	Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA	89
66	DoN 19	Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO	92
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

Naval Air Station New Orleans Air Reserve Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
91	Air Force 22	New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	130
108	Air Force 41	Portland International Airport Air National Guard Station, OR	157
119	Air Force 55	F-100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities	173

Naval Support Activity New Orleans

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
64	DoN 15	Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA	89

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Baton Rouge

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Roberts US Army Reserve Center, Baton Rouge

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
23	Army 50	RC Transformation, LA	36

Maine

Bangor International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
78	Air Force 5	Birmingham International Airport Air National Guard Station, AL	111
96	Air Force 28	Duluth International Airport Air National Guard Station, MN	138
97	Air Force 28	Key Field Air National Guard Station, MS	139
101	Air Force 33	Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	145

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Limestone

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Naval Air Station Brunswick

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
65	DoN 18	Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	91
191	Add 1	Close or Further Realign Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	91

Naval Reserve Center, Bangor

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Naval Shipyard Portsmouth

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
69	DoN 23	Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME	97

Maryland

Aberdeen Proving Ground

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
5	Army 11	Fort Monmouth, NJ	10
121	E&T 6	Combat Service Support Center	180
136	H&SA 18	Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters	204
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223
169	Med 4	Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD	257
170	Med 6	Brooks City Base, TX	259
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272

187	Tech 22	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	297

Andrews Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
92	Air Force 23	Andrews AFB, MD, Will Rogers Air National Guard Station, OK, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Randolph Air Force Base, TX	131
93	Air Force 24	Martin State Air National Guard Station, MD	133
100	Air Force 32	Cannon Air Force Base, NM	143
129	H&SA 3	Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations	191
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195
173	Med 12	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264

Army Research Laboratory, Adelphi

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
186	Tech 19	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition Bethesda/Chevy Chase	294

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Patuxent River

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Fort Detrick

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
169	Med 4	Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD	257
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266

Fort Meade

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
5	Army 11	Fort Monmouth, NJ	10
130	H&SA 5	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	193
140	H&SA 27	Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR	210
141	H&SA 30	Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications	212

Leased Space MD

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
130	H&SA 5	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	193
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195
149	H&SA 49	Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations	225
168	Int 4	National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency	254
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266

Martin State Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
85	Air Force 14	Bradley International Airport Air National Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air National Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Airport Air National Guard Station, MD	121
93	Air Force 24	Martin State Airport Air National Guard Station, MD	133

National Naval Medical Center Bethesda

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
169	Med 4	Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD	257
178	Tech 5	Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers	281

Naval Air Facility Washington

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219

Naval Air Station Patuxent River

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
149	H&SA 49	Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations	225
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285
184	Tech 15	Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center	290
189	Tech 26	Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	301

Naval Station Annapolis

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
166	Ind 26	Naval Shipyard Detachments	250

Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
184	Tech 15	Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Center	290
186	Tech 19	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition	294

Naval Surface Weapons Station Carderock

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
183	Tech 13	Consolidate Sea Vehicle Development & Acquisition	289

Navy Reserve Center Adelphi

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

PFC Flair US Army Reserve Center, Frederick

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
24	Army 52	RC Transformation, MD	37

Massachusetts

Armed Forces Reserve Center Ayers

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
25	Army 54	RC Transformation, MA	38

Armed Forces Reserve Center New Westover

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
52	Army 107	USAR Command and Control New England	73

Army National Guard Combined Support Maintenance Shop Devens

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
25	Army 54	RC Transformation, MA	38

Army National Guard Reserve Center Ayer

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
25	Army 54	RC Transformation, MA	38

Barnes Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
85	Air Force 14	Bradley International Airport Air National Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air National Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Airport Air National Guard Station, MD	121
94	Air Force 25	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air National Guard Station, MO, Atlantic City Air National Guard Station, NJ	134

Fort Devens, 323d Maintenance Facility

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
25	Army 54	RC Transformation, MA	38

Hanscom Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
179	Tech 6	Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	282
187	Tech 22	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	297

Malony US Army Reserve Center

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
52	Army 107	USAR Command and Control New England	73

Natick Soldier Systems Center

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
130	H&SA 5	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	193
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272

Naval Shipyard Puget Sound Boston Detachment

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
166	Ind 26	Naval Shipyard Detachments	250

Otis Air National Guard Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
94	Air Force 25	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air National Guard Station, MO, Atlantic City Air National Guard Station, NJ	134

Regional Training Site Maintenance (98), US Army Reserve Fort Devens

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
25	Army 54	RC Transformation, MA	38

US Army Reserve Ayer Area 3713

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
25	Army-54	RC, Transformation, MA	38

US Army Reserve ECS 65 Ayers

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
25	Army 54	RC Transformation, MA	38

Westover Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84

Westover US Army Reserve Center, Chicopee

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
52	Army 107	USAR Command and Control New England	73

Michigan

Detroit Arsenal

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
51	Army 106	US Army Garrison, MI	72
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
180	Tech 7	Consolidate Ground Vehicle Development & Acquisition in Joint Center	284
183	Tech 13	Consolidate Sea Vehicle Development & Acquisition	289

Navy Reserve Center Marquette

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Parisan US Army Reserve Center, Lansing

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
26	Army 55	RC Transformation, MI	40

Selfridge Air National Guard Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
82	Air Force 10	Beale AFB, CA and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI	117
85	Air Force 14	Bradley International Airport Air National Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air National Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Airport Air National Guard Station, MD	121
95	Air Force 27	W.K. Kellogg Airport Air National Guard Station, MI	137

Selfridge Army Activity

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
51	Army 106	US Army Garrison, MI	72

W. K. Kellogg Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
95	Air Force 27	W.K. Kellogg Airport Air National Guard Station, MI	137

