

Appendix E

History of Base Closures

Background

In the early 1960s, President Kennedy directed Secretary of Defense McNamara to develop and implement an extensive base realignment and closure program to reduce the Department's base structure developed during World War II and the Korean conflict. Hundreds of bases were closed and realigned during this period. More than 60 major bases were closed, making it the largest base closure in U.S. history. Criteria governing selection of bases for closure were established primarily within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, with minimal consultation with the Military Departments or Congress.

Congress did not anticipate the broad extent of these actions. The cumulative political and economic impact was substantial and, with few exceptions, the closures were viewed negatively by Congress.

Legislative History of Section 2687

In 1965, Congress passed legislation setting up reporting requirements designed to involve itself in any DoD base closure program. The legislation was vetoed by President Johnson and the confrontation between the Executive and Legislative branches of government grew. Despite this situation, the DoD completed base realignments and closures routinely throughout the 1960s.

In the early 1970s, DoD found it increasingly difficult to realign or close installations because Congress regulated the base closure process and limited or denied base closure funding. In 1976, the Military Construction Authorization Bill contained a provision prohibiting any base closure or reduction of more than 250 civilian employees until DoD had notified Congress of the proposed actions, assessed the personnel and economic impacts, followed the analysis provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and waited nine months. This bill was vetoed by President Ford and a Congressional veto override effort failed.

In 1977, however, President Carter approved legislation requiring DoD to notify Congress when a base is a candidate for reduction or closure; prepare reports on the strategic, environmental and local economic consequences of such actions; and wait 60 days for Congress' response. The legislation was codified as Section 2687, Title 10, U.S. Code (see Appendix B). Section 2687, coupled with the requirements of NEPA, effectively brought base closures to a halt, in part because the required studies took one to two years to complete.

The Next Decade

Throughout the next decade, after passage of Section 2687, all attempts to close major installations failed. Department proposals to initiate studies were thwarted by Congressional opposition, occasionally in specific prohibitions of funding authority to close or even study the closure of specific installations.

The President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control (The Grace Commission) included in its 1983 report a finding that economies could be made in the base structure. It recommended that a non-partisan, independent commission be established to study the issue and submit a list of closures. Nothing came of these early efforts. Finally, at the end of the second Reagan term, the Administration recognized a window in which to address this political stalemate.

The 1988 Base Closure Commission

In 1988, Secretary of Defense Carlucci recognized the need to close excess bases and the political possibility of gaining Congressional support. By that time, even though the Cold War had no signs of ending, the defense budget had already been declining for three straight years from the 1985 peak, and it was predicted to decline further.

On May 3, 1988, Secretary Carlucci chartered the Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure to recommend military bases within the United States for realignment and closure. Legislation that was subsequently enacted (Public Law 100-526) provided a statutory basis for this one-time approach and also provided relief from certain statutory impediments to the completion of base closures. These included a partial waiver of NEPA requirements; a delegation of property disposal authority to the DoD, and an expedited process of Congressional review of BRAC recommendations.

Enactment of this legislation constituted recognition between the Legislative and the Executive Branches that improvement in the military basing structure could be a means of realizing savings in the defense budget, while not impairing the ability of the armed forces to carry out their missions. It was also a compact which carefully balanced the prerogatives of the two branches of government.

The 1988 Commission's Recommendations

The 1988 Base Closure Commission issued its report in December of that year. It recommended closing 86 military installations and realigning 13 others. An additional 46

installations were designated for increases because units and activities were relocated as a result of the recommended closures and realignments. A recap of the major 1988 base closures and realignments is at Table 1 of this Appendix.

The 1988 Commission was required to base its recommendations on the force structure anticipated in 1988, which was essentially a stable, Cold War force. Even so, it recommended closing about three percent of the domestic base structure.

Implementing the 1988 Commission's Recommendations

Secretary Carlucci was required by Public Law 100-526 to accept or reject the 1988 Commission's recommendations in their entirety. In January of 1989, he accepted all of the recommendations. The law provided Congress with the same opportunity and by May of 1989, the Congressional review period expired without the enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval. The Commission's 1988 recommendations have the force of law.

DoD's planning, budgeting and implementation of the 1988 recommendations are on track. The closures and realignments were required to begin by January of 1990 and must be completed by October of 1995. As of February 1995, 14 of the 16 major installations have been closed or reduced to a caretaker status pending property disposal.

The January 1990 List of Candidates

By the end of 1989, as DoD was preparing to send its revised FY 1991 Budget to the Congress, the world political landscape began changing dramatically. The Berlin Wall had fallen, the Warsaw Pact was weakening, democracy was spreading throughout the region, and U.S.-Soviet relations were improving.

