



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Closing military facilities is a difficult and painful process. Every installation recommended for closure or realignment has enjoyed a proud history and has offered a priceless service to our nation. At the same time, these installations have become an integral part of their local communities, and in turn, have received strong support from the local citizenry. Rightfully, these citizens are concerned about the effect of base closures on the economic livelihood of their communities.

The undeniable fact remains, however, that U.S. military requirements have been fundamentally altered. The end of the Cold War, combined with the growing urgency to reduce the Federal budget deficit, compels the United States to reduce and realign its military forces. To reduce the number of military installations in the United States, and to ensure the impartiality of the decision-making process, Congress enacted the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510, as amended).

Signed by President George Bush on November 5, 1990, this Act established the independent Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (DBCRC). The Commission was established "to provide a fair process that will result in the timely closure and realignment of military installations inside the United States." Authorized to meet only during calendar years 1991, 1993, and 1995, the Commission's authority expires on December 31, 1995. (See Appendix F).

Because this is the third and final round under Public Law 101-510, the 1995 Commission is proud to have the opportunity to bring this pro-

cess to a successful and prudent conclusion and to make suggestions regarding the future. The Commission has taken the approach that the base closure process should not be simply a budget cutting exercise. Base closures must be undertaken to reduce our nation's defense infrastructure in a deliberate way that will improve long-term military readiness and ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent in the most efficient way possible. The Commission's challenge was to develop a list of base closures and realignments that allows the Defense Department to maintain readiness, modernize our military, and preserve the force levels needed to maintain our security. The Commission believes that it has met this challenge.

In compliance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Secretary of Defense submitted a list of proposed military base closures and realignments to the Commission on February 28, 1995. The Secretary's 1995 recommended actions affected 146 domestic military installations, including 33 major closures, 26 major realignments, and an additional 27 changes to prior base closure round decisions, or "redirects." (See Appendix I). The statute also 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. For the 1995 Commission process, the Secretary of Defense announced that the selection criteria would be identical to those used during the 1991 and 1993 base closure rounds.

---

---

## 1995 DoD Force-Structure Plan

	FY1994	FY1997	FY1999
Army Divisions			
Active	13	10	10
Reserve	8	8	8
Marine Corps Divisions			
Active	3	3	3
Reserve	1	1	1
Aircraft Carriers	12	11	11
Reserve Carriers	-	1	1
Carrier Airwings			
Active	11	10	10
Reserve	2	1	1
Battle Force Ships	387	363	344
Air Force Fighters			
Active	978	936	936
Reserve	795	504	504
Air Force Bombers			
Active	139	104	103
Reserve	12	22	26
<b>DoD Personnel (End strength in thousands)</b>			
Active Duty			
Army	543	495	495
Navy	468	408	394
Marine Corps	174	174	174
Air Force	426	385	382
TOTAL	1,611	1,462	1,445
Reserves and			
National Guard	997	904	893
Civilians	913	799	759

## 1995 DoD Selection Criteria

### *Military Value*

1. The current and future mission requirements and the impact on operational readiness of the Department of Defense's total force.
2. The availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace at both existing and potential receiving locations.
3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations.
4. The cost and manpower implications.

### *Return on Investment*

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.

### *Impacts*

6. The economic impact on communities.
7. The ability of both the existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions and personnel.
8. The environmental impact.

Upon receipt of the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, the Commission is required to hold public hearings on the recommendations before making any findings. To change any of the Secretary's recommendations, Public Law 101-510 requires the Commission to find substantial deviation from the Secretary's force-structure plan and the final criteria approved by Congress.

Like previous DBCRC rounds, the 1995 Commission's process was a model of open government. Its recommendations resulted from an independent review of the Secretary of Defense's recommendations, without political or partisan influence. As part of its review and analysis process, the Commission solicited information from a wide variety of sources. Most importantly, communities affected by the recommendations played a major role in the Commission's process. Every major site proposed for closure or realignment was visited by at least one commissioner. These visits enabled the commissioners to gain a first-hand look at the installations. Commissioners also heard from members of the public about the effect that closures would have on local communities. 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. All meetings were open to the public. All data received by the Commission, as well as all transcripts of Commission hearings, were available for public review. Throughout the process, the Commission staff members maintained an active and ongoing dialogue with communities, and met with community representatives at the Commission offices, during base visits, and during regional hearings.