Minnesota

Armed Forces Reserve Center Cambridge

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
27	Army 57	RC Transformation, MN	41

Armed Forces Reserve Center Faribault

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
27	Army 57	RC Transformation, MN	41

Duluth International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
96	Air Force 28	Duluth International Airport Air National Guard Station	138

Fort Snelling

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
54	Army 112	USAR Command and Control Northwest	76

Navy Reserve Center Duluth

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

US Army Reserve Cambridge

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
27	Army 57	RC Transformation, MN	41

Mississippi

Columbus Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148
128	E&T 14	Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training	187

Human Resources Support Center Southeast

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205

Jackson International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
97	Air Force 28	Key Field Air National Guard Station, MS	139

Keesler Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
173	Med 12	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264

Key Field Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
97	Air Force 28	Key Field Air National Guard Station, MS	139

Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
157	Ind 11	Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS	236

Naval Air Station Meridian

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
124	E&T 9	Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education	183

Naval Station Pascagoula

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
67	DoN 20	Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	94

Missouri

Army National Guard Reserve Center Jefferson Barracks

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
28	Army 58	RC Transformation, MO	42

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Kansas City

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, St. Louis

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Fort Leonard Wood

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
50	Army 105	Single Drill Sergeant	71
127	E&T 13	Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, MO	186

Lambert International Airport-St. Louis

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
94	Air Force 25	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air National Guard Station, MO, Atlantic City Air National Guard Station, NJ	134

Leased Space—MO (Army Reserve Personnel Center St. Louis)

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
143	H&SA 33	Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force	214

Marine Corps Support Center Kansas City

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
66	DoN 19	Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO	92

Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Kansas City

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
74	DoN 34	Navy Recruiting Districts	103

Navy Reserve Center Cape Girardeau

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Rosecrans Memorial Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
92	Air Force 23	Andrews AFB, MD, Will Rogers Air National Guard Station, OK, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, and Randolph Air Force Base, TX	131

Whiteman Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
91	Air Force 22	New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	130

Montana

Galt Hall US Army Reserve Center, Great Falls

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
29	Army 60	RC Transformation, MT	43

Great Falls International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
98	Air Force 30	Great Falls International Airport Air National Guard Station, MT	141

Nebraska

Army National Guard Reserve Center Columbus

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
30	Army 62	RC Transformation, NE	44

Army National Guard Reserve Center Grand Island

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
30	Army 62	RC Transformation, NE	44

Army National Guard Reserve Center Kearny

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
30	Army 62	RC Transformation, NE	44

Naval Recruiting District Headquarters Omaha

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
74	DoN 34	Navy Recruiting Districts	103

Navy Reserve Center Lincoln

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Offutt Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Nevada

Hawthorne Army Depot

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
158	Ind 12	Hawthorne Army Depot, NV	236

Naval Air Station Fallon

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

Nellis Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
79	Air Force 6	Eielson AFB, AK, Moody AFB, GA, and Shaw AFB, SC	112
89	Air Force 18	Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV,	

		and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK	126
91	Air Force 22	New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	130
94	Air Force 25	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air National Guard Station, MO, Atlantic City AGS, NJ	134
100	Air Force 32	Cannon Air Force Base, NM	143
113	Air Force 47	Hill AFB, UT, Edwards AFB, CA, Mountain Home AFB, ID, Luke AFB, AZ, Nellis AFB, NV	165

Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
99	Air Force 31	Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air National Guard Station, NV	142

New Hampshire

Armed Forces Reserve Center Pease Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
83	Air Force 11	March Air Force Base, CA	118

Doble US Army Reserve Center Portsmouth

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
31	Army 65	RC Transformation, NH	46

New Jersey

Atlantic City International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
94	Air Force 25	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air National Guard Station, MO, Atlantic City AGS, NJ	134
108	Air Force 41	Portland International Airport Air National Guard Station, OR	157

Fort Dix

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
53	Army 109	USAR Command and Control Northeast	74
68	DoN 21	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	95
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101
144	H&SA 35	Create Joint Mobilization Sites	216
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing Inspector/Instructor	219

Fort Monmouth

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
5	Army 11	Fort Monmouth, NJ	10

Inspector/Instructor West Trenton

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Kilmer US Army Reserve Center, Edison

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
53	Army 109	USAR Command and Control Northeast	74

McGuire Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
68	DoN 21	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	95
86	Air Force 15	New Castle Airport Air National Guard Station, DE	122
188	H&SA-41	Joint Basing	299

Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219
189	Tech 26	Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	301
188	Tech-24	Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	299

Naval Weapons Station Earle

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
186	Tech 19	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition	294

Picatinny Arsenal

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
186	Tech 19	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition	294

SFC Nelson V. Brittin US Army Reserve Center

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
32	Army 66	RC Transformation, NJ	47

New Mexico

Cannon Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
100	Air Force 32	Cannon Air Force Base, NM	143

Holloman Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
170	Med 6	Brooks City Base, TX	259

Jenkins Armed Forces Reserve Center Albuquerque

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
33	Army 68	RC Transformation, NM	48

Kirtland Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
100	Air Force 32	Cannon Air Force Base, NM	143
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208
187	Tech 22	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	297

White Sands Missile Range

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
187	Tech 22	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	297

New York

Armed Forces Reserve Center Amityville

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
34	Army 69	RC Transformation, NY	49

Army National Guard Reserve Center Niagara Falls

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
34	Army 69	RC Transformation, NY	49

Carpenter US Army Reserve Center, Poughkeepsie

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
53	Army 109	USAR Command and Control Northeast	74

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Rome

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Fort Totten / Pyle

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
53	Army 109	USAR Command and Control Northeast	74

