

FINAL DELIBERATIONS VOTING

Installation Name	Motion	Made And Seconded By	C O M M I S S I O N E R S										Final Vote Count	
			Ball	Callaway	Cassidy	Coarter	Levitt	Smith	Stewart					
AVSCOM / TROSCOM	Merger of AVSCOM and TROSCOM	1-Stuart 2- Callaway	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye			Aye	Aye			6-0
Fort Hamilton	Removed from further consideration by this Commission	1- Callaway 2- Cassidy	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye				Aye	Aye			6-0
Fort Totten	Removed from further consideration by this Commission	1- Cassidy 2- Ball	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye				Aye	Aye			6-0
U.S. Army Reserve Center; Marcus Hook	Motion that the Commission does not address this subject and has no language on this subject in its report	1- Cassidy 2- Callaway	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye				Aye	Aye			6-0
Letterkenny Army Depot	Realignment in agreement with DOD's recommendation	1-Smith 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye				Aye	Aye			6-0
Rock Island Arsenal	Realign AMCCOM to Redstone Arsenal	1-Stuart 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye				Aye	Aye			6-0



**FINAL DELIBERATIONS VOTING**

Installation Name	Motion	Made And Seconded By	C O M M I S S I O N E R S							Final Vote Count	
			Ball	Callaway	Cassidy	Courter	Levit	Smith	Stuart		
Forts AP Hill, Buchanan, Pickett, Indian Town Gap, and McCoy	Remove from further consideration by this Commission	1-Smith 2-Cassidy	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye			Aye	Aye	6-0
NAVSTA Treasure Island, Hunters Point Annex	Closure of Hunters Point Naval Annex: This is a change to the 1988 Base Closure Commission Recommendation to partially close this installation.	1-Ball 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye			Aye	Aye	6-0
NAVSTA Puget Sound, Sand Point	Closure	1-Callaway 2-Ball	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye			Aye	Aye	6-0

FINAL DELIBERATIONS VOTING

Installation Name	Motion	Made And Secouded By	C O M M I S S I O N E R S							Final Vote Count
			Ball	Callaway	Cassidy	Courter	LeVitt	Smith	Stuart	
NAS Moffett Field	Closure	1-Ball 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye			Aye	5-0 with one abstention
CBC Davisville	Closure	1-Stuart 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
NAF Midway	Realignment: the mission of the facility will be eliminated and the field will be operated under caretaker status.	1-Callaway 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
Eaker AFB	Closure	1-Stuart 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
Grissom AFB	Closure	1-Stuart 2-Cassidy	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
Richards-Gebaur AGB	Closure	1-Stuart 2-Ball	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0

**FINAL DELIBERATIONS VOTING**

Installation Name	Motion	Made And Seconded By	C O M M I S S I O N E R S							Final Vote Count
			Bell	Callaway	Cassidy	Courter	Levitt	Smith	Stuart	
Rickenbacker AGB	Closure	1- Callaway 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
Wurtsmith AFB	Closure	1-Smith 2- Callaway	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
Williams AFB	Closure	1- Cassidy 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
Beale AFB	Realignment: This is a change to the 1988 Base Closure recommendations.	1- Callaway 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
March AFB	Realignment: This is a change to the 1988 Base Closure recommendations.	1- Callaway 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
Mather AFB	Realignment: This is a change to the 1988 Base Closure recommendations.	1- Callaway 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0

### FINAL DELIBERATIONS VOTING

Installation Name	Motion	Made And Seconded By	C O M M I S S I O N E R S							Final Vote Count
			Ball	Callaway	Cassidy	Courter	Levitt	Smith	Stuart	
Mountain Home AFB	Realignment: This is a change to the 1988 Base Closure recommendations.	1- Callaway 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
Goodfellow AFB	(2 Part) Remove from further consideration by this Commission as a total closure; Realignment. The realignment is a change to the 1988 Base Closure recommendations.	1- Cassidy 2- Callaway	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
Lowry AFB	Closure	1-Smith 2- Cassidy	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye		Aye	Aye	6-0
Fort Benjamin Harrison	Closure	1-Stuart 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
Fort McClellan	Remain open	1-Ball 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	No	Aye	Aye	No	Aye	5-2

### FINAL DELIBERATIONS VOTING

Installation Name	Motion	Made And Seconded By	C O M M I S S I O N E R S							Final Vote Count
			Ball	Callaway	Cassidy	Courier	Levitt	Smith	Stuart	
Fort Devens	Closure	1-Smith 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	No	No	Aye	Aye	5-2
Fort Ord	Closure	1-Stuart 2-Smith	Aye	No	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	6-1
Sacramento Army Depot	Closure	1-Stuart 2-Levitt	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
Army Labs	Closure / Realignment: an amendment offered by Ball to defer implementation until January 1, 1992 was unanimously accepted.	1-Callaway 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
Fort Dix	Realignment	1-Cassidy 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
MCRD San Diego	Remove from further consideration by this Commission	1-Stuart 2-Cassidy	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
NTC Orlando, Hospital	Remain open.	1-Levitt 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0

FINAL DELIBERATIONS VOTING

Installation Name	Motion	Made And Seconded By	C O M M I S S I O N E R S										Final Vote Count	
			Ball	Callaway	Cauley	Courter	Leffitt	Smith	Stuart					
NTC/RTC San Diego	Remove from further consideration by this Commission.	1- Callaway 2- Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
NAVSTA New York, Staten Island	Remove from further consideration by this Commission.	1-Ball 2- Cassidy	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	No	Aye			6-1
NAVSTA Long Beach, Hospital	Closure	1- Cassidy 2- Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye			7-0
NSY Long Beach	Remove from further consideration by this Commission.	1- Cassidy 2- Ball	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	No	Aye			6-1
NSY Philadelphia	Closure	1- Stuart 2- Callaway	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye			7-0
NAVSTA Philadelphia	Closure	1- Stuart 2- Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye			7-0
NAS Whidbey Island, Hospital	Remain Open	1- Callaway 2- Ball	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye			7-0

**FINAL DELIBERATIONS VOTING**

Installation Name	Motion	Made And Seconded By	C O M M I S S I O N E R S							Final Vote Count
			Ball	Callaway	Cassidy	Courter	Levitt	Smith	Stuart	
NAS Chase Field	Closure	1- Cassidy 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	No	Aye	6-1
NAS Kingsville	Remove from further consideration by this Commission.	1- Callaway 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
NAS Meridian	Remove from further consideration by this Commission.	1- Callaway 2-Levitt	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	No	Aye	6-1
Navy RDT&E and Fleet Support Activities	Closure / Realignment	1-Ball 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Realignment: Will not be initiated until January 1, 1992.	1-Smith 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
Fort Chaffee	Closure	1- Callaway 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	No	Aye	6-1

**FINAL DELIBERATIONS VOTING**

Installation Name	Motion	Made And Seconded By	C O M M I S S I O N E R S							Final Vote Count
			Ball	Callaway	Cassidy	Courter	Levitt	Smith	Stuart	
Fort Polk, JRTC	Realignment: Fifth Infantry Division Mechanized to Fort Hood, JRTC to Fort Polk and the 199th Separate Motorized Brigade to Fort Polk.	1- Callaway 2-Ball	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	No	Aye	6-1
MCAS Tustin	Closure	1- Cassidy 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
MacDill AFB	Realignment / Partial Closure	1-Smith 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
Bergstrom AFB	Closure	1- Cassidy 2-Levitt	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
England AFB	Closure	1-Levitt 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	No	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	6-1
Moody AFB	Remain Open	1-Ball 2- Cassidy	Aye	No	Aye	Aye	Aye	No	Aye	5-2

### FINAL DELIBERATIONS VOTING

Installation Name	Motion	Made And Seconded By	C O M M I S S I O N E R S							Final Vote Count
			Ball	Callaway	Cassidy	Courter	Levitt	Smith	Stuart	
Myrtle Beach AFB	Closure	1- Cassidy 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0
Carswell AFB	Closure	1-Stuart 2-Levitt	No	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	No	Aye	5-2
Castle AFB	Closure	1-Levitt 2-Smith	Aye	Aye	No	No	Aye	Aye	Aye	5-2
Loring AFB	Closure	1-Smith 2-Stuart	No	Aye	Aye	No	Aye	Aye	Aye	5-2
Plattsburgh AFB	Remove from further consideration by this Commission	1-Levitt 2-Stuart	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	7-0

HEARING OF MAY 21, 1993

A. Motions Passed

1. I move that the Commission consider Fort Lee, VA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

2. On March 29, 1993, the Commission voted to add Presidio of Monterey Language Institute (DLI), CA, to the list of proposed additions to the Secretary's list for closure or realignment.

The POM Annex/Fort Ord, CA, is a subinstallation of Presidio of Monterey and was included in the Secretary of Army's recommendation re: Presidio of Monterey for closure.

In order to clarify for the record that the intent of the Commission was and is to consider POM Annex/Fort Ord for closure or realignment, I move that the Commission confirm its intention to consider POM Annex/Fort Ord, CA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

3. I move that the Commission consider Fort Monroe, VA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

4. I move that the Commission consider Fort Gillem, GA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman

Motion to amend/table motion:

Motion made by: McPhearson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart/Bowman  
Vote for: Stuart, Byron, Courter, McPherson, Cox, Bowman  
(6)  
Vote against: Johnson (1)

I move that the Commission consider the previously deferred and tabled motion on Fort Gillem, GA; specifically I move that the Commission consider Fort Gillem, GA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Stuart, Johnson, Courter, Cox, Bowman (5)  
Vote against: Byron, McPherson (2)

5. I move that the Commission consider Marcus Hook, U.S. Army Reserve Center, PA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Stuart, Johnson, Courter, McPherson, Bowman (5)  
Vote against: Byron, Cox (2)

6. I move that the Commission consider NSY Norfolk and Defense Distribution Depot, Norfolk, VA, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Cox/Stuart  
Vote for: Stuart, Courter, McPherson, Cox (4)  
Vote against: Byron, Johnson (2)  
Recused: Bowman (1)

7. I move that the Commission consider NSY Portsmouth, ME, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

FINAL DRAFT

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Stuart, Byron, Johnson, Courter, McPherson,  
Cox (6)  
Vote against: (0)  
Recused: Bowman (1)

8. I move that the Commission consider NSY Long Beach, CA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Stuart, Byron, Johnson, Courter, McPherson,  
Bowman (6)  
Vote against: Cox (1)

9. I move that the Commission consider NAS Oceana, VA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Stuart, Johnson, Courter, McPherson, Cox,  
Bowman (6)  
Vote against: Byron (1)

10. I move that the Commission consider MCAS Beaufort and NAVHOSP Beaufort, SC, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Stuart, Johnson, Courter, McPherson, Cox,  
Bowman (6)  
Vote against: Byron (1)

11. I move that the Commission consider NAS Miramar, CA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Stuart, Byron, Johnson, Courter, McPherson,  
Bowman (6)  
Vote against: (0)  
Recused: Cox (1)

FINAL DRAFT

12. I move that the Commission consider MCAS Tustin, CA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for realignment.

Motion made by: Bowman  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Stuart, Johnson, Courter, McPherson, Bowman (5)  
Vote against: Byron (1)  
Recused: Cox (1)

13. I move that the Commission consider NAS Corpus Christi and NAVHOSP Corpus Christi, TX, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

14. I move that the Commission consider NAVSTA Ingleside, TX, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

15. I move that the Commission consider NAVSTA Pascagoula, MS, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

16. I move that the Commission consider NAVSTA Everett, WA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

FINAL DRAFT

17. I move that the Commission consider NAVHOSP Great Lakes, IL, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Byron, Johnson, Courter, McPherson, Cox,  
Bowman (6)  
Vote against: (0)  
Recused: Stuart (1)

18. I move that the Commission consider Ship Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, PA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Stuart, Byron, Courter, McPherson (4)  
Vote against: Johnson, Cox, Bowman (3)

19. I move that the Commission consider NESEC Portsmouth, VA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

20. I move that the Commission consider NAF Martinsburg, WV, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

21. I move that the Commission consider NAF Johnstown, PA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Bowman  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

FINAL DRAFT

22. I move that the Commission consider NRC/AFRC, Chicopee, NMCRC Lawrence and NRC Quincy, MA, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Stuart, Johnson, Courter, McPherson, Cox,  
Bowman (6)  
Vote against: Byron (1)

23. I move that the Commission consider Naval Ordnance Station, Louisville, KY, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

24. I move that the Commission consider NAS Memphis, TN, for a proposed increase in the extent of realignment recommended by the Secretary and/or as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure; I further move that the Commission consider NAVHOSP Millington, TN, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

25. I move that the Commission consider Fort McPherson, GA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Bowman  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Stuart, Courter, Cox, Bowman (4)  
Vote against: Byron, Johnson, McPherson (3)

26. I move that the Commission consider Plattsburgh AFB, NY, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

FINAL DRAFT

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

27. I move that the Commission consider Fairchild AFB, WA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Stuart, Johnson, Courter, McPherson, Cox,  
Bowman (6)  
Vote against: Byron (1)

28. I move that the Commission consider Grand Forks AFB, ND, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

29. I move that the Commission consider Tinker AFB and Defense Distribution Depot, Oklahoma City, OK, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: Cox/Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

30. I move that the Commission consider RPC Tinker AFB (LSBA-IPC Oklahoma City) Oklahoma City, OK, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

FINAL DRAFT

31. I move that the Commission consider Warner-Robins AFB, RPC Warner-Robins (LSBA-IPC Warner-Robins) and Defense Distribution Depot, Warner-Robins, GA, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

32. I move that the Commission consider Kelly AFB, RPC Kelly AFB (LSBA-IPC San Antonio) and Defense Distribution Depot, San Antonio, TX, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Cox  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Stuart, Courter, McPherson, Cox, Bowman (5)  
Vote against: Byron, Johnson (2)

33. I move that the Commission consider NADEP North Island and Defense Distribution Depot, San Diego, CA, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

34. I move that the Commission consider NADEP Cherry Point and Defense Distribution Depot, Cherry Point, NC, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

35. I move that the Commission consider NADEP Jacksonville and Defense Distribution Depot, Jacksonville, FL, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

FINAL DRAFT

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

36. I move that the Commission consider MCLB Albany and Defense Distribution Depot, Albany, GA, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

37. I move that the Commission consider MCLB Barstow and Defense Distribution Depot, Barstow, CA, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

38. I move that the Commission consider Red River Army Depot and Defense Distribution Depot, Red River, TX; Anniston Army Depot and Defense Distribution Depot, Anniston, AL; Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA; Seal Beach, Naval Weapon Station, CA; and Air Force Logistics Center, Ogden, UT as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Cox  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

39. I move that the Commission consider Defense Construction Supply Center (DCSC) and Defense Information Technology Services Organization (DITSO) (RMBA Columbus), Columbus, OH, as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

40. I move that the Commission consider Defense Contract Management District Northeast, MA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

41. I move that the Commission consider Defense Distribution Depot, McClellan AFB, CA, and Naval Depot, San Diego, CA,\* as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

42. I move that the Commission consider DITSO Denver (RMBA Denver), CO; AIPC Chambersburg (MIPA Chambersburg), PA; AIPC Huntsville (MIPA Huntsville), AL; and DITSO Cleveland (RMBA Cleveland), OH as proposed additions to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

43. I move that the Commission consider Gentile AFB, OH, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

---

\* Naval Depot, San Diego, CA, is the same thing as Motion #33.