At the Commission's investigative hearings, Commissioners questioned senior military and civilian officials of the Defense Department directly responsible for the Secretary's recommendations. Defense and base closure experts within the Federal government, private sector, and academia provided an independent assessment of the base closure process and the potential impacts of the Secretary of Defense's recommendations. Public Law 101-510, as amended, also requires the General Accounting Office (GAO) to evaluate DOD's selection process and recommendations, and provide the Commission and Congress a report containing their detailed analysis of the process by

April 15, 1995. GAO testified before the Commission on April 17, 1995, presenting its findings and recommendations. All of the Commission's hearings and deliberations were held in public. Many were broadcast on national television (see Appendices O and P).

Based on military installation visits, hearings, and its review and analysis, the Commission voted to consider alternatives and additions to the Secretary's list. On March 7, 1995, and again on May 10, 1995, the Commission voted to consider a total of 32 installations as possible alternatives and additions to the 146 bases recommended for closure or realignment by the Secretary of Defense (see Appendix I).

Communities that contributed to our country's national security by hosting a military facility for many years should rest assured their concerns were heard, carefully reviewed, and analyzed. The Commission would also like to reassure communities there can be life after a base is closed. Economic recovery is, however, in large part dependent upon a concerted community effort to look towards the future. The same dedicated effort expended by communities over the last several months to save their bases should be redirected towards building and implementing a reuse plan that will revitalize the community and the local economy.

The Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) was established to help communities affected by base closures, as well as other defense program changes. The OEA's principal objective is to help the communities affected by base closures to maintain or restore economic stability. According to an OEA survey, approximately 158,000 new jobs were created between 1961 and 1992 to replace nearly 93,000 jobs lost as a result of base closures. The OEA has also been working with 47 communities located near bases recommended for closure by the 1988 and 1991 Commissions, and has provided \$20 million in grants to help communities develop reuse plans.

As part of the 1995 Commission's interest in post-closure activities, the Commission also reviewed and developed recommendations on how to improve the Federal government's performance in the area of conversion and reuse of military installations. The 1988, 1991, and 1993 base closure rounds have resulted in more than 70 major, and almost 200 smaller, base closings. The Federal

government has an obligation to assist local communities in the challenge of replacing the base in the local economy. The Commission held two hearings in which local elected officials, private sector groups, and officials from the Federal government presented testimony on post-closure activities of the Federal government, and includes its findings and recommendations in chapter 2 of this report.

The commissioners selected for the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission have diverse backgrounds in public service, business, and the military (see Appendix Q). In accordance with Public Law 101-510, as amended, two commissioners were nominated in consultation with the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, two in consultation with the U.S. Senate Majority Leader, and one commissioner with the advice of each of the Minority Leaders of the House and Senate. The remaining two nominations were made independently by the President, who also designated one of the eight commissioners to serve as the Chairman.

The Commission staff included experts detailed from several government agencies, including the Department of Commerce, the Environmental Pro-

tection Agency, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the General Accounting Office, as well as the Department of Defense (see Appendix R). Ten professional staff members were detailed by the General Accounting Office to serve full-time on the Commission's Review and Analysis staff. All detailees fully participated in all phases of the review and analysis effort; they verified data, visited candidate bases, participated in local hearings, and testified before the Commission at its public deliberative hearings.

### *Costs and Savings of the Commission's Recommendations*

After thorough review and analysis, the Commission recommends the closure or realignment of 132 military installations in the United States. This total includes 123 of the 146 closure or realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, and 9 of the 36 military installations identified by the Commission as candidates for consideration during its deliberations.