Navy Recruiting District Headquarters Buffalo

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
74	DoN 34	Navy Recruiting Districts	103

Navy Reserve Center Glen Falls

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Navy Reserve Center Horseheads

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Navy Reserve Center Watertown

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Niagara Falls International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
101	Air Force 33	Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	145

Rome Laboratory

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
187	Tech 22	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	297

Schenectady County Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
102	Air Force 34	Schenectady County Air National Guard Station	147

United States Military Academy

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
5	Army 11	Fort Monmouth, NJ	10

Watervliet Arsenal

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
159	Ind 13	Watervliet Arsenal, NY	238

North Carolina

Army Research Office, Durham

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
178	Tech 5	Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers	281

Charlotte/Douglas International Airport

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
86	Air Force 15	New Castle Airport Air National Guard Station, DE	122

Fort Bragg

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
4	Army 10	Fort Bragg, NC	9
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148

Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
68	DoN 21	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	95
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
173	Med 12	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277

Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

Navy Reserve Center Asheville

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Niven US Army Reserve Center, Albermarle

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
35	Army 72	RC Transformation, NC	50

Pope Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
2	Army 6	Fort Gillem, GA	6
3	Army 8	Fort McPherson, GA	8
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148
117	Air Force 52	General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	170

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
104	Air Force 37	Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	151
119	Air Force 55	F-100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities	173

North Dakota

Fargo, ND Armed Forces Reserve Center

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
36	Army 73	RC Transformation, ND	51

Grand Forks Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
104	Air Force 37	Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	151

Hector International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
105	Air Force 38	Hector International Airport Air National Guard Station, ND	153

Johnson US Army Reserve Center, Fargo

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
36	Army 73	RC Transformation, ND	51

Ohio

Armed Forces Reserve Center Akron

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Army National Guard Reserve Center Mansfield

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
37	Army 75	RC Transformation, OH	52

Army National Guard Reserve Center Westerville

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
37	Army 75	RC Transformation, OH	52

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Cleveland

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Dayton

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Defense Supply Center Columbus

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
5	Army 11	Fort Monmouth, NJ	10
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277
196	Add 6	Close or Realign Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Glenn Research Center

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
187	Tech 22	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	297

Leased Space OH

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
130	H&SA 5	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	193
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195

Lima Tank Plant

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
156	Ind 10	Lima Tank Plant, OH	235

Mansfield Lahm Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
106	Air Force 39	Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station, OH	154

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Akron

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Cleveland

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Parrott US Army Reserve Center Kenton

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
37	Army 75	RC Transformation, OH	52

Rickenbacker Army National Guard Bldg 943 Columbus

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
37	Army 75	RC Transformation, OH	52

Rickenbacker International Airport Air National Guard Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
107	Air Force 40	Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station, OH	156

Scouten US Army Reserve Center Mansfield

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
37	Army 75	RC Transformation, OH	52

Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
107	Air Force 40	Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station, OH	156

Toledo Express Airport Air National Guard Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
106	Air Force 39	Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station, OH	154
115	Air Force 50	Richmond Air National Guard Station, VA, Des Moines International Airport Air National Guard Station, IA	167

US Army Reserve Center Whitehall

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
37	Army 75	RC Transformation, OH	52

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
170	Med 6	Brooks City Base, TX	259

174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266
179	Tech 6	Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	282
187	Tech 22	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	297
188	Tech 24	Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	299
189	Tech 26	Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	301
197	Add 7	Close or Realign Professional Development Education	188

Youngstown-Warren Regional Airport

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148

Oklahoma

Altus Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
118	Air Force 53	Air Force Logistics Support Centers	172

Armed Forces Reserve Center Broken Arrow

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Army National Guard Reserve Center Broken Arrow

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
38	Army 77	RC Transformation, OK	54

Army National Guard Reserve Center Tishomingo

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
38	Army 77	RC Transformation, OK	54

Ashworth US Army Reserve Center Muskogee

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
38	Army 77	RC Transformation, OK	54

Fort Sill

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
10	Army 22	Operational Army (IGPBS)	18
56	Army 117	USAR Command and Control Southwest	78
126	E&T 12	Net Fires Center	185
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Krowse US Army Reserve Center Oklahoma City

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
38	Army 77	RC Transformation, OK	54

McAlester Army Ammunition Plant

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
152	Ind 6	Sierra Army Depot, CA	231

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Tulsa

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Oklahoma City (95th)

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
56	Army 117	USAR Command and Control Southwest	78

Tinker Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
7	Army 16	Red River Army Depot, TX	14
92	Air Force 23	Andrews Air Force Base, MD, Will Rogers Air National Guard Station, OK, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Randolph Air Force Base, TX	131
108	Air Force 41	Portland International Airport Air National Guard Station, OR	157
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277
188	Tech 24	Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	299

Tulsa International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
81	Air Force 8	Fort Smith Air National Guard Station, AR, and Luke AFB, AZ	115
89	Air Force 18	Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK	126
115	Air Force 50	Richmond Air National Guard Station, VA, Des Moines International Airport Air National Guard Station, IA	167

Vance Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148
128	E&T 14	Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training	187

Will Rogers World Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
92	Air Force 23	Andrews AFB, MD, Will Rogers Air National Guard Station, OK, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Randolph Air Force Base, TX	131

Oregon

Army National Guard Reserve Center Camp Withycombe

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
39	Army 80	RC Transformation, OR	56

Army National Guard Reserve Center Jackson Band Armory

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
39	Army 80	RC Transformation, OR	56

Army National Guard Reserve Center Lake Oswego

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
39	Army 80	RC Transformation, OR	56

Army National Guard Reserve Center Maison

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
39	Army 80	RC Transformation, OR	56