B. Motions Failed

1. I move that the Commission consider Fort Leonard Wood, MO, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Johnson

Motion seconded by: Bowman

Vote for: Stuart, Johnson, Bowman (3)

Vote against: Byron, Courter, McPherson, Cox (4)

2. I move that the Commission consider NSB New London, CT, for a proposed increase in the extent of realignment recommended by the Secretary and/or as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure; I further move that the Commission consider NAVHOSP Groton, CT, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Johnson

Motion seconded by: Cox

Vote for: Johnson, Cox (2)

Vote against: Byron, Courter, McPherson, Bowman (4)

Recused: Stuart (1)

3. I move that the Commission consider McChord AFB, WA, as a proposed addition to the Secretary's list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment.

Motion made by: Cox

Motion seconded by: No second

Attorney-Client Communications

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Sheila  
Fr: MAH  
DT: June 4  
RE: MOTIONS: INITIAL CONCERNS

---

The base grouping worksheet has not been returned by any service yet. We are providing another deadline of next Tuesday.

It is my belief that some bases- esp. the ones where there are groupings of smaller installations, DISAs, DLAs can be grouped into one motion. The Commissioners have the option of dividing the motions. We will have to be careful of those bases that are followers when/if we put them in a complex motion containing a group of bases.

It is also my opinion that we do not have to vote "not to add a base" or "not to consider a base" or "not to have any language in the report" like they did last year. See attachment.

The only votes required are:

---- adopt the secdef's rec.

---- finding sub deviation and therefore vote xx as a proposed change to the SecDef's list.

I have a real concern that some recs are going to be very detailed- we must be alerted to those ahead of time by research.

Last commission ran into problems with the detail of the recs. We will need to be aware.

For groupings, generally I think we should do the larger bases first. The followers immediately following that debate - unless the follower can stand on its own for closure reasons- then we may want to postpone for the category discussion.

I'll have more thoughts when I see the R/A's lists.

FINAL DELIBERATIONS  
JUNE 23-27, 1993

1. Fort McClellan, AL

(a) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria in making his recommendation on Fort McClellan, AL. Therefore, the Commission rejects and does not make the following recommendation of the Secretary: "Close Fort McClellan. Relocate the U.S. Army Chemical and Military Police Schools and the Department of Defense Polygraph Institute (DODPI) to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri. Transfer accountability for Pelham Range and other required training support facilities, through licensing, to the Army National Guard. Retain an enclave for the U.S. Army Reserves. Retain the capability for live-agent training at Fort McClellan." The Commission does 17 recommend that if the Secretary of Defense wants to move the Chemical Defense School and Chemical Decontamination Training Facility in the future, the Army should pursue all of the required permits and certificates for the new site prior to the 1995 base closure process. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: (see below)  
Vote against:

(b) Motion to amend motion on Ft. McClellan to read:  
I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from criteria 1 and 4, and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation: close Fort McClellan except for Pelham Range and other required training support facilities to be licensed to the Army National Guard, and an enclave to support the U.S. Army Reserves; relocate the Chemical and Military Police Schools to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri; close the Chemical Decontamination Training Facility at Fort McClellan and construct a replacement facility at Fort Leonard Wood subject to CDTF permits; and relocate the Department of Defense Polygraph Institute to another location determined by the Department of Defense. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force-structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: None  
Vote for: N/A  
Vote against: N/A

(c) Motion to amend fails for lack of second. Vote on original motion (above):

Vote for: Bowman, Cox, McPherson, Courter, Byron, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: Stuart (1)

2. Presidio of Monterey/POM Annex, CA

Discussion. Motion/vote tabled/deferred.

3. Fort Belvoir, VA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: realign Fort Belvoir as follows: Disestablish the Belvoir Research, Development and Engineering Center (BRDEC), Fort Belvoir, Virginia. Eliminate the Tunnel Detection, Materials, Marine Craft, Topographic Equipment, Construction Equipment and Support Equipment business areas. Relocate the Supply, Bridging, Counter Mobility, Water Purification, and Fuel/Lubricant Business Areas to the Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center (TARDEC), Detroit Arsenal, Michigan. Transfer command and control of the Physical Security, Battlefield Deception, Electric Power, Remote Mine Detection/Neutralization, Environmental Controls and Low Cost/Low Observables Business Areas to the Night Vision Electro-Optics Directorate (NVEOD) of the Communication and Electronics Research, Development and Engineering Center (CERDEC), Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

4. Presidio of San Francisco, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from criteria 2 and 4, and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation: The 1988 Commission decision will be changed to allow only the Sixth U.S. Army to remain at the Presidio of San Francisco, California. The Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army will negotiate a lease that is favorable to both departments for the current facilities occupied by Sixth U.S. Army and family housing at the Presidio of San Francisco necessary to accommodate the headquarters members. If agreement cannot be reached, the Commission expects the Army to make a subsequent recommendation to the 1995 Commission for the relocation of Sixth U.S. Army. The Commission further recommends the Defense Commissary Agency and the Army and Air Force Exchange System determine the commissary and exchange requirements to support Sixth U.S. Army based on sound business decisions. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Cox  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

5. Ft. Gillem, GA

I move that the Commission find that Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure and final criteria in not recommending the closure of Ft. Gillem. Therefore, the Commission recommends the closure of Ft. Gillem and the movement of the Director of Engineering and Housing and all 3rd Army Tenants to Ft. McPherson, Georgia, and 2nd Army to Ft. Stewart. The Commission further recommends the Army, directly or through GSA, make the warehouse buildings at Ft. Gillem available to the Army and Air Force Exchange Service as long as they wish to remain a tenant there. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: None  
Vote for: N/A  
Vote against: N/A

6. Ft. McPherson, GA

No motion.

7. Ft. Lee, VA

No motion.

8. Ft. Monroe, VA

No motion.

9. Vint Hill Farms, VA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Vint Hill Farms. Relocate the maintenance and repair function of the Intelligence Material Management Center (IMMC) to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA. Transfer the remaining elements of IMMC, the Intelligence and Electronic Warfare Directorate (formerly the Signal Warfare Directorate), and the program executive officer (PEO) for Intelligence and Electronic Warfare (IEW) to Ft. Monmouth, NJ.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: N/A (0)

10. Ft. Monmouth, NJ

(a) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from criterion 4. The Commission finds that the Department misstated the cost differential between two alternative choices. Therefore, the Commission adopts the following recommendation: Move CECOM headquarters out of the leased space and into space at Ft. Monmouth vacated by the 513th Military Intelligence Brigade and the Chaplain School or other suitable space; relocate the Chaplain School to Ft. Jackson; consolidate activities to maximize utilization of main post Ft. Monmouth; and dispose of excess facilities and real property at Evans and Charles Woods sub posts, as well as main post Ft. Monmouth. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: N/A  
Vote against: N/A

(b) Motion to make technical amendment to insert the following: "rejects the Secretary's recommendation on Ft. Monmouth, and, instead."

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

(c) Vote on amended motion:

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from criterion 4. The Commission finds that the Department misstated the cost differential between two alternative choices. Therefore, the Commission rejects the Secretary's recommendation on Ft. Monmouth, and, instead, adopts the following recommendation: Move CECOM headquarters out of the leased space and into space at Ft. Monmouth vacated by the 513th Military Intelligence Brigade and the Chaplain School or other suitable space; relocate the Chaplain School to Ft. Jackson; consolidate activities to maximize utilization of main post Ft. Monmouth; and dispose of excess facilities and real property at Evans and Charles Woods sub posts, as well as main post Ft. Monmouth. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

11. Rock Island Arsenal, IL

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Instead of sending the materiel management functions of U.S. Army Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command (AMCCOM) to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, as recommended by the 1991 Base Closure Commission, reorganize these functions under Tank Automotive Command (TACOM) with the functions remaining in place at Rock Island Arsenal, IL.

Motion made by: McPherson

Motion seconded by: Stuart

Vote for: Byron, Stuart, Courter, McPherson, Cox, Bowman (6)

Vote against: Johnson (1)

12. Marcus Hook USAR Center, PA

No motion.

13. Presidio of Monterey/Presidio of Monterey Annex, CA [previously deferred]

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force-structure plan and criterion 4, and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation: Retain the Presidio of Monterey but dispose of all facilities at the Presidio of Monterey Annex except the housing, commissary, child care facility, and post-exchange required to support the Presidio of Monterey and Navy Post Graduate School. Consolidate base operations support with the Naval Post Graduate School by interservice agreement. The Department of Defense will evaluate whether contracted base operations support would provide savings for the Presidio of Monterey. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force-structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson

Motion seconded by: McPherson

Vote for: Unanimous (7)

Vote against: (0)

14. Letterkenny Army Depot, PA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1 and 4. Therefore, the Commission rejects the Secretary's recommendation on Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, and, instead, adopts the following recommendation: Letterkenny Army Depot will remain open. Consolidate tactical missile maintenance at the depot as originally planned. Add tactical missile maintenance workload currently being accomplished by the Marine Corps Logistics Base in Barstow, California, to the consolidation plan. Retain current artillery workload at Letterkenny.

Retain the Systems Integration Management Activity-East (SIMA-E) at Letterkenny Depot Activity until the Defense Information Systems Agency completes its review of activities relocated under DMRD 918. Relocate Depot Systems Command to Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, and consolidate with the Armament, Munitions, and Chemical Command into the Industrial Operations Command, as approved by the 1991 Commission.

The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Cox  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

15. Tooele Army Depot, UT

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Realign Tooele Army Depot (TEAD) by reducing it to a depot activity and placing it under the command and control of Red River Army Depot, TX. Retain conventional ammunition storage and the chemical demilitarization mission. The depot workload will move to other depot maintenance activities, including the private sector. The activities of the depot not associated with the remaining mission will be inactivated, transferred or eliminated, as appropriate.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

16. McGuire AFB, NJ

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1, 2, 3, and 4 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on McGuire AFB, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Retain McGuire AFB as an active installation. The 438th and 514th Airlift Wings, the 170th Air Refueling Group (ANG), and the 108th Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will remain at McGuire AFB. Move the 19 KC-10 aircraft from Barksdale AFB to McGuire AFB. Move the requisite number of KC-135 aircraft to establish the East Coast Mobility Base at McGuire AFB. The C-130 913th Airlift Group (AFRES) remains at Willow Grove NAS, PA. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Bowman, Cox, McPherson, Courter, Stuart, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: Byron (1)

17. Grand Forks AFB, ND

I move to withdraw Grand Forks AFB, ND, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

18. Griffiss AFB, NY

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Griffiss AFB, New York, is recommended for realignment. The 416th Bomb Wing will inactivate. The B-52H aircraft will transfer to Minot AFB, North Dakota, and Barksdale AFB, Louisiana. The KC-135 aircraft from Griffiss AFB will transfer to Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota. The 485th Engineering Installation Group at Griffiss AFB will relocate to Hill AFB, Utah.

The Northeast Air Defense Sector will remain at Griffiss in a cantonment area pending the outcome of a NORAD sector consolidation study. If the sector remains it will be transferred to the Air National Guard (ANG). Rome Laboratory will remain at Griffiss AFB in its existing facilities as a stand-alone Air Force laboratory. A minimum essential airfield will be maintained and operated by a contractor on an "as needed, on call" basis. The ANG will maintain and operate necessary facilities to support mobility/contingency/training of the 10th Infantry (Light) Division located at Ft. Drum, New York, and operate them when needed. Only the stand-alone laboratory and the ANG mission will remain.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

19. Fairchild AFB, WA

I move to withdraw Fairchild AFB, WA, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

20. March AFB, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: March AFB, California, is recommended for realignment. The 22nd Air Refueling Wing will inactivate. The KC-10 (Active and Associate Reserve) aircraft will be relocated to Travis AFB, California. The Southwest Air Defense Sector will remain at March in a cantonment area pending the outcome of a NORAD sector consolidation study. If the sector remains it will be transferred to the Air National Guard (ANG). The 445th Airlift Wing Air Force Reserve (AFRES), 452nd Air Refueling Wing (AFRES), 163rd Reconnaissance Group (ANG) (becomes an Air Refueling Group), the Air Force Audit Agency, and the Media Center (from Norton AFB, California) will remain and the base will convert to a reserve base. Additionally, the Army Corps of Engineers Unit, the US Customs Aviation Operation Center West, and the Drug Enforcement Agency aviation unit will remain.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

21. Plattsburgh AFB, NY

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from criteria 2 and 4 and, therefore, the Commission adopt the following recommendation: Close Plattsburgh AFB and transfer the KC-135s to McGuire AFB, New Jersey. The Commission finds that this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Bowman, Cox, McPherson, Courter, Stuart, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: Byron (1)

22. K.I. Sawyer AFB, MI

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: K.I. Sawyer AFB, Michigan, is recommended for closure. The 410th Wing will inactivate. B-52H aircraft will transfer to Barksdale AFB, Louisiana. The Air Force will retire its B-52G aircraft instead of implementing the previous Base Closure Commission recommendation to transfer those aircraft from Castle AFB, California, to K.I. Sawyer AFB.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

23. Homestead AFB, FL

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1 and 3 for the military value of this strategically located base and criterion 4 for costs to move the 482d Fighter Wing and operate MacDill AFB and criterion 6 for economic impact, and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Homestead AFB, Florida, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Realign Homestead AFB with the following actions. Inactivate the 31st Fighter Wing; all F-16s from the 31st Fighter Wing will remain temporarily assigned to Moody AFB, Georgia, and Shaw AFB, South Carolina; move the Inter-American Air Forces Academy to Lackland AFB, Texas; temporarily relocate the Air Force Water Survival School to Tyndall AFB, Florida. Future disposition of the Water Survival School is dependent upon efforts to consolidate its functions with the United States Navy. Relocate the 726th Air Control Squadron to Shaw AFB. Consolidate the Naval Security Group with other US Navy units. Close all DoD activities and facilities, including family housing, the hospital, commissary, and base-exchange facilities. All essential cleanup and restoration activities associated with Hurricane Andrew will be completed. The 482d F-16 Fighter Wing and the 301st Rescue Squadron (AFRES) and the North American Air Defense alert activity will remain in cantonment areas. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

24. MacDill AFB, FL

(a) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1, 3 and 4 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on MacDill AFB, Florida, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Retain the Joint Communication Support Element at MacDill as long as the airfield is non-DoD operated. Retain the 482nd at Homestead AFB, FL. Operation of the airfield at MacDill will be taken over by the Department of Commerce or another Federal agency. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

(b) Motion, second and unanimous voice vote to suspend voting after Cox voted. Resumed after McPherson returned to room and completed.