The Commission estimates that the closure or realignment of these 132 military installations will

### **1995 Closure & Recommendations (\$ in Millions)**

	<b>1-Time Cost</b>	<b>Annual Savings</b>	<b>20-Year Savings</b>
<b>DoD Submission (28 February 1995)</b>	3,743	1,768	21,026
<b>DoD Revised Baseline*</b>	3,521	1,569	18,994
<b>Final Commission Results</b>	3,561	1,606	19,317
<b>Change from DoD Revised Baseline</b>	+40	+37	+323

\*Reflects revisions in costs and savings estimates submitted to the Commission by the Defense Department, as well as the removal of the following installations from the list as requested by the Secretary of Defense: Kirtland Air Force Base, NM; Dugway Proving Ground, UT; Caven Point Reserve Center, NJ; and Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity, WV.

require one-time, upfront costs of \$3.6 billion, and will result in annual savings of \$1.6 billion once implemented. Over the next 20 years, the total savings will be approximately \$19.3 billion.

The preceding table summarizes the costs and savings estimates of the recommendations submitted to the Commission by the Secretary of Defense on February 28; the costs and savings of these estimates as revised by the military services as a result of site surveys taken after the submission of the original recommendations, as well as the removal of certain installations from the original list by the Secretary of Defense; and the costs and savings estimates of the Commission proposals contained in this report.

While the Commission believes that the one-time costs of implementing its recommendations will exceed the Defense Department's revised estimates by \$40 million, the annual savings and 20-year savings from the Commission's recommendations will exceed the Defense Department's revised estimates by \$37 million and \$323 million, respectively. These 1995 recommendations represent the first time that the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission has recommended savings greater than those proposed by the Secretary of Defense.

The following list summarizes the closure and realignment recommendations of the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

## 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Recommendations

### *Part I: Major Base Closures*

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Fort McClellan, AL  
Fort Chaffee, AR  
Oakland Army Base, CA  
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, CO  
Savanna Army Depot Activity, IL  
Fort Ritchie, MD  
Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, NJ  
Seneca Army Depot, NY  
Fort Indiantown Gap, PA  
Fort Pickett, VA

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Naval Air Facility, Adak, AK  
Long Beach Naval Shipyard, CA  
Ship Repair Facility, GU  
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis, IN  
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division Detachment, Louisville, KY  
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division Detachment, White Oak, MD  
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, MA  
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Warminster, PA

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

McClellan Air Force Base, CA  
Ontario International Airport Air Guard Station, CA  
Chicago O'Hare International Airport Air Reserve Station, IL  
Roslyn Air Guard Station, NY  
Bergstrom Air Reserve Base, TX  
Reese Air Force Base, TX

#### DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Distribution Depot McClellan, CA  
Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, TN  
Defense Distribution Depot San Antonio, TX  
Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, UT

### *Part II: Major Base Realignments*

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Fort Greely, AK  
Fort Hunter Liggett, CA  
Sierra Army Depot, CA  
Fort Meade, MD  
Detroit Arsenal, MI  
Fort Dix, NJ  
Charles E. Kelly Support Center, PA  
Letterkenny Army Depot, PA  
Fort Buchanan, PR  
Red River Army Depot, TX  
Fort Lee, VA  
Department of the Navy  
Naval Air Station, Key West, FL  
Naval Activities, GU  
Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, TX  
Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Keyport, WA

## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Onizuka Air Station, CA  
Eglin Air Force Base, FL  
Malmstrom Air Force Base, MT  
Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND  
Kelly Air Force Base, TX  
Hill Air Force Base, UT (Utah Test and Training Range)

### *Part III: Smaller Base or Activity Closures, Realignments, Disestablishments or Relocations*

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, CA  
East Fort Baker, CA  
Rio Vista Army Reserve Center, CA  
Stratford Army Engine Plant, CT  
Big Coppett Key, FL  
Concepts Analysis Agency, MD  
Fort Holabird, MD  
Publications Distribution Center Baltimore, MD  
Hingham Cohasset, MA  
Sudbury Training Annex, MA  
Aviation-Troop Command (ATCOM), MO  
Fort Missoula, MT  
Camp Kilmer, NJ  
Camp Pedricktown, NJ  
Bellmore Logistics Activity, NY  
Fort Totten, NY  
Recreation Center #2, Fayetteville, NC  
Information Systems Software Center (ISSC), VA  
Camp Bonneville, WA

## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Oakland, CA  
Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering West Coast Division, San Diego, CA  
Naval Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, CA  
Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN, Long Beach, CA  
Naval Undersea Warfare Center-Newport Division, New London Detachment, New London, CT  
Naval Research Laboratory, Underwater Sound Reference Detachment, Orlando, FL  
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, GU  
Public Works Center, GU  
Naval Biodynamics Laboratory, New Orleans, LA  
Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, MD  
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Detachment, Annapolis, MD

Naval Aviation Engineering Support Unit, Philadelphia, PA  
Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, PA  
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Open Water Test Facility, Oreland, PA  
Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, RDT&E Division Detachment, Warminster, PA  
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Charleston, SC  
Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering East Coast Detachment, Norfolk, VA  
Naval Information Systems Management Center, Arlington, VA  
Naval Management Systems Support Office, Chesapeake, VA

## Navy/Marine Reserve Activities

Naval Reserve Centers at:  
Huntsville, AL  
Stockton, CA  
Santa Ana, Irvine, CA  
Pomona, CA  
Cadillac, MI  
Staten Island, NY  
Laredo, TX  
Sheboygan, WI

Naval Air Reserve Center at:  
Olathe, KS

Naval Reserve Readiness Commands at:  
New Orleans, LA (Region 10)  
Charleston, SC (Region 7)

## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor Activity, Buffalo, NY

## DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Contract Management District South, Marietta, GA  
Defense Contract Management Command International, Dayton, OH  
Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, OH  
Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny, PA  
Defense Industrial Supply Center Philadelphia, PA

## DEFENSE INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE

Investigations Control and Automation Directorate, Fort Holabird, MD

***Part IV: Changes to Previously Approved  
BRAC Recommendations***

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**

Tri-Service Project Reliance, Army Bio-Medical  
Research Laboratory, Fort Detrick, MD

**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, CA  
Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, CA  
Naval Air Station Alameda, CA  
Naval Recruiting District, San Diego, CA  
Naval Training Center, San Diego, CA  
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, FL  
Naval Aviation Depot, Pensacola, FL  
Navy Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center,  
Naval Training Center, Orlando, FL  
Naval Training Center, Orlando, FL  
Naval Air Station Agana, GU  
Naval Air Station Barbers Point, HI  
Naval Air Facility Detroit, MI  
Naval Shipyard, Norfolk Detachment,  
Philadelphia, PA  
Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington, VA  
Office of Naval Research, Arlington, VA  
Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command,  
Arlington, VA  
Naval Recruiting Command, Washington, DC  
Naval Security Group Command Detachment  
Potomac, Washington, DC

**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE**

Williams Air Force Base, AZ  
Lowry Air Force Base, CO  
Homestead Air Force Base, FL (301st Rescue  
Squadron)  
Homestead Air Force Base, FL (726th Air Control  
Squadron)  
MacDill Air Force Base, FL  
Griffiss Air Force Base, NY (Airfield Support for  
10th Infantry Division [Light])  
Griffiss Air Force Base, NY (485th Engineering  
Installation Group)

**DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY**

Defense Contract Management District West,  
El Segundo, CA

***Part V: DoD Recommendations Rejected  
by the Commission***

**PROPOSED CLOSURES REJECTED  
BY THE COMMISSION**

Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, CA  
Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA  
North Highlands Air Guard Station, CA  
Price Support Center, IL  
Selfridge Army Garrison, MI  
Naval Air Station Meridian, MS  
Naval Technical Training Center Meridian, MS  
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division,  
Lakehurst, NJ  
Rome Laboratory, Rome, NY  
Springfield-Beckley MAP Air Guard Station, OH  
Greater Pittsburgh IAP Air Reserve Station, PA  
Air Force Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator  
Activity, Fort Worth, TX  
Brooks Air Force Base, TX  
Defense Distribution Depot Red River, TX

**PROPOSED REALIGNMENTS REJECTED  
BY THE COMMISSION**

Robins Air Force Base, GA  
Fort Hamilton, NY  
Tinker Air Force Base, OK  
Hill Air Force Base, UT

**PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS REJECTED BY  
THE COMMISSION AT THE REQUEST OF THE  
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE**

Caven Point Reserve Center, NJ  
Kirtland Air Force Base, NM  
Dugway Proving Ground, UT  
Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity  
(AMSA), WV