Navy Reserve Center Central Point

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Portland International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
108	Air Force 41	Portland International Airport Air National Guard Station, OR	157

Sears US Army Reserve Center, Portland

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
39	Army 80	RC Transformation, OR	56

Sharff US Army Reserve Center, Portland

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
39	Army 80	RC Transformation, OR	56

Umatilla Army Depot

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
160	Ind 14	Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR	239

Pennsylvania

Bristol US Army Reserve Center, Philadelphia

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
40	Army 82	RC Transformation, PA	57

Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271

Engineering Field Activity Northeast

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
72	DoN 28	Engineering Field Division/Activity	100

Human Resources Support Center Northeast

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205

Kelly Support Center

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
53	Army 109	USAR Command and Control Northeast	74

Letterkenny Army Depot

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
7	Army 16	Red River Army Depot, TX	14
57	DoN 6	Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA	81
150	Ind 4	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	229
153	Ind 7	Rock Island Arsenal, IL	232

Marine Corps Reserve Center Johnstown

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
68	DoN 21	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	95

Naval Air Station Willow Grove

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
68	DoN 21	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	95
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

Naval Support Activity Mechanicsburg

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272

Naval Support Activity Philadelphia

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205

Navy Crane Center Lester

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
72	DoN 28	Engineering Field Division/Activity	100

Navy Philadelphia Business Center

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
166	Ind 26	Naval Shipyard Detachments	250

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Lehigh

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Pittsburgh

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Reading

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

North Penn US Army Reserve Center, Norristown

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
40	Army 82	RC Transformation, PA	57

Pitt US Army Reserve Center, Coraopolis

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
53	Army 109	USAR Command and Control Northeast	74

Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148

Serrenti US Army Reserve Center, Scranton

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
40	Army 82	RC Transformation, PA	57

Tobyhanna Army Depot

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
7	Army 16	Red River Army Depot, TX	14
57	DoN 6	Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA	81
150	Ind 4	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	229
161	Ind 15	Lackland Air Force Base, TX	240
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277

US Army Reserve Center Bloomsburg

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
40	Army 82	RC Transformation, PA	57

US Army Reserve Center Lewisburg

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
40	Army 82	RC Transformation, PA	57

US Army Reserve Williamsport

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
40	Army 82	RC Transformation, PA	57

W. Reese US Army Reserve Center/OMS, Chester

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
40	Army 82	RC Transformation, PA	57

Puerto Rico

Army National Guard Reserve Center Humacao

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
41	Army 85	RC Transformation, PR	58

Aguadilla-Ramey US Army Reserve Center/BMA-126

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
41	Army 85	RC Transformation, PR	58

Camp Euripedes Rubio, Puerto Nuevo

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
41	Army 85	RC Transformation, PR	58

Fort Buchanan

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223

Lavergne US Army Reserve Center Bayamon

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
41	Army 85	RC Transformation, PR	58

Rhode Island

Bristol US Army Reserve Center

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
42	Army 87	RC Transformation, RI	60

Harwood US Army Reserve Center, Providence

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
42	Army 87	RC Transformation, RI	60

Naval Station Newport

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
61	DoN 12	Officer Training Command, Pensacola, FL	86
63	DoN 14	Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA	88
70	DoN 25	Naval Station Newport, RI	98
77	DoN 44	Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	105
124	E&T 9	Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education	183
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285

Quonset State Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
93	Air Force 24	Martin State Air National Guard Station, MD	133
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148

South Carolina

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Charleston

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Fort Jackson

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
50	Army 105	Single Drill Sergeant	71
55	Army 115	USAR Command and Control Southeast	77
124	E&T 9	Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education	183
144	H&SA 35	Create Joint Mobilization Sites	216

Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

McEntire Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
89	Air Force 18	Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK	126

Naval Weapons Station Charleston

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285

Shaw Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
2	Army 6	Fort Gillem, GA	6
3	Army 8	Fort McPherson, GA	8
79	Air Force 6	Eielson Air Force Base, AK, Moody Air Force Base, GA, and Shaw Air Force Base, SC	112
85	Air Force 14	Bradley International Airport Air National Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air National Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Air National Guard Station, MD	121
89	Air Force 18	Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Nellis Air Force Base, NV, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK	126
113	Air Force 47	Hill AFB, UT, Edwards AFB, CA, Mountain Home AFB, ID, Luke AFB, AZ, Nellis AFB, NV	165

South Naval Facilities Engineering Command

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
72	DoN 28	Engineering Field Division/Activity	100

South Dakota

Ellsworth Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
109	Air Force 43	Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD and Dyess Air Force Base, TX	159

Joe Foss Field Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
90	Air Force 20	Capital Air National Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air Guard Station, IN	128
100	Air Force 32	Cannon Air Force Base, NM	143
105	Air Force 38	Hector International Airport Air National Guard Station, ND	153

Tennessee

McGhee Tyson Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
78	Air Force 5	Birmingham International Airport Air National Guard Station, AL	111
82	Air Force 10	Beale Air Force Base, CA and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI	117
83	Air Force 11	March Air Force Base, CA	118
97	Air Force 28	Key Field Air National Guard Station, MS	139

Memphis International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
110	Air Force 44	Nashville International Airport Air National Guard Station, TN	161

Nashville International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
110	Air Force 44	Nashville International Airport Air National Guard Station, TN	161

Naval Support Activity Mid South

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
64	DoN 15	Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA	89
135	H&SA 17	Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center	203

US Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Facility Kingsport

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
43	Army 89	RC Transformation, TN	61

Texas

Army National Guard Reserve Center # 2 Dallas

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
44	Army 91	RC Transformation, TX	62

Army National Guard Reserve Center (Hondo Pass) El Paso

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
44	Army 91	RC Transformation, TX	62