25. Chanute AFB, IL

Motion to defer voting until discussion on NAS Memphis.

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: Bowman/Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

26. Castle AFB, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Redirect the B-52 and KC-135 Combat Crew Training mission from Fairchild AFB, Washington to Barksdale AFB, Louisiana (B-52) and Altus AFB, Oklahoma (KC-135).

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

27. O'Hare International Airport, Air Reserve Station, Chicago, IL

(a) First motion:

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 2 and 4 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on O'Hare and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Close O'Hare ARS as proposed by the City of Chicago and relocate the assigned Air Reserve component (ARC) units to the Greater Rockford Airport, or another location acceptable to the Secretary of the Air Force (in consultation and agreement with the receiving location), provided the City of Chicago can demonstrate that it has the financing in place to cover the full cost of replacing facilities (except for FAA grants for airfield facilities open to the public), environmental impact analyses, moving, and any added costs of environmental cleanup resulting from higher standards or a faster schedule than DoD would be obliged to meet if the base did not close, without any cost whatsoever to the federal government, and further provided that the closure/realignment must begin by July 1995 and be completed by July 1997. Chicago would also have to fund the cost of relocating the Army Reserve activity, or leave it in place. If these conditions are not met, the units should remain at O'Hare International Airport. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: McPherson

(b) Motion to amend to change second date to "1998":

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

(c) Vote on motion, as amended:

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 2 and 4 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on O'Hare and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Close O'Hare ARS as proposed by the City of Chicago and relocate the assigned Air Reserve component (ARC) units to the Greater Rockford Airport, or another location acceptable to the Secretary of the Air Force (in consultation and agreement with the receiving location), provided the City of Chicago can demonstrate that it has the financing in place to cover the full cost of replacing facilities (except for FAA grants for airfield facilities open to the public), environmental impact analyses, moving, and any added costs of environmental cleanup resulting from higher standards or a faster schedule than DoD would be obliged to meet if the base did not close, without any cost whatsoever to the federal government, and further provided that the closure/realignment must begin by July 1995 and be completed by July 1998. Chicago would also have to fund the cost of relocating the Army Reserve activity, or leave it in place. If these conditions are not met, the units should remain at O'Hare International Airport. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Vote for: Bowman, Cox, McPherson, Courter, Stuart, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: Byron

(d) Later motion to revise:

[Intro: On Friday, we voted to recommend that O'Hare Air Reserves Station be closed and relocated provided the City of Chicago demonstrated that it had the financing to cover, among other things, the full cost of replacing facilities "except for FAA grants for airfield facilities open to the public." We included that exception to make clear that we did not intend to deprive a community to which O'Hare ARS is relocated of FAA grants for which it would otherwise be entitled. To ensure that our intent is clear:

**FINAL DRAFT**

I move that the phrase "(except for FAA grants for airfield facilities open to the public)" be revised to read as follows: "(except for FAA grants for airport planning and development that would otherwise be eligible for Federal financial assistance to serve the needs of civil aviation at the receiving location)."

[The entire recommendation now reads:

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 2 and 4 and, therefore that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on O'Hare and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Close O'Hare ARS as proposed by the City of Chicago and relocate the assigned Air Reserve Component (ARC) units to the Greater Rockford Airport, or another location acceptable to the Secretary of the Air Force (in consultation and agreement with the receiving location), provided the City of Chicago can demonstrate that it has the financing in place to cover the full cost of replacing facilities (except for FAA grants for airport planning and development that would otherwise be eligible for Federal financial assistance to serve the needs of civil aviation at the receiving location), environmental impact analyses, moving, and any added costs of environmental cleanup resulting from higher standards or a faster schedule than DoD would be obliged to meet if the base did not close, without any cost whatsoever to the federal government, and further provided that the closure/realignment must begin by July 1995 and be completed by July 1998. Chicago would also have to fund the cost of relocating the Army Reserve activity, or leave it in place. If these conditions are not met, the units should remain at O'Hare International Airport. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.]

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

28. Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base, OH

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: The 121st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) and the 160th Air Refueling Group (ANG) will move into a cantonment area on the present Rickenbacker ANGB, and operate as a tenant of the Rickenbacker Port Authority (RPA) on RPA's airport. The 907th Airlift Group (AFRES) will realign to Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio as originally recommended. The 4950th Test Wing will still move to Edwards AFB, California. There is no recommendation by the Secretary of Defense or the Commission to move the 178th Fighter Group; it will stay at Springfield Municipal Airport, Ohio.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

29. Newark AFB, OH

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Newark AFB, Ohio, is recommended for closure. The Aerospace Guidance and Metrology Center (AGMC) depot will be closed; some workload will move to other depot maintenance activities including the private sector.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

30. McClellan AFB, CA; Kelly AFB, TX; Tinker AFB, OK and Warner-Robins AFB, GA

(a) I move that the Commission withdraw, McClellan AFB, California; Kelly AFB, Texas; Tinker AFB, Oklahoma; and Warner-Robins AFB, Georgia, from further consideration by the Commission.

FINAL DRAFT

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
No vote.

(b) I move to amend the motion to delete the names Kelly, Tinker and Warner-Robins. Amended motion reads: I move that the Commission withdraw McClellan, AFB, CA, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Bowman, Cox, McPherson, Courter, Byron, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: Stuart (1)

(c) I move that the Commission withdraw Kelly AFB, Texas, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

(d) I move that the Commission withdraw Tinker AFB, Oklahoma, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

(e) I move that the Commission withdraw Warner-Robins AFB, Georgia, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

31. Mather AFB, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Redirect the 940th Air Refueling Group (AFRES) with its KC-135 aircraft to Beale AFB, California vice McClellan AFB, California. Because of the rapidly approaching closure of Mather AFB, the 940th will temporarily relocate to McClellan AFB, while awaiting permanent beddown at Beale AFB.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

32. Carswell AFB, TX

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Transfer the fabrication function of the 436th Training Squadron (formerly 436th Strategic Training Squadron) to Luke AFB, Arizona and the maintenance training function to Hill AFB, Utah. The remaining functions of the 436th Training Squadron will still relocate to Dyess AFB, Texas. Final disposition of the base exchange and commissary will depend on the outcome of the Congressionally mandated base exchange and commissary test program.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

33. Norfolk Naval Shipyard, VA

I move that the Commission remove Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Virginia, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Cox, McPherson, Courter, Stuart, Byron, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: (0)  
Recused: Bowman (1)

34. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, NH

I move that the Commission remove Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, New Hampshire, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Cox, McPherson, Courter, Stuart, Byron, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: (0)  
Recused: Bowman (1)

35. Naval Shipyard Charleston, SC

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion 1 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Shipyard Charleston, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: close Naval Shipyard Charleston, but maintain the option for the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission later to recommend the retention of Charleston Naval Shipyard facilities that are deemed necessary to establish or support naval commands that are retained at, realigned to, or relocated to Charleston, South Carolina. The Commission finds that this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (6)  
Vote against: (0)  
Recused: Bowman (1)

36. Mare Island Naval Shipyard, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Mare Island Naval Shipyard (NSY). Relocate the Combat Systems Technical Schools Command activity to Dam Neck, Virginia. Relocate one submarine to the Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, Washington. Family housing located at Mare Island NSY will be retained as necessary to support Naval Weapons Station Concord.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

37. Long Beach Naval Shipyard, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criterion 4 and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation: Close Long Beach Naval Shipyard, retaining parcel R, which contains drydock #1, for future emergent use. The Navy may lay-up or GOOCU drydock #1, as it sees fit to best maintain the dock. The Commission finds that this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Stuart, Byron, Johnson (3)  
Vote against: Bowman, Cox, McPherson, Courter (4)

38. Naval Submarine Base, New London, CT

(a) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion 2 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Submarine Base, New London, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Realign Naval Submarine Base, New London by terminating its mission to homeport ships. Relocate berthed ships, their personnel, associated equipment and other support to Naval Station Charleston, South Carolina.

FINAL DRAFT

Piers, waterfront facilities, and related property shall be retained by the Navy at New London, Connecticut. Realign or relocate the Nuclear Submarine Support Facility to Charleston, South Carolina. Retain Charleston Naval Shipyard facilities deemed necessary to establish a nuclear submarine support facility at Charleston, South Carolina, including at least one graving dock. Disestablish the Nuclear Power Training Unit. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: N/A

(b) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 2, 4, and 5 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Submarine Base, New London, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Naval Submarine Base, New London remains open and does not realign. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

39. Naval Education and Training Center (NETC) Newport, RI

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Realign the Naval Education and Training Center (NETC) Newport and terminate the Center's mission to berth ships. Relocate the ships to Naval Station Mayport, Florida and Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia. Piers, waterfront facilities and related property shall be retained by NETC Newport. The Education and Training Center will remain to satisfy its education and training mission.

Motion made by: Bowman  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

40. Naval Station Staten Island, NY

(a) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Naval Station Staten Island. Relocate its ships along with their dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Stations, Norfolk, Virginia and Mayport, Florida. Disposition of minor tenants is as follows: Ship intermediate Maintenance Activity, New York relocates to Earle, New Jersey and Norfolk, Virginia; Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair (SUPSHIP), Brooklyn Detachment disestablishes.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Not voted on.

(b) Motion to amend Motion on NS Staten Island to include: "Retain family housing located at Naval Station, Staten Island, as necessary to support Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey."

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Voted for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Voted against: (0)

(c) Amended Motion reads as follows:

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: close Naval Station Staten Island. Relocate its ships along with their dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Stations, Norfolk, Virginia and Mayport, Florida. Disposition of minor tenants is as follows: Ship intermediate Maintenance Activity, New York, relocates to Earle, New Jersey and Norfolk, Virginia; Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair (SUPSHIP), Brooklyn Detachment disestablishes. Retain family housing located at Naval Station, Staten Island, as necessary to support Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey.

Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

41. Naval Station Charleston, SC

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion 1 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Station Charleston, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Naval Station (NS), Charleston, but maintain the option for the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission later to recommend the retention of Naval Station Charleston facilities that are deemed necessary to establish or support naval commands that are retained at, realigned to, or relocated to Charleston, South Carolina. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: McPherson

Motion seconded by: Stuart

Vote for: Bowman, Cox, McPherson, Courter, Stuart (5)

Vote against: Byron, Johnson (2)

42. Naval Station Ingleside, TX

I move that the Commission withdraw Naval Station Ingleside, Texas, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson

Motion seconded by: Cox

Vote for: Unanimous (7)

Vote against: (0)

43. Naval Stations Pascagoula, MS

I move that the Commission withdraw Naval Stations Pascagoula, Mississippi, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Stuart

Motion seconded by: McPherson

Vote for: Unanimous (7)

Vote against: (0)

44. Naval Station, Mobile, AL

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Naval Station, Mobile and relocate assigned ships to Naval Stations Pascagoula, Mississippi, and Ingleside, Texas, along with dedicated personnel, equipment and appropriate other support.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

45. Naval Station Alameda, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1 and 2 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Air Station Alameda, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Close Naval Air Station, Alameda, California and relocate its aircraft along with the dedicated personnel, equipment and support to NAS North Island. In addition, those ships currently berthed at NAS Alameda will be relocated to the Fleet concentrations at San Diego and Bangor/Puget Sound/Everett. Disposition of major tenants is as follows: reserve aviation assets relocate to NASA Ames/Moffett Field, California, NAS Whidbey Island, and NAS Willow Grove; Navy Regional Data Automation Center, San Francisco realigns to NAS North Island; Ship Intermediate Maintenance Department disestablishes; the Naval Air Reserve Center and the Marine Corps Reserve Center relocate to leased space at NASA/Ames. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Bowman, Courter, Stuart, Johnson (4)  
Vote against: Cox, McPherson, Byron (3)

46. Naval Station, Treasure Island, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Naval Station, Treasure Island and relocate personnel, as appropriate to the Naval Station, San Diego, California; Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia; Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois and various Naval Reserve sites in California. Major tenants are impacted as follows: Naval Reserve Center San Francisco relocates to the Naval/Marine Corps Reserve Center, Alameda, California and REDCOM 20 relocates to the Naval Reserve Center, San Bruno, California. Naval Technical Training Center relocates to Fleet Training Center San Diego, Naval Amphibious School, Little Creek and Naval Training Center Great Lakes.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

47. Naval Station, Everett, WA

I move that the Commission withdraw Naval Station, Everett, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

48. Naval Air Station, Meridian, MS

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1, 2, and 3 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Air Station, Meridian, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Naval Air Station, Meridian will remain open. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

49. Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, TX

I move that the Commission withdraw Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Cox  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

50. MCAS Beaufort, SC

I move that the Commission withdraw MCAS Beaufort, South Carolina, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

51. Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, FL

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Naval Air Station, Cecil Field and relocate its aircraft along with dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina; Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia; and Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina. Disposition of major tenants is as follows: Marine Corps Security Force Company relocates to MCAS Cherry Point; Aviation Intermediate Maintenance Department relocates to MCAS Cherry Point; Air Maintenance Training Group Detachment, Fleet Aviation Support Office Training Group Atlantic, and Sea Operations Detachment relocate to MCAS Cherry Point and NAS Oceana.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

52. MCAS El Toro, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on MCAS El Toro, CA, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Close Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) El Toro, California. Relocate its aircraft along with their dedicated personnel, equipment and support to other naval air stations, primarily Naval Air Station (NAS), Miramar, California and MCAS Camp Pendleton, California. In an associated action, the squadrons and related activities at NAS Miramar will move to other naval air stations, primarily NAS Lemoore and NAS Fallon in order to make room for the relocation of the MCAS El Toro squadrons. Relocate Marine Corps Reserve Center to NAS Miramar, California. Additionally, change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission, which was to close MCAS Tustin and relocate its helicopter assets to Marine Corps Air Reserve Ground Combat Center at Twentynine Palms, California, as follows: relocate MCAS Tustin helicopter assets to NAS North Island, NAS Miramar and MCAS Camp Pendleton, California. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Bowman, McPherson, Courter, Stuart, Byron, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: (0)  
Recused: Cox (1)

53. NAS Barbers Point, HI

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on NAS Barbers Point, Hawaii, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Close the Naval Air Station (NAS) Barbers Point and relocate its aircraft, along with their dedicated personnel, equipment and

support to other naval air stations, including Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS), Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii and NAS Whidbey Island, Washington. Disestablish the Naval Air Reserve Center. Retain the family housing as needed for multi-service use. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

54. Naval Air Station (NAS) Agana, Guam

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation: Close Naval Air Station (NAS) Agana. Move aircraft, personnel and associated equipment to Anderson AFB, Guam. Retain housing at NAS Agana necessary to support Navy personnel who have relocated to Anderson AFB. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Bowman, McPherson, Courter, Stuart, Byron, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: (0)  
Recused: Cox (1)

55. Naval Air Facility (NAF), Midway Island

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Naval Air Facility (NAF), Midway Island.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

56. Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Alameda, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Alameda and relocate repair capability as necessary to other depot maintenance activities. This relocation may include personnel, equipment and support. The depot workload will move to other depot maintenance activities, including the private sector.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

57. Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Pensacola, FL

(a) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 4 and 5 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Pensacola, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Completely close the Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Pensacola. Relocate repair and maintenance capabilities for H-1 and H-60 helicopters to Corpus Christi and the remaining repair and maintenance activities to the NADEP at Cherry Point. This relocation will include the personnel and equipment needed to accommodate the new work. Move the whirl tower and dynamic component facility to Cherry Point NADEP, or the private sector, in lieu of the Navy's plan to retain it as a stand alone facility. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Johnson

(b) Motion to amend Motion on NADEP, Pensacola, by inserting: "Corpus Christi Army Depot." The amended Motion reads as follows:  
I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 4 and 5 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Pensacola, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Completely close the Naval Aviation Depot

(NADEP), Pensacola. Relocate repair and maintenance capabilities for H-1 and H-60 helicopters to Corpus Christi and the remaining repair and maintenance activities to the NADEP at Cherry Point. This relocation will include the personnel and equipment needed to accommodate the new work. Move the whirl tower and dynamic component facility to Cherry Point NADEP, Corpus Christi Army Depot, or the private sector, in lieu of the Navy's plan to retain it as a stand alone facility. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

58. Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Norfolk, VA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Norfolk and relocate repair capability as necessary to other depot maintenance activities. This relocation may include personnel, equipment and support. The Depot workload will move to other depot maintenance activities, including the private sector.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Cox, McPherson, Courter, Stuart, Johnson (5)  
Vote against: Bowman, Byron (2)

59. NOS Louisville, KY

I move that the Commission withdraw NOS Louisville, Kentucky, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

60. Naval Air Station (NAS), Glenview, IL

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Naval Air Station (NAS), Glenview and relocate its aircraft and associated personnel, equipment and support to Navy Reserve, National Guard and other activities. Family housing located at NAS Glenview will be retained to meet existing and new requirements of the nearby Naval Training Center (NTC), Great Lakes. The Recruiting District, Chicago will be relocated to NTC Great Lakes. The Marine Corps Reserve Center activities will relocate as appropriate to Dam Neck, Virginia; Green Bay, Wisconsin; Stewart Army National Guard Facility, New Windsor, New York and NAS, Atlanta, Georgia.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

61. Naval Air Station (NAS), Dallas, TX

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Naval Air Station (NAS), Dallas and relocate its aircraft and associated personnel, equipment and support to Carswell, Fort Worth, Texas. The following Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers relocate to Carswell: Naval Reserve Center, Dallas; Marine Corp Reserve Center, Dallas; Marine Corps Reserve Center (Wing) Dallas and REDCOM 11. Carswell AFB, Texas, will become a navy operated Carswell Joint Reserve Center to receive and accommodate the reserve units currently there and being relocated there by this 1993 Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

62. Naval Air Facility (NAF), Detroit, MI

(a) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Naval Air Facility (NAF), Detroit and relocate its aircraft and associated personnel, equipment and support to the Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida and Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas. The Mt. Clemons, Michigan Marine Corps Reserve Center will relocate to the Marine Corps Reserve Center, Twin Cities, Minnesota.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Johnson

(b) Motion to table motion 64(a).

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

(c) Motion to amend tabled motion 64(a) by adding the language: "or NAS South Weymouth, Massachusetts."

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

(d) Amended motion: I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Naval Air Facility (NAF), Detroit and relocate its aircraft and associated personnel, equipment and support to the Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida; or NAS South Weymouth, Massachusetts; and Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas. The Mt. Clemons, Michigan Marine Corps Reserve Center will relocate to the Marine Corps Reserve Center, Twin Cities, Minnesota.

Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

63. Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, MA

(a) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria in making his recommendation on Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, MA. Therefore, the Commission rejects and does not make the following recommendation of the Secretary: Close Naval Air Station (NAS), South Weymouth and relocate its aircraft and associated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Stations Brunswick, Maine, New Orleans, Louisiana, and Naval Station Mayport, Florida. The Marine Corps Reserve Center activities will relocate to Dam Neck, Virginia; Johnstown, Pennsylvania; Camp Pendleton, California, and NAS Willow Grove, Pennsylvania.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Cox

(b) Motion to amend motion 65(a) by adding, at the end, the following language: "The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria."

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

(c) Amended motion: I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria in making his recommendation on Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, MA. Therefore, the Commission rejects and does not make the following recommendation of the Secretary: Close Naval Air Station (NAS), South Weymouth and relocate its aircraft and associated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Stations Brunswick, Maine, New Orleans, Louisiana, and Naval Station Mayport, Florida. The Marine Corps Reserve Center activities will relocate to Dam Neck, Virginia; Johnstown, Pennsylvania; Camp Pendleton, California, and NAS Willow Grove, Pennsylvania. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

64. Naval Air Station (NAS) Memphis, TN (flying mission/reserve squadron)

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission reject the portion of the Secretary's recommendation relating to the flying mission/reserve squadron and, instead, adopt the following: Realign Naval Air Station (NAS) Memphis by terminating the flying mission and relocating its reserve squadrons to Carswell, Texas. Disestablish the Naval Air Reserve Center and relocate the Marine Corps (Wing) Reserve Center Millington to Carswell. This recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

65. Naval Air Facility Johnstown, PA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 4 and 5 and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation: Close the Naval Air Facility Johnstown, Pennsylvania. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

66. Naval Air Facility, Martinsburg, WV

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation: Close Naval Air Facility, Martinsburg, West Virginia. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Bowman  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

67. Bergstrom AFB, TX

(a) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria 1, 2 and 4, and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Bergstrom AFB, Texas, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Bergstrom cantonment area will remain open and the 704th Fighter Squadron (AFRES) with its F-16 aircraft and the 924th Fighter Group (AFRES) support units (AFRES) remain at the Bergstrom cantonment area until at least the end of 1996.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Motion to withdraw motion made by: Johnson  
Vote for withdrawal: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against withdrawal: (0)

(b) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria 1, 2 and 4, and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Bergstrom AFB, Texas, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Bergstrom cantonment area will remain open and the 704th Fighter Squadron (AFRES) with its F-16 aircraft and the 924th Fighter Group (AFRES) support units (AFRES) remain at the Bergstrom cantonment area until at least the end of 1996. Close or relocate the Regional Corrosion Control Facility at Bergstrom by September 30, 1994, unless a civilian airport authority assumes the responsibility for operating and maintaining the

facility before that date. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

68. Naval Training Center (NTC), Orlando, FL, and Naval Hospital Orlando, FL

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion 2 and 4 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on NTC Orlando, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: NTC Orlando will remain open. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: No second

69. Naval Training Center (NTC), Orlando, FL

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Naval Training Center (NTC), Orlando, and relocate certain personnel, equipment and support to NTC Great Lakes and other locations, consistent with DoD training requirements. Disposition of major tenants is as follows: Recruit Training Command relocates to NTC Great Lakes; the Nuclear Power School and the Nuclear "A" School relocate to the Submarine School at the Naval Submarine Base (NSB), New London; Personnel Support Detachment relocates to NTC Great Lakes; Service School Command relocates to Great Lakes; Naval Dental Clinic relocates to Great Lakes; Naval Education and Training Program Management Support Activity disestablishes.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Bowman, Cox, McPherson, Courter, Byron, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: (0)  
Recused: Stuart (1)

**70. Naval Training Center (NTC), San Diego, CA**

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on NTC San Diego, and, instead, adopt the following: Close Naval Training Center (NTC), San Diego. Relocate certain personnel, equipment and support to NTC Great Lakes, and other locations, consistent with training requirements. Disposition of major tenants is as follows: Recruit Training Command relocates to NTC, Great Lakes; Branch Medical Clinic relocates to Submarine Base, San Diego; Naval Recruiting District relocates to Naval Air Station North Island; Service School Command (Electronic Warfare) relocates to Naval Training Center, Great Lakes; Service School Command (Surface) relocates to NTC Great Lakes; the remainder of the Service School Command relocates to NTC Great Lakes, Naval Air Station Pensacola, and Fleet Training Center, San Diego. The co-generation plant and the bachelor quarters and adjacent non-appropriated fund activities (marinas) located aboard NTC San Diego property will be retained by the Navy to support other naval activities in the San Diego area. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson

Motion seconded by: McPherson

Vote for: Bowman, Cox, McPherson, Courter, Byron, Johnson (6)

Vote against: (0)

Recused: Stuart (1)

**71. Naval Hospital, Orlando, FL**

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Naval Hospital, Orlando and relocate certain military and civilian personnel to other Naval Hospitals.

Motion made by: Johnson

Motion seconded by: Bowman

Vote for: Bowman, Cox, McPherson, Courter, Byron, Johnson (6)

Vote against: (0)

Recused: Stuart (1)

72. Electronics Systems Engineering Activity (NESEA) St. Inigoes, Maryland, NESEA Charleston, South Carolina, Naval Electronics Security Systems Engineering Center (NESSEC), Washington, DC, and NESEA Portsmouth

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1, 2, 5, and 6 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Electronics Systems Engineering Activity (NESEA) St. Inigoes, Maryland, NESEA Charleston, South Carolina, Naval Electronics Security Systems Engineering Center (NESSEC), Washington, DC, and NESEA Portsmouth, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity (NESEA), Charleston remains open and becomes the new East Coast lead facility. NESSEC, Washington closes and moves to NESEA, Charleston. NESEA, Portsmouth closes and moves to NESEA, Charleston, except for a detachment of fewer than 60 people. NESEA, St. Inigoes closes and moves to NESEA, Charleston. Module Maintenance Facility moves from Charleston Naval Shipyard to NESEA Charleston. The ATC/ACLS facility at St. Inigoes, the Aegis Radio Room Laboratory, IFF, LAMPS and special warfare will remain in place and will be transferred to Naval Air Systems Command. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Courter  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

73. Naval Air Warfare Center-Aircraft Division, Trenton, New Jersey

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Aircraft Division of the Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC) Trenton, New Jersey and relocate appropriate functions, personnel, equipment and support to the Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, and the Naval Air Warfare Center, Patuxent River, Maryland.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

74. Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Norfolk Detachment, Norfolk, VA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1 and 5, and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Norfolk Detachment, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: The Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Norfolk Detachment, Norfolk, Virginia, remains open. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: McPherson

Motion seconded by: Byron

Vote for: McPherson, Courter, Byron (3)

Vote against: Bowman, Cox, Stuart, Johnson (4)

[Therefore, the Secretary's recommendation is adopted.]