It became clear that DoD's force structure and budget would decline over the next several years, in response to reduced tensions and threats. While the long-term force structure requirements of the post-Cold War were not yet known, base closures and realignments became part of each Military Department's budget strategy for balancing their base structure with their declining force structure.

Since it would take one to two years to complete the required base closure and environmental impact studies under the old Section 2687 procedures, then-Secretary of Defense Cheney decided to get started. DoD could only have some studies completed in time to submit a final list of closures and realignments to Congress with DoD's FY 1992/1993 budget in January of 1991, if it announced a list of candidates for closure or realignment in January of 1990, and began the required one to two year study process.

Public Law 101-510

Most of the January 1990 studies were never completed. In November of 1990 Congress passed and the President signed Public Law 101-510 (see Appendix A). The law required DoD to begin its review of the base structure anew, without regard for the January 1990 list of candidates except when the study was below the numerical thresholds established by Public Law 101-510. Working from the 1988 BRAC experience and lessons learned, the new law authorized independent Presidential BRAC Commissions in 1991, 1993 and 1995 to review the Secretary of Defense's recommendations for base closures and realignments in those years. The law also established initial direction to follow as DoD began implementing closures and realignments.

The 1991 Base Closure Process

The first of the three Commissions to operate under the new law received Secretary of Defense Cheney's recommendations for base closures and realignments on April 12, 1991. Those recommendations were based on approved final selection criteria and a six year force structure plan as required by law. By April of 1991, the Warsaw Pact had disintegrated and DoD was planning on significant force reductions.

Consequently, the Secretary of Defense recommended a significant base structure drawdown involving 31 major base closures and 48 realignments. The 1991 Commission accepted approximately 90 percent of those recommendations and in its report to the President, recommended the closure of 26 major bases and the realignment of 48 others. These approved closures represent a reduction of about 5.4 percent of the domestic base structure. A recap of the major 1991 base closures and realignments is at Table 1 of this Appendix.

Implementing the 1991 Commission's Recommendations

The President accepted all of the Commission's recommendations on July 11, 1991, and forwarded the Commission's report with his approval to the Congress. The Congressional review period established by P.L. 101-510 expired without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval. Recommendations of the 1991 Commission now have the force of law.

DoD's planning, budgeting and implementation of the 1991 recommendations are on track. The closures and realignments were required to begin by July of 1993 and must be completed by July of 1997. As of February 1995, 19 of the 26 major installations have been closed and two more are scheduled for closure by the end of FY 1995.

The 1993 Base Closure Process

The second of the three Commissions to operate under P.L. 101-510, as now amended, received Secretary of Defense Aspin's recommendations for base closures and realignments on March 12, 1993. Those recommendations were based on the approved final selection criteria and a six year force structure plan (President Bush's "base force").

Secretary of Defense Aspin recommended substantial base structure reductions, based on the planned force structure drawdown, involving 31 major base closures and 12 major realignments. The 1993 Commission accepted approximately 95 percent of those recommendations and in its report to the President of July 1993, recommended the closure of 28 major bases and the realignment of 13 others. These approved closures and realignments represent a further reduction of about 6.2 percent of the domestic base structure. A recap of the major 1993 base closures and realignments is at Table 1 of this Appendix.

Implementing the 1993 Commission's Recommendations

The President accepted all of the Commission's recommendations on July 2, 1993, and forwarded the Commission's report with his approval to the Congress. The Congressional review period established by P.L. 101-510 expired without enactment of a joint resolution of disapproval. Consequently, the recommendations of the 1993 Commission now have the force of law.

DoD's planning, budgeting and implementation of the 1993 recommendations are on track. The closures and realignments are required to begin by July of 1995 and must be completed by July of 1999. As the DoD learned how to close bases faster, it began to accelerate savings. As of February 1995, three of the 1993 major closures have occurred, and another five are scheduled for closure by the end of FY 1995.

The Need To Expedite Mission Drawdown - A Brief History of Base Closure Implementation

Because the 1988 BRAC round was driven by consolidation of a stable force, rather than a force drawdown, implementation was expensive and slow. Usually, extensive facilities needed to be constructed at consolidation sites before closures and realignments could actually occur. Closures took five to six years from the date of announcement. By 1991, the situation had changed and DoD was downsizing in earnest. Rather than consolidating a stable force, DoD simply eliminated forces when bases were closed.