Army National Guard Reserve Center California Crossing

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
44	Army 91	RC Transformation, TX	62

Army National Guard Reserve Center Ellington

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
44	Army 91	RC Transformation, TX	62

Army National Guard Reserve Center Marshall

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
44	Army 91	RC Transformation, TX	62

Army National Guard Reserve Center New Braunfels

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
44	Army 91	RC Transformation, TX	62

Brooks City Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
170	Med 6	Brooks City Base, TX	259

Carswell ARS, Naval Air Station Fort Worth

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
92	Air Force 23	Andrews AFB, MD, Will Rogers Air National Guard Station, OK, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Randolph Air Force Base, TX	131
113	Air Force 47	Hill AFB, UT, Edwards AFB, CA, Mountain Home AFB, ID, Luke AFB, AZ, Nellis AFB, NV	165

Corpus Christi Army Depot

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, San Antonio

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Dyess Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
109	Air Force 43	Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD and Dyess Air Force Base, TX	159

Ellington Field Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
111	Air Force 45	Ellington Air National Guard Station, TX	162

Fort Bliss

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
10	Army 22	Operational Army (IGPBS)	18
126	E&T 12	Net Fires Center	185

Fort Hood

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
6	Army 15	Fort Hood, TX	13
10	Army 22	Operational Army (IGPBS)	18

Fort Sam Houston

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
3	Army 8	Fort McPherson, GA	8
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223
169	Med 4	Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD	257
170	Med 6	Brooks City Base, TX	259
172	Med 10	San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX	262
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266

Lackland Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
90	Air Force 20	Capital Air National Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air National Guard Station, IN	128
101	Air Force 33	Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	145
107	Air Force 40	Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air National Guard Station, OH	156
112	Air Force 46	Lackland Air Force Base, TX	164
122	E&T 7	Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training	181
123	E&T 8	Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training	182
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208
147	H&SA 44	Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA)	222
161	Ind 15	Lackland Air Force Base, TX	240
170	Med 6	Brooks City Base, TX	259
172	Med 10	San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX	262
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
179	Tech 6	Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	282

Laughlin Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148

128	E&T 14	Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training	187

Leased Space TX

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
139	H&SA 26	Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional, and Hopewell Offices	209
141	H&SA 30	Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications	212

Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
162	Ind 16	Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant	241

Naval Air Station Corpus Christi

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
71	DoN 26	Naval Station Ingleside, TX, and Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX	99
75	DoN 35	Navy Regions	103

Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Ft. Worth

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
62	DoN 13	Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	87
64	DoN 15	Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA	89
77	DoN 44	Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	105
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
92	Air Force 23	Andrews AFB, MD, Will Rogers Air National Guard Station, OK, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Randolph Air Force Base, TX	131
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup) Naval Station Ingleside	243

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
71	DoN 26	Naval Station Ingleside, TX, and Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX	99

Navy Reserve Center Lubbock, TX

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Navy Reserve Center Orange, TX

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

Randolph Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
92	Air Force 23	Andrews Air Force Base, MD, Will Rogers Air National Guard Station, OK, Tinker Air Force Base, OK, Randolph Air Force Base, TX	131
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148
128	E&T 14	Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training	187
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
143	H&SA 33	Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force	214
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219
170	Med 6	Brooks City Base, TX	259

Red River Army Depot, TX

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
7	Army 16	Red River Army Depot, TX	14

Sheppard Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148
125	E&T 10	Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site	184
128	E&T 14	Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training	187
172	Med 10	San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX	262

US Army Reserve Center # 2 Houston

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
44	Army 91	RC Transformation, TX	62

US Army Reserve Center Lufkin

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
44	Army 91	RC Transformation, TX	62

Utah

Deseret Chemical Depot

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
163	Ind 17	Deseret Chemical Depot, UT	242

Fort Douglas

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
54	Army 112	USAR Command and Control Northwest	76

Hill Air Force Base

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
100	Air Force 32	Cannon Air Force Base, NM	143
113	Air Force 47	Hill AFB, UT, Edwards AFB, CA, Mountain Home AFB, ID, Luke AFB, AZ, Nellis AFB, NV	165
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277
185	Tech 18	Create an Air Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	293
188	Tech 24	Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development and Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	299

Tooele Army Depot

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
152	Ind 6	Sierra Army Depot, CA	231
158	Ind 12	Hawthorne Army Depot, NV	236

Vermont

Army National Guard Reserve Center Ludlow

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
45	Army 95	RC Transformation, VT	65

Army National Guard Reserve Center North Springfield

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
45	Army 95	RC Transformation, VT	65

Army National Guard Reserve Center Rutland

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
45	Army 95	RC Transformation, VT	65

Army National Guard Reserve Center Windsor

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
45	Army 95	RC Transformation, VT	65

Burlington International Airport Air National Guard Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
94	Air Force 25	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert-St. Louis International Airport Air National Guard Station, MO, Atlantic City Air National Guard Station, NJ	134

Courcelle Brothers US Army Reserve Center, Rutland

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
45	Army 95	RC Transformation, VT	65

US Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Facility #160, Rutland

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
45	Army 95	RC Transformation, VT	65

US Army Reserve Center Berlin

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
45	Army 95	RC Transformation, VT	65

US Army Reserve Center Chester

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
45	Army 95	RC Transformation, VT	65

Virginia

Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Lease, VA

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
136	H&SA 18	Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters	204

Arlington Service Center

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
140	H&SA 27	Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR	210
149	H&SA 49	Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations	225

Bailey's Crossroads Lease, VA

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
132	H&SA 10	Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations	197
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisitions	266
198	Add 8	Close or Realign Joint Medical Command HQs	226

Balston Lease, VA

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
132	H&SA 10	Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations	197
178	Tech 5	Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers	281