75. Naval Surface Warfare Center, Annapolis, MD

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 4 and 5 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Annapolis, Maryland, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: The Naval Surface Warfare Center, Annapolis, Maryland, remains open and is not disestablished. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Byron

Motion seconded by: McPherson

Vote for: Unanimous (7)

Vote against: (0)

76. Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity (now the Naval Surface Warfare Center-Port Hueneme, Yorktown Detachment)

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Relocate the Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity (now the Naval Surface Warfare Center-Port Hueneme, Yorktown Detachment) to the Naval Surface Warfare Center-Dahlgren, Coastal Systems Station, Panama City, Florida.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

77. Naval Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, PA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion 1 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the Naval Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: The Naval Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, remains open. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

78. Naval Surface Warfare Center -- Port Hueneme, Virginia Beach, VA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Disestablish the Virginia Beach Detachment of the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Port Hueneme and relocate its functions, personnel, equipment and support to the Fleet Combat Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

79. Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) (Dahlgren), White Oak, MD

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure and final criterion 1 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) (Dahlgren), White Oak, Maryland, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Disestablish the White Oak Detachment of the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) (Dahlgren), located at White Oak, Maryland. Relocate its functions, personnel, equipment and support to NSWC-Dahlgren, Virginia, NSWC-Indian Head, Indian Head, Maryland, and NSWC-Dahlgren, Coastal Systems Station, Panama City, Florida. The property and facilities at White Oak will be retained for use by the Navy so that it may, among other things, relocate the Naval Sea Systems (NAVSEA) Command from leased space in Arlington, Virginia. The Commission finds that this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

80. Sea Automated Data Systems Activity (SEAADSA), Indian Head, MD

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Disestablish the Sea Automated Data Systems Activity (SEAADSA) and relocate necessary functions, personnel, equipment, and support at Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) Indian Head, Maryland.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

81. Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility (NWEF), Albuquerque, NM

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Permit a small detachment of the Weapons Division to remain after the closure of the Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility (NWEF), Albuquerque, NM, in order to provide liaison with the Sandia Laboratory of the Department of Energy.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

82. Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity (NESEA) San Diego, CA, and the NESEA Vallejo, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Change the receiving location of the Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity (NESEA) San Diego, California and the NESEA Vallejo, California to be Air Force Plant #19 in San Diego vice new construction at Point Loma, San Diego, California.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

83. Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning and Procurement (SUBMEPP), NH

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Disestablish the Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning and Procurement (SUBMEPP), New Hampshire and relocate the necessary functions, personnel, equipment, and support at Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Kittery, Maine.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

84. (PERA)-(CV), Bremerton, WA, (PERA)-(Surface) Atlantic, Norfolk, VA, (PERA)-(Surface) Pacific, San Francisco, CA, (PERA)-(Surface) (HQ), Philadelphia, PA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Disestablish the following four technical centers and relocate necessary functions, personnel, equipment, and support at the Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, San Diego, California; Portsmouth, Virginia and Newport News, Virginia:

(PERA)-(CV), Bremerton, Washington,  
(PERA)-(Surface) Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia,  
(PERA)-(Surface) Pacific, San Francisco, California,  
(PERA)-(Surface) (HQ), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Motion made by: Bowman  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

85. Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory (NCEL), Port Hueneme, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory (NCEL), Port Hueneme, CA, and realign necessary functions, personnel, equipment, and support at the Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

86. Naval Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, PA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 4, 5, and 6 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the Naval Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: The Naval Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, remains open. The Commission finds these recommendations are consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Bowman  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

87. SPCC Mechanicsburg, PA

I move that the Commission withdraw SPCC Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

88. Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, PA

(a) I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 4 and 5, and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Relocate the Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to the Aviation Supply Office compound in North Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart

FINAL DRAFT

(b) Motion to amend Motion 90(a) by adding the following language: "and 6" (as an additional final criterion the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from).

Motion made by:

Motion seconded by:

Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]

Vote against: (0)

(c) Amended motion: I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 4, 5, and 6, and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Relocate the Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to the Aviation Supply Office compound in North Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Vote for: Unanimous (7)

Vote against: (0)

89. Defense Industrial Supply Center, Philadelphia, PA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 4, 5, and 6 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Defense Industrial Supply Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Defense Industrial Supply Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, remains open and located within the ASO compound in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Bowman

Motion seconded by: McPherson

Vote for: Unanimous (7)

Vote against: (0)

90. Defense Electronics Supply Center (DESC) (Gentile AFS), Dayton, OH

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Defense Electronics Supply Center (DESC) (Gentile AFS), Dayton, Ohio, and relocate its mission to the Defense Construction Supply Center (DCSC), Columbus, Ohio.

Motion made by: Stuart  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

91. Gentile Air Force Station, Dayton, OH

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion 1 and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation: Close Gentile Air Force Station, Dayton, Ohio, except for space required to operate the AUTODIN Switching Center. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

92. Defense Clothing Factory, Philadelphia, PA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Defense Clothing Factory, relocate the personnel supporting the flag mission, and use existing commercial sources to procure the Clothing Factory products.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

93. Defense Logistics Services Center and Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service, Battle Creek, MI

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion 4 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the Defense Logistics Services Center and Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service, Battle Creek, Michigan, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: The Defense Logistics Services Center and Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service, Battle Creek, Michigan, remains open and located in Battle Creek. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

94. Defense Contract Management District Midatlantic (DCMDM) and Defense Contract Management District Northcentral (DCMDN)

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Disestablish Defense Contract Management District Midatlantic (DCMDM) and Defense Contract Management District Northcentral (DCMDN), and relocate the missions to DCMD Northeast, DCMD South and DCMD West.

Motion made by: Cox  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

95. Defense Contract Management District West, El Segundo, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion 2. Therefore, the Commission rejects the Secretary's recommendation on Defense Contract Management District West, El Segundo, CA, and, instead, adopts the following recommendation: Relocate the Defense Contract Management District West, El Segundo, CA, to Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Los Angeles, CA, or Navy space obtained from exchange of land for space between the Navy and the Port Authority/City of Long Beach. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

96. Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny, PA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion 1 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny, Pennsylvania, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: The Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania remains open. The Commission finds this recommendation to be consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Cox  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

97. Defense Distribution Depot Charleston, SC

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense on Defense Distribution Depots in Charleston, South Carolina (DDCS); Oakland, California (DDOC); and Pensacola, Florida (DDPF).

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

[The Secretary's recommendations are as follows:

- (a) DDCS: Disestablish Defense Distribution Depot Charleston, SC (DDCS), and relocate the mission to Defense Distribution Depot Jacksonville, FL (DDJF). Slow moving and/or inactive materiel remaining at DDCS at the time of the realignment will be relocated to available storage space within the DoD Distribution System.
- (b) DDOC: Disestablish Defense Distribution Depot Oakland, CA (DDOC), and relocate the primary mission to Defense Distribution Depot Tracy, CA (DDTC), Defense Distribution Depot Sharpe, CA (DDSC), and Defense Distribution Depot San Diego, CA (DDDC). Slow moving or inactive materiel remaining at DDOC at the time of closure will be relocated to other available storage space within the DoD Distribution System.
- (c) DDPF: Disestablish Defense Distribution Depot Pensacola, FL (DDPF), and relocate the mission to Defense Distribution Depot Jacksonville, FL (DDJF). Slow moving and/or inactive materiel remaining at DDPF at the time of the disestablishment will be relocated to available storage space within the DoD Distribution System.]

98. Defense Distribution Depot Tooele, UT

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion 2 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the Defense Distribution Depot Tooele, Utah, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Disestablish Defense Distribution Depot Tooele, Utah (DDTU). Relocate the depot's function/materiel to Defense Distribution Depot Red River, Texas (DDRT). Any remaining materiel will be placed in available space in the DoD Distribution System. Change the recommendation of the 1988 Commission regarding Pueblo Army Depot, CO, as follow: instead of sending the supply mission to Tooele Army Depot, UT, as recommended by the 1988 Commission, relocate the mission to a location to be determined by the Defense Logistics Agency. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Cox  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

99. Naval Air Station (NAS), Memphis, TN (re: NATTC)

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Relocate the Naval Air Technical Training Center to NAS Pensacola, Florida.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Cox, McPherson, Courter, Stuart, Byron, Johnson (6)  
Vote against: Bowman (1)

100. Chanute AFB, IL

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 4 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Chanute AFB, Illinois, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: As part of the closure of Chanute AFB, Illinois, consolidate the Air Force's 16 Metals Technology, Non-Destructive Inspection, and Aircraft Structural Maintenance training courses with the Navy at Naval Air Station (NAS) Memphis, Tennessee, and then move with the Navy to Pensacola. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Bowman  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

101. National Capital Region

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense to realign and relocate Navy National Capital Region activities.

Motion made by: McPherson  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

102. Naval Supply Center (NSC) Charleston, SC

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Supply Center (NSC) Charleston, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Partially disestablish Naval Supply Center (NSC) Charleston, South Carolina, and retain the facilities and personnel appropriate for the continued support of Navy activities in the Charleston, South Carolina, area. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

103. Naval Supply Center (NSC) Oakland, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1, 3 and 6 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Supply Center (NSC) Oakland, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Naval Supply Center (NSC) Oakland, California, remains open. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

104. Naval Supply Center (NSC) Pensacola, FL

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Disestablish the Naval Supply Center (NSC) Pensacola.

Motion made by: Byron  
Motion seconded by: Johnson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

105. Naval Hospital, Beaufort, SC; Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, TX; Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, IL; and Naval Hospital, Millington, TN

I move that the Commission withdraw Naval Hospital, Beaufort, South Carolina; Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, Texas; Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois; and Naval Hospital, Millington, Tennessee, from further consideration by the Commission.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

106. Naval Hospital, Charleston, SC

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 1, and 6 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Hospital, Charleston, South Carolina, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: The Naval Hospital, Charleston, South Carolina, remains open. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

107. Naval Hospital, Oakland, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Naval Hospital, Oakland and relocate certain military and civilian personnel to other Naval hospitals, and certain military personnel to the Naval Air Stations at Lemoore and Whidbey Island. The Deployable Medical Unit, Northwest Region, will relocate to Naval Hospital, Bremerton, Washington.

Motion made by: Bowman  
Motion seconded by: Byron  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

108. Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criterion 4 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Stand-Alone Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Close the following reserve centers:

Navy/Marine Corps Reserve Centers at:

Fort Wayne, Indiana  
Abilene, Texas

Naval Reserve Centers at:

Gadsden, Alabama  
Montgomery, Alabama

Naval Reserve Centers at: (continued)

Fayetteville, Arkansas  
Fort Smith, Arkansas  
Pacific Grove, California  
Macon, Georgia  
Terre Haute, Indiana  
Hutchinson, Kansas  
Monroe, Louisiana  
New Bedford, Massachusetts  
Pittsfield, Massachusetts  
Joplin, Missouri  
St. Joseph, Missouri  
Great Falls, Montana  
Missoula, Montana  
Atlantic City, New Jersey  
Perth Amboy, New Jersey  
Jamestown, New York  
Poughkeepsie, New York  
Altoona, Pennsylvania  
Kingsport, Tennessee  
Memphis, Tennessee  
Ogden, Utah  
Staunton, Virginia  
Parkersburg, West Virginia

Naval Reserve Facilities at:

Alexandria, Louisiana  
Midland, Texas

Readiness Command Districts at:

Olathe, Kansas (REDCOM 18)  
Scotia, New York (REDCOM 2)  
Ravenna, Ohio (REDCOM 5)

FINAL DRAFT

The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7)  
Vote against: (0)

109. Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria 2 and 3 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendations on Stand-Alone Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Close the following reserve centers:

Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center at:

Lawrence, Massachusetts

Naval Reserve Center at:

Chicopee, Massachusetts  
Quincy, Massachusetts

and consolidate these activities at the existing facilities at NAS South Weymouth, Massachusetts. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Bowman  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

110. DoD Family Housing Office, Niagra Falls, NY

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the DoD Family Housing Office and the 111 housing units it administers.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

111. 1st Marine Corps District, Garden City, NY

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force structure plan and final criterion 4 in making his recommendation on 1st Marine Corps District, Garden City, NY. Therefore, the Commission rejects and does not make the following recommendation of the Secretary: Close the 1st Marine District, Garden City, New York and relocate necessary personnel, equipment and support to the Defense Distribution Region East, New Cumberland, Pennsylvania. The Defense Contract Management Area Office, a present tenant in the facility occupied by this activity as its host, will remain in place and assume responsibility for this facility. The Marine Corps Reserve Center, Garden City will relocate to Fort Hamilton, New York. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria. [Therefore 1st Marine Corps District, Garden City, NY, remains open.]

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

112. Navy Radio Transmission Facility (NRTF), Driver, VA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close the Navy Radio Transmission Facility (NRTF), Driver, Virginia.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

[Note: Motions 114 and 115 were voted on together.]

113. Navy Radio Transmission Facility (NRTF), Annapolis, MD

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Disestablish the Navy Radio Transmission Facility (NRTF), Annapolis. The Navy shall retain the real property on which this facility resides.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Cox  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

114. Hunters Point Annex to Naval Station Treasure Island, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Permit the Navy to dispose of Hunters Point Annex to Naval Station Treasure Island, San Francisco, California, in any lawful manner, including outleasing.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

[Note: Motions 116 and 117 were voted on together.]

115. Public Works Center (PWC) San Francisco, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Disestablish the Public Works Center (PWC) San Francisco.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

116. Western Engineering Field Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC), San Bruno, CA

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Realign the Western Engineering Field Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC), San Bruno, California. Retain in place necessary personnel, equipment and support as a Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Engineering Field Activity under the management of the Southwestern Field Division, NAVFAC, San Diego, California.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: Stuart  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

117. O'Hare International Airport, Air Reserves Station, Chicago, IL

[See Motion 27(d).]

118. Data Center Consolidation Plan

I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from criteria 2 and 3 and, therefore, that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on the DoD-wide Data Center Consolidation Plan, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation: Disestablish the 43 DISA information processing centers listed below:

Navy Sites

NSC Charleston, SC	NSC Puget Sound, WA
ASO Philadelphia, PA	NSC Norfolk, VA
NCTS Pensacola, FL	NAWC AD Patuxent River, MD
NAWC WD China Lake, CA	NAWC WD Point Mugu, CA
FISC San Diego, CA	NSC Pearl Harbor, HI
FACSO Port Hueneme, CA	NAS Whidbey Island, WA
TRF Bangor, WA	TRF Kings Bay, GA
NAS Brunswick, ME	NAS Key West, FL
NAS Mayport, FL	NAS Oceana, VA
EPMAC New Orleans, LA	NCTAMSLANT Norfolk, VA
BUPERS Washington, DC	NCTS New Orleans, LA
NCTS Washington, DC	CRUITCOM Arlington, VA
NCTAMS EASTPAC Pearl Harbor, HI	NARDAC San Francisco, CA
NAVDAF Corpus Christi, TX	NCCOSC San Diego, CA

Marine Corps Sites

MCAS Cherry Point, NC	RASC Camp Lejeune, NC
RASC Camp Pendleton, CA	MCAS El Toro, CA

Air Force Sites

CPSC San Antonio, TX	7th CG, Pentagon, VA
AFMPC Randolph AFB, TX	

Defense Logistics Agency Sites

IPC Battle Creek, MI	IPC Ogden, UT
IPC Philadelphia, PA	IPC Richmond, VA

Defense Information Systems Agency Sites

DITSO Indianapolis IPC, IN  
DITSO Kansas City IPC, MO  
DITSO Columbus Annex (Dayton), OH  
RMBA Cleveland, OH

FINAL DRAFT

Consolidate the information processing center workload at the following 16 megacenters:

Recommended Megacenter Locations

- Columbus, Ohio
- Ogden, Utah
- San Antonio, Texas
- Rock Island, Illinois
- Montgomery, Alabama
- Denver, Colorado
- Warner-Robins, Georgia
- Huntsville, Alabama
- Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania
- Dayton, Ohio
- St. Louis, Missouri
- Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
- Jacksonville, Florida
- Chambersburg, Pennsylvania
- San Diego, California
- Sacramento, California

The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

Motion made by: Johnson  
Motion seconded by: McPherson  
Vote for: Unanimous (7) [voice vote]  
Vote against: (0)

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL

TO: SHEILA  
FROM: MARY ANN  
RE: UPDATE ON ASSIGNMENTS  
JUNE 20 5:55 P.M.