This change was mirrored in the impacted communities as well. In the 1988 round, the actual closure date was so far in the future that communities were not convinced that the closure would actually occur. Communities rarely had a sense of urgency in planning reuse, and generally did not get organized for six months to a year after announcement. By 1991, it was clear that downsizing was in earnest and that DoD bases would be closed. Communities realized they had to act sooner and take the early initiative to start a reuse plan, especially in light of the recessionary economic climate of the early 1990's. On average, communities were forming reuse organizations within two months after the closures were announced, instead of six months to a year.

Likewise, in 1988, conversion of property was neither quick nor simple. Communities struggled to understand complex Federal and State laws and regulations that were never developed for land reuse transactions as massive as those resulting from base closures. In instances where property disposal was not part of the process, the pace of base closing has been dramatic. For example, DoD closed 32 percent of its foreign installations in just four years despite the intervening turbulence of the Iraq War.

After three rounds of domestic base realignment and closures, only about 15 percent of the base capacity has been selected for closure. While military missions are terminating more quickly, most of these bases have yet to be fully closed and turned over to other activities. Several factors such as the need to construct new facilities at receiving bases, the environmental condition of closing bases, and cumbersome property disposal procedures contribute to the delay in closing a base. While funding of the BRAC program has received sustained Congressional support, a \$500 million rescission of FY 1994 funds in early 1994 did slow the pace of some closures.

Despite these impediments, DoD is closing domestic bases faster than in the past. DoD has reduced closure time from nearly five years for the bases on the 1988 list to approximately two years for bases on the 1993 list. Much of this improvement is attributable to statutory streamlining which Congress has often initiated, and the procedural and policy improvements DoD has made to assist communities in achieving rapid economic reinvestment.

The 1995 Base Closure Process

The 1995 base closure process is described in detail in the body of this report.

Table 1 - MAJOR BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT RECAP

Baseline: Base Structure Report (495-U.S. includes 10 territories and possessions)

1988 Commission

16 Closures

Chanute AFB, IL
Mather AFB, CA
Pease AFB, NH
George AFB, CA
Norton AFB, CA
Naval Station Brooklyn, NY

Phila Naval Hosp, PA
Naval Station Galveston, TX
Naval Station Lake Charles, LA
Presidio of San Francisco, CA
Fort Sheridan, IL

Jefferson Proving Ground, IN
Lexington Army Depot, KY
Army Material Tech Lab, MA
Fort Douglas, UT
Cameron Station, VA

11 Realignments

Naval Station Puget Sound, WA
Pueblo Army Depot, CO
Umatilla Army Depot, OR
Fort Dix, NJ

Fort Bliss, TX
Fort Meade, MD
Fort Monmouth, NJ
Fort Huachuca, AZ

Fort Holabird, MD
Fort Devens, MA
Fort McPherson, GA

1991 Commission

26 Closures

Fort Ben Harrison, IN
Fort Devens, MA
Fort Ord, CA
Sacramento Army Depot, CA
Hunters Point Annex, CA
Tustin MCAS, CA
Chase Field NAS, TX
Moffett NAS, CA
Naval Station Long Beach, CA

Naval Station Philadelphia, PA
Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, PA
Naval Station Puget Sound, WA
NAV ELEC SYS ENGR CTR,
San Diego, CA
Bergstrom AFB, TX
Carswell AFB, TX
Eaker AFB, AR
England AFB, LA

Gribsom AFB, IN
Loring AFB, ME
Lowry AFB, CO
Myrtle Beach AFB, SC
Richards-Gebaur ARS, MO
Rickenbacker AGB, OH
Williams AFB, AZ
Wurtsmith AFB, MI
Castle AFB, CA

19 Realignments

MacDill AFB, FL
Beale AFB, CA
AVSCOM/TROSCOM, MO
Fort Chaffee, AR
Fort Polk, LA
Letterkenny Army Depot, PA
Rock Island Arsenal, IL

NAVAIR Eng Ctr, Lakehurst, NJ
NAVAIR Devel Ctr, Warminster, PA
NAVAIR Propul Ctr, Trenton, NJ
NAV ORD STA, Indian Head, MD
NAV Avionics Ctr, Indianapolis, IN
NAV Coastal Sys Ctr, Panama City, FL
NAV ORD STA, Louisville, KY

NAV Surf Wpns Ctr, White Oak, MD
NAV Undsea Warfre Eng Sta,
Keyport, WA
NAV Wpns Ctr, China Lake, CA
NAV Wpns Sup Ctr, Crane, IN
Pac Missile Tst Ctr, Point Mugu, CA