Center for Naval Research

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
178	Tech 5	Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers Crystal City Leases, VA	281

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
5	Army 11	Fort Monmouth, NJ	10
129	H&SA 3	Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations	191
132	H&SA 10	Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations	197
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223

Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Arlington

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217

Defense Supply Center Richmond

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277

Fort Belvoir

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
5	Army 11	Fort Monmouth, NJ	10
127	E&T 13	Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, Mo	186
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195
132	H&SA 10	Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations	197
133	H&SA 12	Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leases	199
134	H&SA 15	Co-locate Missile and Space Defense Agencies	201
141	H&SA 30	Consolidate Media Organizations into New Agency for Media/ Publications	212
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223
169	Med 4	Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD	257

174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biological, and Medical Research & Development and Acquisitions	266
176	S&S 7	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
178	Tech 5	Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers	281
185	Tech 18	Create an Air Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development and Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	293

Fort Eustis

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
3	Army 8	Fort McPherson, GA	8
8	Army 19	Fort Monroe, VA	16
120	E&T 5	Aviation Logistics School	179
121	E&T 6	Combat Service Support Center	180
142	H&SA 31	Consolidate Transportation Command Components	213
144	H&SA 35	Create Joint Mobilization Sites	216
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219
173	Med 12	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264

Fort Lee

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
121	E&T 6	Combat Service Support Center	180
122	E&T 7	Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training	181
123	E&T 8	Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training	182
133	H&SA 12	Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leases	199
139	H&SA 26	Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional, and Hopewell Offices	209

Fort Monroe

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
8	Army 19	Fort Monroe, VA	16

Headquarters Battalion, Headquarters Marine Corps, Henderson Hall

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
129	H&SA 3	Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations	191
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basin	219

Hoffman Lease, VA

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
132	H&SA 10	Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations	197
143	H&SA 33	Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force	214
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223

Langley Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
79	Air Force 6	Eielson Air Force Base, AK, Moody Air Force Base, GA, and Shaw Air Force Base, SC	112
80	Air Force 7	Kulis Air National Guard Station, AK, and Elmendorf AFB, AK	114
101	Air Force 33	Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	145
113	Air Force 47	Hill AFB, UT, Edwards AFB, CA, Mountain Home AFB, ID, Luke AFB, AZ, Nellis AFB, NV	165
114	Air Force 49	Langley Air Force Base, VA	166
118	Air Force 53	Air Force Logistics Support Centers	172

119	Air Force 55	F-100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities	173

Langley Research Center

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
187	Tech 22	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	297

Leased Space VA

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
129	H&SA 3	Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations	191
130	H&SA 5	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	193
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195
133	H&SA 12	Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leases	199
134	H&SA 15	Co-locate Missile and Space Defense Agencies	201
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
139	H&SA 26	Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional, and Hopewell Offices	209
140	H&SA 27	Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency & Establish Joint C4ISR	210
141	H&SA 30	Consolidate Media Organizations into New Agency for Media/Publications	212
142	H&SA 31	Consolidate Transportation Command Components	213
149	H&SA 49	Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations	225
168	Int 4	National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency	254
178	Tech 5	Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers	281

Marine Corps Base Quantico

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
131	H&SA 8	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Corrections Facilities	208

Naval Air Station Oceana

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
125	E&T 10	Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site	184
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
193	Add 3	Close or Further Realign Master Jet Base Oceana, VA	108

Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285

Naval Medical Center Portsmouth

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
172	Med 10	San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX	262

Naval Shipyard Norfolk

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
69	DoN 23	Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME	97

72	DoN 28	Engineering Field Division/Activity	100
164	Ind 18	Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA	243
166	Ind 26	Naval Shipyard Detachments	250

Naval Station Norfolk

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
60	DoN 10	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
70	DoN 25	Naval Station Newport, RI	98
71	DoN 26	Naval Station Ingleside, TX, and Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX	99
72	DoN 28	Engineering Field Division/Activity	100
77	DoN 44	Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	105
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208
139	H&SA 26	Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional, and Hopewell Offices	209
142	H&SA 31	Consolidate Transportation Command Components	213
145	H&SA 37	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217
164	Ind 18	Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA	243
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition Test & Evaluation	285

Naval Support Activity Norfolk

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
64	DoN 15	Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA	89
72	DoN 28	Engineering Field Division/Activity	100
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208

Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
174	Med 15	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biological, & Medical Research & Development and Acquisitions	266
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285
184	Tech 15	Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	290
186	Tech 19	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition	294

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
181	Tech 9	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	285
184	Tech 15	Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	290

Richmond International Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	PAGE #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
115	Air Force 50	Richmond Air National Guard Station, VA, Des Moines International Airport Air National Guard Station, IA	167

Rosslyn Lease, VA

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
132	H&SA 10	Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations	197
148	H&SA 46	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223

US Marine Corps Direct Reporting Program Manager Advanced Amphibious Assault

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
180	Tech 7	Consolidate Ground Vehicle Development & Acquisition in a Joint Center	284

Washington

1LT Richard H. Walker US Army Reserve Center

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
46	Army 97	RC Transformation, WA	66

Army National Guard Reserve Center Everett

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
46	Army 97	RC Transformation, WA	66

Fairchild Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
116	Air Force 51	Fairchild Air Force Base, WA	169

Fort Lewis

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
54	Army 112	USAR Command and Control Northwest	76
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Corrections Facilities	208
171	Med 9	McChord Air Force Base, WA	261

Human Resources Support Center Northwest

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
137	H&SA 19	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205

McChord Air Force Base

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
108	Air Force 41	Portland International Airport Air National Guard Station, OR	157
146	H&SA 41	Joint Basing	219
171	Med 9	McChord Air Force Base, WA	261