*2 separate copy -  
of one copy just  
dry dock but not  
others, could direct  
also to former &  
eval 18/19.*

RE: BATTLECREEK AND DLA: IF DLA LEAVES THE PROPERTY REVERTS TO GSA AND ITS GSA'S PROBLEM THAT IT IS A NATIONAL HISTORICAL LANDMARK. IF A MILLION HOOPS ARE JUMPED THROUGH IT COULD BE DEMOLISHED (IF LAW IS FOLLOWED) BUT ITS NOT A PROBLEM FOR US TO LEAVE IT.

RE: DRY DOCK COMPETITION: SPOKE TO NAVY LAWYER, HAVE REGS AND SPOKE TO LARRY. I ANSWERED HIS QUESTION AND IT IS NOT REALLY PERTINENT TO OUR DECISIONS. K PROCUREMENT ISSUE.

RE: A-76 FOR LEASE OF DRY DOCK FOR A CLOSED SHIPYARD. ADVISED LARRY THAT IT DOESN'T APPEAR TO APPLY IN THIS SITUATION. NO JOBS ARE BEING REPLACED- LEASE IS GIVEN AND THE COMPANY EMPLOYS PEOPLE.

RE: CULMINATIVE ECON IMPACT: SEE MEMO

RE: DLA LETTERS OUT OF CONF ON MARCH 26- BOB SAID HE'D KNOW AND HE HAS NO IDEA WHAT THIS IS ABOUT. CONFERENCES ARE HELD ALL THE TIME AND WE NEVER RECEIVED ANYTHING "SPICY" RE: DLA/BAD NUMBERS/PHIL

*Im...  
DLA?*

RE: CLASSIFIED OCEANIA BRIEF: CANCELLED PER WAYNE

RE: NCR: STILL WORKING. SPOKE TO BILL. BILL HASN'T MET WITH GSA. THEY ARE AVOIDING. HE'S GOING OVER TO BULLY THEM IN A.M. SPOKE TO ED SHAPIRO (REPRESENTS NAVAIR) SPOKE TO ED NEWBERRY HE WANTS A DATE UH I MEAN HE WANTS TO HELP US SORT OUR LEGAL ISSUES. I TOLD HIM I'D WAIT TO HEAR RE: GSA'S POSITION LEGALLY AND EMOTIONALLY. BILL SENT NAVY K LAWYER THE CONTRACT- ATTACHED K.

RE: MOTIONS. YOU KNOW WHERE WE ARE. I'M ADVISING ALEX AND TRYING TO PRAY FOR PROGRESS!

RE: SLIDES: THEY WILL BE BY CATEGORY- SEE ATTACHED. UNFORTUNATELY THEY WILL BE IN 4 SEP BOOKS- TEAMS. SEE ATTACHED FOR CATEGORY ORDER.

*Journal Books/Memoir -*

*if prob I mitigate - work all weekend - 10/15/05  
2) would prob - DLA books  
can do*

*John Henderson - 10/15/05*

*CBT can be mitigated*

*not conflict;  
not conflict of interest  
see memo.*

OPEN MEETING

9:30 a.m.

Hart Senate Office Building  
Room 216  
Washington, D.C.

Friday, June 22, 1995

*final deliberation  
transcript of 1995  
BRAC*

- ① beginning
- ② beginning of 2nd day
- ③ conclusion

SIOWERS PRESENT:

Ian Dixon

Iton W. Cornella

Rebecca G. Cox

S. B. Davis

S. Lee Kling

Enjamala Montoya

Endi Louise Steele

Jose Robles

*(major parts missing; Col Brown, Army team leader in 95 and consulting member of 5005 BRAC has entire transcript.)*

Page 2

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to the first day of the final deliberations of the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

My name is Alan Dixon, and I am chairman of the Commission. With me are my colleagues, Commissioners A. Cornella, Rebecca Cox, General J.B. Davis, S. Lee Kling, Admiral Benjamin Montoya, General Joe Robles, and Wend Steele.

Today, we will begin to decide which military bases to recommend to the President for closure or realignment. It is a painful responsibility which none of us sought, but which we are determined to carry out in a deliberate way that will improve long-term military readiness and insure we are spending the American taxpayers' money in the most efficient way possible.

Yet, as unappealing as our task is, I can assure every American taxpayer that we are as well-prepared for it as any eight people could be. In the 16 weeks since we received the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, our commissioners and staff have made 205 visits to the 165

Page 3

military installations and activities. We conducted 16 regional hearings around the country and in Guam. We held another 13 hearings in Washington and have had hundreds of meetings with community representatives and elected officials.

The commissioners have worked hard. The staff has worked hard. The process has been open at every point, and whatever the outcome of our votes, I am confident when I say I believe that every community on the list has been treated and will be judged fairly.

Before I describe how the final deliberations will be conducted, I wanted to offer my thanks on behalf of the other commissioners and our staff to all the military and civilian personnel who have cooperated with us completely and graciously during what is clearly a traumatic time for them. They show character beyond words and do their country proud.

Now, let me describe how these deliberations will proceed. When we finish our work today, we will resume work in this room at 8:30 tomorrow morning and Saturday morning. If we have not finished by Saturday, we will take off Sunday and return here Monday morning at 8:30 and for as many mornings as necessary.

Page 3

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Service Team	10
Jim Owsley, Team Leader	
Ann Reese, DOD Analyst	
Christian Foran, Analyst	
Glenn Knechtle, GAO Analyst	
Les Farrington, GAO Analyst	
Dick Belmer, GAO Analyst	
Joe Varallo, Associate Analyst	
Service Team	339
Frank Cirillo, Team Leader	
Lieutenant Colonel Bob Bivins, DOD Analyst-COBRA	
Steve Beary, Economic Analyst	
Deirdre Murrie, Environmental Analyst	
Don Flippen, FAA Analyst	
Marilyn Wasleski, GAO Analyst	
Andy Trippet, Associate Analyst	
Pages: 32, 36, 48, 133, 139, 219, 231, 236, 238, 252, 258, 289, 293, 299, 302, 306, 311, 314, 317, 319, 322, 325, 330, 332, 336, 348, 355, 371, 389, 391, 393, 418, 420, 443, 445, 449, 454, 457, 467, 470, 473, 478, 483, 486,	

Page 4

We have deliberately left these work days open-ended and will know only late on each day what time we will stop work. For those reasons, it is impossible to predict in advance what time of what day a base will be considered.

We will begin in a few minutes with a presentation by our staff cross-service team. This presentation will include the installations in the following categories: Air Force laboratories and product centers; Air Force depots; Army depots; Navy depots/warfare centers; Navy technical centers; and the Dugway Proving Ground and a group of miscellaneous Air Force installations.

As will be the case throughout the deliberations, our staff will present the commissioners with the results of its review and analysis of the data underlying the recommendations on the Secretary's list and regarding the bases the Commission added for consideration on May 10.

After the presentation on each installation, there will be as many questions and as much debate as the commissioners desire, and then it will be appropriate to entertain a motion for some kind of action. It is our intention to vote on each installation after its presentation. The final result on each base will be known at

...the fact that we have until July 1  
normal report to the President.  
cross-service team is finished, we will  
Air Force, then the Navy, the Army, and  
ense Logistics Agency.  
me take a minute to describe our voting  
use it may be slightly confusing at times.  
e statute affords the recommendations for of  
f Defense a presumption of correctness. From  
point, that means the Commission can  
dify the Secretary's recommendation only by a

on to reject or modify the Secretary's  
n ends in a tie, then the motion fails and the  
ommendation stands. In addition, in order to  
retary's recommendation, the Commission must  
finding that the recommendation has  
viated from the force structure and base

ie of a motion to accept the Secretary's  
n, a tie vote is all that is needed to support  
A majority vote is not necessary. The base

1 personally prefer to achieve greater savings.  
2 As I have said earlier, the base closure law allows  
3 the Commission to remove a base from the Secretary's list  
4 only if it finds substantial deviation from the force  
5 structure plan or the selection criteria. For my part, I  
6 will apply a very rigid test to this question of substantial  
7 deviation, because I believe that closing bases now is the  
8 key to the continued readiness and future modernization of  
9 our military forces.

10 Now, ladies and gentlemen, we're ready to begin.  
11 And I would ask that all the staff members who may be  
12 testifying today please stand, and I will administer the  
13 oath.

14 [Staff sworn.]

15 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Director Lyles, you may begin,  
16 sir. And thank you from this entire Commission for the  
17 excellent work done by you and your staff.

18 MR. LYLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good  
19 morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. Before  
20 we turn to the Commission review and analysis staff to begin  
21 a discussion of the closure and realignment recommendations,  
22 I would like to take just a moment or two to make two points

Page 8

does not give the same presumption to bases  
t by the Commission. These bases can be  
ned only with a majority vote.  
there is no need to make a motion to keep  
open. We do not have to vote on all the bases  
if we do not vote, that particular base will

r will try to make sure we all understand  
ns as we proceed with the voting.  
ore I recognize the Commission staff  
l Lyles, who will begin the presentations, I  
ay a few words about the difficult task at  
approach it. I believe the elimination of  
cture in the Defense Department is critical  
f the military services to maintain and  
r forces over the next decade.  
are aware of the pressures on the defense  
last 10 years, the defense budget has  
t 40 percent in real terms. For FY 1996, the  
: for modernization and procurement of new  
4 billion - down 71 percent since 1986, and  
its lowest level since 1950.

Page 11

1 to set the stage for the Commission's discussions over the  
2 next several days.

3 The first point involves the financial and  
4 budgetary context of the Commission's deliberations. As you  
5 can see from the first chart on the screen there, back on  
6 March 1st, the Defense Department estimated that the base  
7 closure and realignment recommendations they were forwarding  
8 to the Commission had one-time, up-front costs of \$3.74  
9 billion, with annual savings of 1.77 billion once they were  
10 implemented, and a 20-year savings of \$21 billion.

11 Two things have happened since March 1st that have  
12 changed or could change these cost and savings estimates.  
13 The first is that the military services, principally the Army  
14 and the Air Force, have gone out and done detailed site  
15 surveys of the installations on their closure lists. As a  
16 result of these site surveys, the services have revised the  
17 one-time cost and annual savings projections on a number of  
18 their recommendations.

19 The second line on this chart shows the cumulative  
20 results of these revisions. Using the Defense Department's  
21 own figures, the one-time cost to implement their March 1st  
22 recommendations have now gone up by \$337 million, or 9

Page 9

36, we have reduced the size of the  
percent. If this Commission closes everything  
: wants closed this year, we will have reduced  
re by just 21 percent in all four rounds of

: no bad bases left to vote on. All the  
fore us have made it through three rigorous  
Nonetheless, throughout our four months of  
and analysis, certain indisputable facts  
DOD officials have testified that even after  
ompleted, there will still be significant  
icture in the Defense Department.  
DOD officials have also testified that the  
unting on the savings from this round to  
line in their modernization funding. Third,  
ense budget is likely to decline over the next  
d fourth, this is the last round of closures  
nt, expedited procedure, and it is unclear  
ess will ever authorize another round.  
aid that, I believe it is critical that the  
ieve at the very minimum the level of savings  
arch by the Secretary of Defense. I would

Page 12

1 percent. Their annual savings have gone down by \$146  
2 million, or 8.3 percent. And the 20-year savings have gone  
3 down by \$1.9 billion, a little over 9 percent.

4 The second thing that has happened, Mr. Chairman,  
5 is that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the  
6 Army have written, asking the Commission to remove several  
7 installations from the March 1st list. These installations  
8 are listed on the second chart and include Kirtland Air Force  
9 Base in the Air Force, Dugway Proving Ground, and two smaller  
10 installations in the Army.

11 If the Commission agrees with the Department's  
12 recommendation to remove these installations from the list,  
13 the financial result is shown on this slide. The one-time up  
14 front cost to implement the closures and realignments  
15 declined by 225 million, or 6 percent, from the March 1st  
16 figure. The annual savings declined by 199 million, or 11  
17 percent. And the 20-year savings declined by 2.1 billion, or  
18 10 percent.

19 So, Mr. Chairman, the message here is that if the  
20 Commission were just to accept the Defense Department's  
21 recommendations as they stand now, using the Defense  
22 Department's numbers, the annual savings would be 11 percent

Defense Department estimated when they sent the list to Commission on March the 1st.

The second area I would like to highlight briefly, Chairman, is the Commission's approach to economic impact cumulative economic impact in our analysis of the Defense Department recommendations over the past four months. Economic impact is one of the eight selection criteria ordered by the Defense Department when they drew up their recommendations.

In the presentations by the Commission's staff over next several days, you will see estimates for economic impact and for cumulative economic impact for each installation on the Secretary of Defense's list of recommendations, as well as on the Commission's list of bases for consideration.

The economic impact of a proposed closure or argument of an installation is defined as "The direct and indirect job loss resulting from a realignment or closure as a percent of the employment base within its economic area."

The cumulative economic impact of a closure or argument is "The direct and indirect job loss as a percent

2 three shaded installations are those that are recommended by  
3 the Department of Defense for closure or realignment. We  
4 have a map that shows the location of each of these  
5 installations.

6 Our next chart begins with the first installation,  
7 which is the Rome Laboratory, located at Griffiss Air Force  
8 Base in New York. Rome Laboratory is the Air Force center of  
9 excellence for command, control, communications, computers,  
10 and intelligence, known as C4-I. And it is one of the Air  
11 Force's tier I top laboratories.