1993 Commission

28 Closures

Vint Hill Farms, VA	Naval Station Mobile, AL	Mare Island Naval Shipyard, CA
MCAS El Toro, CA	Naval Air Station Alameda, CA	Naval Aviation Depot Alameda, CA
Naval Hospital Oakland, CA	Naval Station Treasure Island, CA	Naval Training Center San Diego, CA
Naval Air Station Cecil Field, FL	Naval Aviation Depot Pensacola, FL	Naval Training Center Orlando, FL
Naval Air Station Agana, Guam	Naval Air Station Barbers Point, HI	Naval Air Station Glenview, IL
NESEC, St. Inigoes, MD	Naval Station Staten Island, NY	Charleston Naval Shipyard, SC
Naval Station Charleston, SC	Naval Air Station Dallas, TX	Naval Aviation Depot Norfolk, VA
Homestead Air Force Base, FL	O'Hare IAP ARS, IL	K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, MI
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, NY	Gentile Air Force Station, OH (DESC)	Newark Air Force Base, OH
Defense Personnel Support Center, PA		

13 Realignments

Anniston Army Depot, AL	Fort Monmouth, NJ	Letterkenny Army Depot, PA
Tooele Army Depot, UT	Fort Belvoir, VA	MCLB Barstow, CA
NWS Seal Beach, CA	NSWC (Dahlgren) White Oak Det,	NETC, Newport, RI
Naval Air Station Memphis, TN	White Oak, Maryland	March Air Force Base, CA
Griffiss Air Force Base, NY	Hill Air Force Base ALC, UT	

Table 2 - DoD RECOMMENDATIONS REJECTED BY PREVIOUS COMMISSIONS

1988 Commission

Because the 1988 Commission was the sole authority for recommending closure and realignments to the Secretary of Defense there were no recommendations made that were not accepted by the Secretary of Defense.

1991 Commission

<u>Installation</u>	<u>Recommended Action</u>	<u>Commission Action</u>
<u>Army</u>		
Fort McClellan, AL	Close	Open
Fort Dix, NJ	Close	Realign
Fort Chaffee, AR	Close	Realign
Army Corps of Engineers	None	Realign

Navy

Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA	Close	Open
Naval Training Center Orlando, FL	Close	Open
RDT&E & Fleet Support Activities	Close 10/Realign 16	Close 7/Realign 17

Air Force

Moody AFB, GA	Close	Open
---------------	-------	------

1993 Commission

Army

Fort McClellan, AL	Close	Open
Letterkenny Army Depot, PA	Realign	Open
Presidio of Monterey Annex, CA	None	Realign

Changes to Previously Approved 88/91 Recommendations Affecting Army

Presidio of San Francisco, CA	Send 6th Army to Ft Carson	Keep 6th Army at Presidio of SF
Letterkenny Army Depot, PA	Send functions to Rock Island	Realign Keep Functions at Letterkenny

Navy

Naval Air Station Agana, Guam	None	Close
Naval Air Facility Martinsburg, WV	None	Close
Naval Air Facility Johnstown, PA	None	Close
Naval Hospital, Charleston, SC	Close	Open
Naval Air Station Meridian, MS	Close	Open
Naval Air Station South Weymouth, MA	Close	Open
Naval Supply Center Charleston, SC	Disestablish	Realign
Naval Supply Center Oakland, CA	Close	Open
Naval Submarine Base New London, CA	Realign	Open
Aviation Supply Office, PA	Close	Open
Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, PA	Close	Open
Naval Electronic Security Systems Engineering Center, Charleston, SC	Disestablish	Open
Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Portsmouth, VA	Receive	Close
Naval Surface Warfare Center-Carderock, Annapolis Detachment, Annapolis, MD	Disestablish	Open
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Lawrence, MA	None	Close
Naval Reserve Center, Chicopee, MA	None	Close
Naval Reserve Center, Quincy, MA	None	Close

Appendix E
History of Base Closures

Changes to Previously Approved BRAC 88/91 Recommendations

Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, CA	None	Realign
--------------------------------------	------	---------

Air Force

Plattsburgh AFB, NY	None	Close
Homestead AFB, FL	Close	Realign
McGuire AFB, NJ	Realign	Open

Changes to Previously Approved BRAC 88/91 Recommendations

Bergstrom AFB, TX	Redirect	Open
-------------------	----------	------

Defense Logistics Agency

Defense Industrial Supply Center, PA	Relocate	Open
Defense Reutilization & Marketing Service, MI	Disestablish	Open