Naval Air Station Whidbey Island

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
165	Ind 19	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243

Naval Station Bremerton

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
69	DoN 23	Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME	97
166	Ind 26	Naval Shipyard Detachments	250
175	S&S 5	Commodity Management Privatization	271
177	S&S 13	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Tacoma

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
76	DoN 37	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104

US Army Reserve Center Fort Lawton

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
54	Army 112	USAR Command and Control Northwest	76

Submarine Base Bangor

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
138	H&SA 22	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208

Vancouver Barracks

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
54	Army 112	USAR Command and Control Northwest	76

West Virginia

MAJ Elbert Bias US Army Reserve Center, Huntington

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
47	Army 99	RC Transformation, WV	67

Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport Sheppard Air National Guard Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148

Fairmont US Army National Guard Reserve Center

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
47	Army 99	RC Transformation, WV	67

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Moundsville

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Yeager Airport Air National Guard Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
103	Air Force 35	Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, Yeager Air National Guard Station, WV	148

Wisconsin

Armed Forces Reserve Center Madison

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Dane County Airport

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
90	Air Force 20	Capital Air National Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport Air National Guard Station, IN	128
100	Air Force 32	Cannon Air Force Base, NM	143

General Mitchell International Airport Air Reserve Station

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
97	Air Force 28	Key Field Air National Guard Station, MS	139
117	Air Force 52	General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	170

Fort McCoy

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
9	Army 20	Maneuver Training	17
54	Army 112	USAR Command and Control Northwest	76

Navy Reserve Center La Crosse

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup	101

Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center Madison

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
73	DoN 29	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101

Olson US Army Reserve Center, Madison

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
48	Army 102	RC Transformation, WI	69

US Army Reserve Center O'Connell

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
48	Army 102	RC Transformation, WI	69

Wyoming

Army Aviation Support Facility Cheyenne

Commission Item #	DOD's Item #	Recommendation	Final Report Page #
49	Army 103	RC Transformation, WY	70

Army National Guard Reserve Center Thermopolis

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
49	Army 103	RC Transformation, WY	70

Cheyenne Airport Air National Guard Station

COMMISSION ITEM #	DOD'S ITEM #	RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
88	Air Force 17	Boise Air Terminal Air National Guard Station, ID	125

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

INDEX BY RECOMMENDATION

NUMERICAL LIST OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS AND PAGE NUMBERS

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION NUMBER	TITLE OF RECOMMENDATION	FINAL REPORT PAGE #
1	Fort Wainwright, AK	5
2	Fort Gillem, GA	6
3	Fort McPherson, GA	8
4	Fort Bragg, NC	9
5	Fort Monmouth, NJ	10
6	Fort Hood, TX	13
7	Red River Army Depot	14
8	Fort Monroe, VA	16
9	Maneuver Training	17
10	Operational Army (IGPBS)	18
11	RC Transformation, AL	20
12	RC Transformation, AZ	22
13	RC Transformation, AR	23
14	RC Transformation, CA	25
15	RC Transformation, CT	26
16	Arc Transformation, DE	27
17	RC Transformation, GA	29
18	RC Transformation, HI	30
19	RC Transformation, IL	31
20	RC Transformation, IN	32
21	RC Transformation, IA	33
22	RC Transformation, KY	35
23	RC Transformation, LA	36
24	RC Transformation, MD	37
25	RC Transformation, MA	38
26	RC Transformation, MI	40
27	RC Transformation, MN	41

Commission Recommendation Number	Title of Recommendation	Final Report Page #
28	RC Transformation, MO	42
29	RC Transformation, MT	43
30	RC Transformation, NE	44
31	RC Transformation, NH	46
32	RC Transformation, NJ	47
33	RC Transformation, NM	48
34	RC Transformation, NY	49
35	RC Transformation, NC	50
36	RC Transformation, ND	51
37	RC Transformation, OH	52
38	RC Transformation, OK	54
39	RC Transformation, OR	56
40	RC Transformation, PA	57
41	RC Transformation, PR	58
42	RC Transformation, RI	60
43	RC Transformation, TN	61
44	RC Transformation, TX	62
45	RC Transformation, VT	65
46	RC Transformation, WA	66
47	RC Transformation, WV	67
48	RC Transformation, WI	69
49	RC Transformation, WY	70
50	Single Drill Sergeant	71
51	US Army Garrison, MI	72
52	USAR Command and Control New England	73
53	USAR Command and Control Northeast	74
54	USAR Command and Control Northwest	76
55	USAR Command and Control Southeast	77
56	USAR Command and Control Southwest	78
57	Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA	81
58	Naval Support Activity Corona, CA	82
59	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, CA	83
60	Submarine Base New London, CT	84
61	Officer Training Command, Pensacola, FL	86

Commission Recommendation Number	Title of Recommendation	Final Report Page #
62	Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA	87
63	Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA	88
64	Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA	89
65	Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	91
66	Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO	92
67	Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	94
68	Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA	95
69	Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME	97
70	Naval Station Newport, RI	98
71	Naval Station Ingleside, TX, and Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX	99
72	Engineering Field Division/Activity	100
73	Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers (Rollup)	101
74	Navy Recruiting Districts	103
75	Navy Regions	103
76	Navy Reserve Centers (Rollup)	104
77	Navy Reserve Readiness Commands	105
78	Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station, AL	111
79	Eielson Air Force Base, AK; Moody Air Force Base, GA; and Shaw AFB, SC	112
80	Kulis Air Guard Station, AK, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK	114
81	Fort Smith Air Guard Station, AR, and Luke Air Force Base, AZ	115
82	Beale Air Force Base, CA, and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI	117
83	March Air Reserve Base, CA	118
84	Onizuka Air Force Station, CA	120
85	Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT; Barnes Air Guard Station, MA; Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI; Shaw Air Force Base, SC; and Martin State Air Guard Station, MD	121
86	New Castle Airport Air Guard Station, DE	122
87	Robins Air Force Base, GA	124
88	Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID	125
89	Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID; Nellis Air Force Base, NV; and Elmendorf AFB, AK	126
90	Capital Air Guard Station, IL, and Hulman Regional Airport AGS, IN	128
91	New Orleans Air Reserve Station, LA	130
92	Andrews Air Force Base, MD; Will Rogers Air Guard Station, OK; Tinker Air Force Base, OK; and Randolph Air Force Base, TX	131