12 According to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of  
13 Staff -- and I quote -- "In each of the world wars of this  
14 century, new technology debuted that revolutionized the way  
15 we fought wars. The revolution occurring today is in C4-I."

16 Chart A-4 -- will you please put the chart back?  
17 This chart shows the Secretary of Defense's recommendation  
18 and the cost-savings personnel and the economic impact  
19 involved.

20 The Secretary's recommendation is to close Rome  
21 lab. Chart A-5 shows the DOD proposed relocation of Rome  
22 Laboratory's activities and personnel positions to Hanscom

Page 14  
e employment base resulting from the proposed 1995  
closure or realignment action, other proposed 1995 closure or  
arguments across all the services within the same economic  
area and prior closure or realignment actions across all the  
services within the same economic area."

Mr. Chairman and commissioners, I think our hearing  
has demonstrated that the economic impact estimates  
presented are just estimates and are considered by most  
experts to be worst-case estimates, and the actual  
economic impacts of base closures may or may not reflect this  
worst case.

I would also like to emphasize that the data and  
methods used to estimate economic impacts are well-  
documented and are applied consistently across all the  
installations in the Commission's review process. We have  
two senior economists on our staff helping us in this

Mr. Dave Henry from the Department of Commerce, and Mr.  
Wilson from FEMA.

Mr. Chairman, with these introductory remarks, I  
trust the staff is ready to proceed with the first category  
of closure and realignment recommendations. Mr. Ben Borden,  
Director of review and analysis, is on my right. And on

Page 17  
1 Air Force Base and Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. Under this  
2 plan, the lab site, a modelling and fabrication facility,  
3 along with personnel, will remain at Griffiss Air Force Base.

4 The next chart shows the issues we have reviewed.  
5 The DOD position is that its costs are fair and have a six-  
6 year return on investment, while the community's position is  
7 that it will take more than 100 years for the return on  
8 investment. Our review and analysis show a 13-year return on  
9 investment.

10 The second issue involves space. DOD's position is  
11 that space is available for the renovation at Hanscom Air  
12 Force Base without constructing new facilities. The  
13 community's position is that renovated and new facilities  
14 will be needed. The staff, because of a timing problem on  
15 the facility to be modified at Hanscom, found that a new  
16 facility or an investment in interim facilities will be  
17 required.

18 DOD's position on Rome activity to be moved to Fort  
19 Monmouth is that they will increase cross-servicing. The  
20 community's position is that it breaks up teams of highly  
21 committed individuals without standing C4-I expertise and  
22 capabilities who are currently involved in DOD and

Page 15  
ent is Mr. Jim Owsley, the team chief of the cross-  
service team, who will begin the discussion and presentation.

MR. OWSLEY: Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman  
and commissioners. It's a pleasure to be here this morning  
to present our analysis of the Secretary of Defense's  
recommendations on product centers and laboratories,  
activity centers, depots, and air warfare centers.

Starting me on the first portion of my testimony is Dick  
Cantwell; next to him is Les Farrington; and then last in line,  
Mark Cantwell, all senior analysts for the Commission staff.

The cross-services presentation today will address  
installations. The installations are divided into seven  
categories that you see on the screens before you. Category  
A is the Air Force product centers and laboratories; Category  
B is the Air Force depots; Category C is the Army depots;  
Category D is Navy depots and warfare centers; Categories E  
through G includes 15 installations that span the Air Force,  
Navy, and Army.

We would now like to get into the first of the  
product centers. The next chart depicts the seven Air Force  
product centers and laboratories. They are Hanscom Air Force  
Base, Rome Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base,

Page 18  
1 interservicing projects. We believe that no increase in  
2 cross-servicing is likely to occur from this relocation.

3 DOD's position is that some loss in Rome's  
4 laboratory missions effectiveness will result, but they will  
5 return at a later date. The community's position is that  
6 most key personnel will not relocate and that the lab will  
7 never be the same.

8 We believe there is a high probability that team  
9 expertise would be seriously degraded by the closure and  
10 relocation. Many personnel will not move and, as a result,  
11 the gaining installations would have to hire new people who  
12 will have to be trained.

13 The Air Force, the last issue is one involving re-  
14 use. And the Air Force is no longer committed to the  
15 community's re-use plan, because the law requires them to  
16 look at bases that are open equally each time they start the  
17 process. There's a 1993 letter to the then Commission from  
18 the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for  
19 installations stating, "The Air Force has no plans to close  
20 or relocate Rome Laboratory within the next five years."

21 The community believes this program promise limits  
22 its redevelopment of Griffiss Air Force Base Rome Lab. The

hart on Rome Lab shows the pros and cons discussed previously. And those pros are frastructure will be gained at the gaining will eliminate some excess laboratory space. e one-time costs to do this and the longer-investment and the breakup of a proven lab

our presentation on Rome Laboratory. Do uestions?

AN DIXON: Thank you very much, Mr. Owsley. f my colleagues have any questions of Mr. ny member of the staff regarding Rome Labs? ioner Kling?

SSIONER KLING: Mr. Owsley, I noticed the e in the annual savings between what the Defense has shown and what the staff does. for that? What's the largest factor that makes percent difference? And the other question to this is a very high technical location. 've touched on the fact that we would

2 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you very much.  
3 MR. HELMER: The basic difference between our  
4 estimate and the Air Force's is that we moved less people, as  
5 far as the personnel eliminated were concerned. We felt that  
6 the Air Force overstated the savings personnel-wise. We also  
7 added \$8 million for the interim building to locate people or  
8 to construct, if you will, a new facility. Those are the  
9 basic differences.

10 COMMISSIONER KLING: You're comfortable with those  
11 figures?

12 MR. HELMER: Yes, sir, we are.

13 COMMISSIONER KLING: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any other questions by  
15 my colleagues?

16 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Montoya.

18 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: I wish to focus on the  
19 savings side, because there the percentage change is even  
20 larger than on the cost side. Can one of you put your finger  
21 on one or two variables as to why there's such a large swing  
22 between the community position and ours and the Department's

ir or could impair the effectiveness of that.  
d of touch on that a little bit, as well, as to  
s feelings on that respect are?

W/SLEY: Yes. I would like to touch on the  
then ask Mr. Helmer, who did the analysis,  
st portion of that. Rome Lab is a highly  
e Air Force and has been in operation for  
ears. They assist many, many agencies of the  
her than the Air Force and particularly in the  
mmunity.

ve interrelated labs that assist each other  
hey're totally netted together in fiber optics  
hey have immediate communications, clear  
is. I think, as in almost any laboratory in this  
judged really good, the thing that makes a  
echnology center are the people.

his case, as we went through the laboratory  
I and talked to people and we had several visits  
a large number of these people indicated that  
-term residents of the area. And some were  
t, not ready to take retirement, but would take  
it if it meant relocating themselves and their

1 in the savings piece?

2 MR. HELMER: Yes, sir. The main savings in the  
3 analysis result from personnel eliminations. And we  
4 eliminated less people in the Air Force.

5 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: And how about the community?  
6 Why are the community savings so low?

7 MR. HELMER: Well, the community did a number of  
8 things. They included, for example, a higher discount rate.  
9 The standard rate we're using is in the area of, I believe,  
10 2.75. And theirs is 4.85. They also included things like  
11 locality pay. And they also didn't accept the personnel  
12 reductions.

13 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Did not, you say?

14 MR. HELMER: Did not, yes.

15 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any further questions by  
17 any of the commissioners?

18 COMMISSIONER COX: Mr. Owsley -

19 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.

20 COMMISSIONER COX: I was on the 1993 Commission,  
21 and I certainly agree that the '95 Commission is in no way  
22 bound by the 1993 Commission. But I do note that there are

ms likely that the continuity of a team  
together for many years will certainly be  
he Air Force concurs with this, but they  
ave a management plan that would put them  
me like type people in some cases at Hanscom  
e and that in time, the team synergism through  
the personnel that do move would come back  
od a team as Rome currently has.

point out that Rome Laboratory does report  
n command, so this is not like taking a  
t is totally new to a command, because the  
Hanscom is also the commander of Rome. So there  
, if you will, that he and his staff will  
ome Laboratory. And that mitigates to some  
cern that we have, but it does not replace the  
believe would not move.

IAN DIXON: Mr. Helmer, can you cast any light  
issioner's question on cost?

ELMER: Yes, sir. The basic difference

IAN DIXON: Talk into your mike, Mr. Helmer.

1 over 40 directs, redirects, or changes from decisions we did  
2 make in 1993.

3 And while I'm not in the position of defending all  
4 the of '93 decisions and certainly things have changed since  
5 then, I am interested in sort of what the differences are  
6 from 1993 in the DOD recommendation. And we obviously  
7 decided in 1993 that moving the Rome labs was not cost-  
8 effective.

9 Since then, if you might just tell me a little bit  
10 - and it's certainly not a big factor, but a factor in this  
11 re-use plan. Because one of the arguments has been, "Gosh,  
12 we counted on the Rome labs for the re-use plan. We were  
13 entitled to do so, not because the '93 Commission didn't  
14 close it, but because the Air Force made a commitment to it."  
15 What is the re-use plan? Have there been legitimate  
16 reliances on the Air Force commitment?

17 MR. OWSLEY: Yes, commissioner. After the closing  
18 of Griffiss Air Force Base where Rome is located and the  
19 Commission and the Air Force's position to keep Rome lab in  
20 place, the Rome lab people tried to offset the loss of the  
21 personnel and the economic effects of losing Griffiss by  
22 starting a re-use plan that involved as its hub Rome's

... what has happened at the parent, Hanscom Air Force, in that area, as we know, around Boston.

The city around there and the State of New York has an approximately \$10 million to date to start a re-use activity. That re-use activity that we have seen indications on -- and it shows and it uses right in the area of that industrial technology complex is Rome Laboratory.

And because of the nature of the work they do, there will be a propensity to draw other like firms, which is what Rome was trying to do, was to develop a technology base rather than manufacturing base, because they believed that would propel them into the future.

They did use Rome as a base. They relied on the years. And if you look at their plan that they presented to us several times, it focused around the ability that Rome might have to be privatized or might stand on its own at the end of the five-year period. That was an important assumption on their part.

I will say that as you look at the laboratory structure and what I believe led the Air Force to the

... correct?

MR. OWSLEY: The cross-service group did not recommend it for closure. It recommended its realignment to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, along with the Navy's SPAWAR and other such C4-I activities. There could have been great synergism occur there, but the services -- each of the services, for the reasons that they analyzed, did not adopt that recommendation. So in the end, the Air Force, in trying to consolidate on their own, recommended the movement of Rome Laboratory to Hanscom.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there any other question by any commissioner of this staff?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there any motion by any commissioner regarding the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense with reference to Rome Laboratory? Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Mr. Chairman, before we have a motion, can we --

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Robles.

... recommendation is they have a serious reduction in laboratories coming in the future.

And they had to look for ways to consolidate things that are ready for those reductions that are imminent. So there was a difference in the Air Force's recommendation in contrast to '95 for those reasons. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER COX: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any further questions any commissioner regarding this staff report on Rome?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, just one short

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Davis.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Recognizing that one of the major reasons is to do some consolidation among laboratories that DOD put this one forth, or one of the reasons, clearly, I just -- is this an opinion -- we lose synergism by not doing that, or do you think you maintain the level of good work that Rome performs if they stay right where they are?

MR. OWSLEY: I think you will retain the synergism that Rome has with the other services in that better by moving them where they are. Hanscom is not a C4-I activity

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: I didn't realize we were going to go right into the vote. That's my fault. But I think there ought to be -- I want to make just a couple of statements, because I think it's applicable to this whole family of things we're going to talk about.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Robles.

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: I spent most of my adult life in the military and in the Army, and so I'm a simple soldier. So I'm going to come at it from a simple point of view. I'm gravely concerned about this whole category of laboratories and production centers in all the services. And let me tell you why.

One of my responsibilities on active duty was to make a lot of these things happen, do realignments, come up with alternatives, work BRAC issues. And it was relatively easy when we're talking about moving force structure type decisions. That is, it was easy to move a tank battalion or move a brigade or move a tactical fighter wing. We know how to do this, the military. They know how to do it. They have done it for all of my tenure in the military. And it's pretty straightforward.

What concerns me greatly is that as we start the

... It's an acquisition activity, mainly. They do not move Rome Laboratory, but they do not do the same kind of activities.

The cross-services group recommended that the synergy in the C4-I area would be enhanced by moving all of the C4-I activities to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, where there is a large organization doing that. And that would be enhanced getting the Navy, Army, and Air Force together. That recommendation was not picked up by any one of the services.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you, Commissioner Davis. Are there any questions of any commissioner of the staff?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion? Pardon me, Commissioner Steele.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: One final thing, really briefly. So the bottom line with that, Mr. Owsley, was that the joint cross-service group recommended it for inclusion in their proposal to increase cross-servicing, the recommendation that came to us actually does not

defense downsizing, the focus now is on infrastructure. We're going to do the force structure reduction. That's going to happen automatically. And, as you look at the track record since '89, we have done that very well. We have taken over a third of the military's capability -- war fighting capability out very quickly.

But when we start to dabble in infrastructure and start to make adjustments in infrastructure, we don't have quite as good a template to do that. And I worry a lot when we start to move labs around. I worry a lot when we start to move very highly sophisticated test centers. I worry a lot when we move basic production facilities in which there is no analogue in the civilian sector.

The military has always been a leader in these laboratory facilities. And a lot of the work that happens in the military labs spins off to the civilian sector. At the same time, we're cutting back on FFRDCs, federally funded research and development center grants, to universities and other places.

So I just have to say that as we get ready to vote on this whole family of laboratories and on this whole family of infrastructure and production facilities and things in

are many in some sectors, but there's a lot  
which there's a void out there -- that we don't  
same bucket as moving a tank battalion or a  
wing or a force structure action that's  
ple by military standards and we think twice.  
I just have to say that this is sort of --  
want to call it my protest, statement that I  
nervous about starting to break apart labs that  
ars to construct to build the teamwork to do the  
to get the right teams in place and say,  
n do that."  
u use the same analogue like, well, take  
s and move them from Fort A to Fort B." So  
pobox for the day, but I think it's something we  
about as we start to vote in some of these  
ons.

AN DIXON: Thank you very much, Commissioner

re any other questions or statements?  
(No response.)

MAN DIXON: Is there a motion?