Commission Recommendation Number	Title of Recommendation	Final Report Page #
93	Martin State Air Guard Station, MD	133
94	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA–Lambert St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO; and Atlantic City Air Guard Station, NJ	134
95	W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, MI	137
96	Duluth International Airport Air Guard Station, MN	138
97	Key Field Air Guard Station, MS	139
98	Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT	141
99	Reno-Tahoe International Airport Air Guard Station, NV	142
100	Cannon Air Force Base, NM	143
101	Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station, NY	145
102	Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY	147
103	Pope Air Force Base, NC; Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA; Yeager Air Guard Station, WV	148
104	Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND	151
105	Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND	153
106	Mansfield-Lahm Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH	154
107	Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH	156
108	Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR	157
109	Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD, and Dyess Air Force Base, TX	159
110	Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, TN	161
111	Ellington Air Guard Station, TX	162
112	Lackland Air Force Base, TX	164
113	Hill Air Force Base, UT; Edwards Air Force Base, CA; Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID; Luke Air Force Base, AZ; and Nellis Air Force Base, NV	165
114	Langley Air Force Base, VA	166
115	Richmond Air Guard Station, VA, and Des Moines International Airport AGS, IA	167
116	Fairchild Air Force Base, WA	169
117	General Mitchell Air Reserve Station, WI	170
118	Air Force Logistics Support Centers	172
119	F-100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities	173
120	Aviation Logistics School	179
121	Combat Service Support Center	180
122	Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training	181
123	Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training	182
124	Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education	183

Commission Recommendation Number	Title of Recommendation	Final Report Page #
125	Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site	184
126	Net Fires Center	185
127	Prime Power to Fort Leonard Wood, MO	186
128	Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training	187
129	Co-locate Miscellaneous Air Force Leased Locations and National Guard Headquarters Leased Locations	191
130	Co-locate Defense Military Department Adjudication Activities	193
131	Co-locate Military Department Investigation Agencies with DoD Counterintelligence and Security Agency	195
132	Co-locate Miscellaneous Army Leased Locations	197
133	Co-locate Miscellaneous OSD, Defense Agency, and Field Activity Leased Locations	199
134	Co-locate Missile and Space Defense Agencies	201
135	Co-locate Navy Education and Training Command and Navy Education and Training Professional Development & Technology Center	203
136	Consolidate Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters	204
137	Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices within each Military Department and the Defense Agencies	205
138	Consolidate Correctional Facilities into Joint Regional Correctional Facilities	208
139	Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, Midwestern Regional, and Hopewell Offices	209
140	Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR Capability	210
141	Consolidate Media Organizations into a New Agency for Media and Publications	212
142	Consolidate Transportation Command Components	213
143	Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force	214
144	Create Joint Mobilization Sites	216
145	Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217
146	Joint Basing	219
147	Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency	222
148	Relocate Army Headquarters and Field Operating Agencies	223
149	Relocate Miscellaneous Department of the Navy Leased Locations	225
150	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA	229
151	Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA	230
152	Sierra Army Depot, CA	231
153	Rock Island Arsenal, IL	232
154	Newport Chemical Depot, IN	233

Commission Recommendation Number	Title of Recommendation	Final Report Page #
155	Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS	234
156	Lima Tank Plant, OH	235
157	Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS	236
158	Hawthorne Army Depot, NV	236
159	Watervliet Arsenal, NY	238
160	Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR	239
161	Lackland Air Force Base, TX	240
162	Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX	241
163	Deseret Chemical Depot, UT	242
164	Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA	243
165	Fleet Readiness Centers (Rollup)	243
166	Naval Shipyard Detachments	250
167	Defense Intelligence Agency	253
168	National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency	254
169	Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD	257
170	Brooks City Base, TX	259
171	McChord Air Force Base, WA	261
172	San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX	262
173	Convert Inpatient Services to Clinics	264
174	Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biologist, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisition	266
175	Commodity Management Privatization	271
176	Depot-Level Repairable Procurement Management Consolidation	272
177	Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration	277
178	Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers	281
179	Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	282
180	Consolidate Ground Vehicle Development & Acquisition in a Joint Center	284
181	Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, T&E	285
182	Consolidate Navy Strategic Test and Evaluation	288
183	Consolidate Sea Vehicle Development & Acquisition	289
184	Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development and Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	290
185	Create an Air Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development and Acquisition, Test & Evaluation Center	293

Commission Recommendation Number	Title of Recommendation	Final Report Page #
186	Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition	294
187	Defense Research Service-Led Laboratories	297
188	Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development and Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	299
189	Establish Centers for Rotary Wing Air Platform Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	301
190	Navy Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development and Acquisition, Test & Evaluation	302
191	Close or Further Realign Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME	91
192	Close or Realign Broadway Complex San Diego, CA	107
193	Close or Further Realign Master Jet Base Oceana, VA	108
195	Close or Further Realign Galena Airport FOL, AK	174
196	Close or Realign Defense Finance and Accounting Service	217
197	Close or Realign Professional Development Education	188
198	Close or Realign Joint Medical Command HQs	226

O

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)