2 cover --  
3 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Pardon me. Ladies and gentlemen,  
4 it will be a long few days. And we understand that some will  
5 leave when their results have been obtained, and we respect  
6 that. Please do it in an orderly way. We have got a lot of  
7 work to do.  
8 Commissioner Owsley? I mean -- pardon me. Mr.  
9 Owsley.  
10 (Laughter.)  
11 MR. OWSLEY: I will take promotions any time I can  
12 get them.  
13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Don't ever take this job, Jim.  
14 I'm telling you. Mr. Owsley.  
15 MR. OWSLEY: Thank you. The next laboratory area  
16 that we'll cover is Kirtland, which will be covered by Mr.  
17 Frank Cantwell.  
18 MR. CANTWELL: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,  
19 commissioners. March 1st, the Department of Defense  
20 recommended the realignment of Kirtland Air Force Base. The  
21 Department's recommendation would relocate most of the units  
22 currently located on Kirtland, leaving the Phillips

COMMISSIONER COX: Mr. Chairman.  
MAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.  
M O T I O N  
COMMISSIONER COX: Having been moved by  
Robles' very fine remarks, I move that the  
find that the Secretary of Defense deviated  
from final criteria 1, 4, and 5 and, therefore,  
reject the Secretary's recommendation on Rome  
and instead adopt the following recommendation:  
Laboratory, Rome, New York, including all  
facilities. The Commission finds that this  
on is consistent with the force structure plan  
ria.  
MAN DIXON: Is there a second to the motion by  
Cox?  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: I second the motion.  
MAN DIXON: It is seconded by Commissioner  
here any comments or remarks concerning this  
Commissioner Cox?  
(No response.)  
MAN DIXON: If not, counsel will call the roll  
by Commissioner Cox, seconded by Commissioner

1 Laboratory in a contoned area.  
2 Of special note, Kirtland is also the home of the  
3 Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratory. The slide  
4 on the left -- and could you please put the base analysis  
5 slide on the right. The slide on the left is an excerpt from  
6 a memorandum sent from Secretary Perry to Chairman Dixon.  
7 I would like to summarize the paragraph on the left  
8 by saying that after the Secretary reviewed the results of  
9 the site survey, he felt that this recommendation was no  
10 longer fiscally or operationally sound. The fiscal concerns  
11 are shown on the base analysis slide on the right.  
12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: May I interrupt you, Mr. Cantwell?  
13 MR. CANTWELL: Yes, sir.  
14 CHAIRMAN DIXON: I doubt that there's any question  
15 in the mind of any commissioner regarding Kirtland. If the  
16 Chair is wrong, would any commissioner who thinks otherwise  
17 speak up? But my only thought was, it's going to be a long  
18 time, and this one is not in any -- is there any debate about  
19 it? Is there any commissioner that needs to hear more?  
20 (No response.)  
21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion on Kirtland Air  
22 Base?

EEDON: Commissioner Cox?  
COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
EEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
EEDON: Commissioner Kling?  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
EEDON: Commissioner Montoya?  
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
EEDON: Commissioner Robles?  
COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
EEDON: Commissioner Steele?  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
EEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
EEDON: Mr. Chairman?  
MAN DIXON: Aye.  
EEDON: Mr. Chairman, the votes are eight  
nays.  
MAN DIXON: The vote on the first motion is  
no nays. And the recommendation of the  
defense is unanimously rejected.

1 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion.  
2 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Davis.  
3 M O T I O N  
4 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Sir, I move the Commission  
5 find the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from  
6 final criteria 4 and 5 in the force structure plan.  
7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a second to the motion by  
8 Commissioner Davis?  
9 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Second.  
10 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Sir, I'm going to have to put  
11 an add-in here.  
12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Pardon me, commissioner. I  
13 apologize.  
14 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: The Washington weather has got  
15 me on a postnasal drip, and so I had to slow down, sir.  
16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Excuse me.  
17 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: The Commission reject the  
18 Secretary's recommendation on Kirtland Air Force Base, New  
19 Mexico, and instead adopt the following recommendation:  
20 Retain Kirtland Air Force Base, including all units, base  
21 activities, and facilities. The Commission finds this  
22 recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan

d my apologies.  
 Is there a second?  
 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Second, Mr. Chairman.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Montoya seconds the  
 tion of Commissioner Davis.  
 Are there any comments regarding the motion?  
 (No response.)  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel, will you call the roll?  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?  
 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?  
 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?  
 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA; Aye.

3 This is borne out by the fact that the Air Force  
 4 projects it would have to construct or renovate nearly 1  
 5 million square feet to be able to take on the Brooks mission.  
 6 Brooks currently operates in very nice and well-maintained  
 7 facilities in a campus-like environment in San Antonio.  
 8 The San Antonio community would most prefer that  
 9 Brooks remain open as it is. They, however, have offered a  
 10 sound proposal that would preserve the Brooks mission and its  
 11 linkage to the San Antonio biomedical community by placing  
 12 into cantonment most of the Brooks facilities.  
 13 Cantonment saves the 200 million up-front costs of  
 14 the Air Force's recommendation, and it offers additional  
 15 annual savings of nearly \$18 million and net present value  
 16 savings of 248 million by having the Brooks base operating  
 17 services taken over by nearby Lackland reorganization Kelly  
 18 Air Force Base. The cantonment plan would also make part of  
 19 Brooks available for re-use.  
 20 The map on the left indicates the spaces that are  
 21 intended for Brooks at Wright-Patterson. They are not  
 22 contiguous while they are at Brooks. And this is a concern

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?  
 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the votes are eight  
 as and zero nays.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the motion is unanimously  
 opted. And the original recommendations of the Secretary  
 Defense which have been, of course, amended by subsequent  
 response to the Commission, is set aside and overruled.  
 So for the folks in the audience, anyone watching  
 it did not understand what has taken place, with respect to  
 me Laboratory and Kirtland Air Force Base, the votes of the  
 mission have held that those two bases remain open.  
 MR. OWSLEY: The next category that we'll cover is  
 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas. The chart on the  
 t indicates the Air Force's position relative to Brooks.  
 ere are a lot of words, but essentially, the recommendation  
 to close Brooks and move the major portions of it to  
 right-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio.  
 Among its activities, Brooks Air Force Base  
 nducts approximately 40 percent of the human systems and

1 that has been expressed by the community. The map on the  
 2 right reflects the Brooks proposed cantonment. You can see  
 3 the continuous nature of the buildings in the shaded area on  
 4 the map.  
 5 I might add that the Air Force has informed the  
 6 Commission officially that if the Commission were to decide  
 7 to reject the Department's recommendation on Brooks, the Air  
 8 Force would prefer to retain Brooks open as is rather than to  
 9 place Brooks into cantonment. The Air Force believes that  
 10 cantonment is unworkable in the long term.  
 11 Our last chart summarizes the pros and cons that  
 12 you have heard previously. Are there any further questions  
 13 on Brooks?  
 14 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any questions by any  
 15 commissioner of Mr. Owsley or others on the staff concerning  
 16 Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio?  
 17 Commissioner Kling?  
 18 COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Owsley, my question goes  
 19 to when you look at this presentation about the cantonment  
 20 from the community, it looks like you still receive quite a  
 21 bit of savings, with a smaller up-front cost and so forth.  
 22 What is the Air Force's reasoning that it feels that they

ospace related medical research and product development  
 thin the Department of Defense. Brooks's primary  
 nponents are the human systems center Armstrong laboratory,  
 Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine, and the Air Force  
 nter for Environmental Excellence.  
 Will you put up the next two charts? The Air Force  
 uns to consolidate similar activities and has recommended  
 closure of Brooks and the movement of the mission and  
 rsonnel to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio.  
 ight-Patterson conducts about 20 percent of DOD's aerospace  
 dical research.  
 The overriding issues in this recommendation are  
 closure costs, the disruption of the mission, and the  
 ndition of facilities. Implementation of the  
 ommendation would require an up-front cost of over \$200  
 llion and has the potential to interrupt many critical  
 earch projects.  
 More than half of the professional staff at Brooks  
 ve said they probably will not move. This figure is based  
 a petition that was circulated at the center which was  
 ven to us on our visit. Some of the activity at Wright-  
 tterson is similar to that of Brooks. However, the

1 cannot live with the contonement proposal?  
 2 MR. OWSLEY: It is unclear that -- as you know, the  
 3 COBRAs are comparative tools. And in the case when you go  
 4 into a contonement, you don't really have a comparative thing  
 5 that you're trying to do. So those estimates would probably  
 6 have to be refined by the Air Force and the people there.  
 7 There is a feeling that there will not be that large of a  
 8 savings if you really get into the final analysis that the  
 9 Air Force would have to do.  
 10 It would also require services to be provided from  
 11 approximately 10 to 20 miles away, depending on whether you  
 12 use San Antonio -- I mean, Kelly or you use Lackland Air  
 13 Force Base to furnish those services. The Air Force has  
 14 previous experience they had in other areas, and they just do  
 15 not believe this is a satisfactory way to preserve the  
 16 lifestyle that encourages good working by their people.  
 17 So they really believe that they would rather have  
 18 the base remain open if you are not going to accept their  
 19 recommendation. And, by the way, we believe that as a staff,  
 20 after looking where the service would have to come from and  
 21 things like that, that the Air Force is correct in that.  
 22 COMMISSIONER KLING; I'm glad to hear that. I

at very closely. And I feel the same way that  
er Robles felt about Rome, that this is something  
break up and you hate to separate down.  
e facilities, by the way, are pretty fine  
as fine as I've seen anyplace. Anyway, thank

MAN DIXON: Thank you very much, Commissioner

ere any further -- pardon me, Mr. Owsley. Do  
response?

DWSLEY: I think I should say that the one  
dn't come out here in these pros and cons is the  
e interface, which is essentially the cockpit with  
I that the Air Force believes would be better  
h the relocation to Wright-Patterson. And the  
ly agrees with that part of the Air Force  
cause Wright-Patterson really does control the  
those kinds of things.

ld also point out that this is only 20 some  
r so from the Brooks operation, and the Air Force

3 Property Maintenance Agency, which caused all that to be done  
4 by one agency and was finally disbanded because it actually  
5 added cost to the process.

6 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you, Commissioner Davis.

8 Are there any further comments?

9 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Mr. Chairman?

10 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Robles?

11 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: I think -- and I need to say

12 this on the record, because we're very -- and this gets  
13 mostly to Mr. Lyles' concern about savings. I think in this  
14 case, we have a two-edged issue. Issue one is, it's the  
15 wrong thing to do to break up this world class lab and move  
16 it somewhere else.

17 But I think pragmatically, from my on-the-ground  
18 look at Brooks, you're talking about a lot of facilities, a  
19 lot of buildings, a lot of chambers, a lot of test facilities  
20 that require special engineering, special piping, special  
21 certification, special environmental concerns. And although  
22 I won't say I don't believe the numbers, I will tell you that

Page 44

to consider moving those people if this  
ation does not go through.

MAN DIXON: They can do that without BRAC, of

DWSLEY: Yes.

MAN DIXON: Mr. Farrington, do you have a

FARRINGTON: Yes, sir. I might just add, on  
of people, I have a breakdown on the number of  
is man-machine interface, which is the crew  
kind of work that's done at Wright-Pat and also at  
civilians, 59 military, and 44 contractors, for a  
people. That's the breakdown of that man-

MAN DIXON: Thank you.

ere any further questions?

MISSIONER STEELE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MAN DIXON: Commissioner Steele.

MISSIONER STEELE: I just want to say I agree  
sioner Robles' soapbox on this subject, so I won't  
ut just to add on this subject, it's not only  
hip -- I mean, the scientists at Brooks. It's a

1 a number of COBRAs are ordinal measures, not cardinal  
2 measures.

3 And the fact of the matter, I think, is that you  
4 will incur an enormous cost to reconstruct all those very  
5 specialized and sensitive facilities at other places. So not  
6 only doesn't it make sense from a synergistic point of view.  
7 it doesn't make sense from an economic point of view.

8 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you, Commissioner Robles.

9 Are there any further questions or comments?

10 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: I have a comment, Mr.  
11 Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Montoya.

13 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: I wish to register a dissent  
14 from the Air Force view that one has to have separate  
15 logistics support facilities at every base, regardless of  
16 their distance apart. I happen to have lived under a  
17 different model.

18 And I believe as budgets get tougher, as dollars  
19 get more difficult to come by, particularly in the logistics  
20 end of things, that the Air Force would be well-served or DOD  
21 would be well-served to consider themselves a holding company  
22 and provide common support to the activities in the San

Page 45

with other entities in the community,  
and with NASA, which I think is also very

ve have received numerous letters from all of  
s supporting retaining Brooks at its current  
I just wanted to make that comment.

MAN DIXON: Thank you, Commissioner Steele.  
ere any further comments or questions of

MISSIONER DAVIS: Yes, sir.

MAN DIXON: Commissioner Davis.

MISSIONER DAVIS: I would like to speak to the  
interface. Having been a beneficiary of some of  
viator, having been a beneficiary of some of  
products over the years, one of the things that is  
rooks' current location is the fact that they  
significant laboratory and that you have a  
amount of young pilots at Randolph Air Force  
1 draw from and some of us older pilots that you  
m Kelly Air Force Base.

again would like to join General Robles on  
about tinkering with a superb lab. I do agree

1 Antonio area. Because I think there are savings that can be  
2 achieved there. And so I just want to register that I don't  
3 accept the position that every place has to have its own  
4 logistics tail. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you, Commissioner Montoya.

6 Are there any further questions or comments?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?

9 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion.

10 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Davis.

11 M O T I O N

12 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Sir, I move the Commission  
13 find the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from  
14 final criteria 1, 4, and 5 and, therefore, the Commission  
15 reject the Secretary's recommendation on Brooks Air Force  
16 Base and instead adopt the following recommendation: Retain  
17 Brooks Air Force Base, including all activities and  
18 facilities. The Commission finds this recommendation is  
19 consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

20 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a second to the motion by  
21 Commissioner Davis?

22 COMMISSIONER STEELE: I second the motion.

Page 48

Is there any further comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DIXON: The counsel will call the roll.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?

COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?

COMMISSIONER STEELE: aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?

COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?

COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes

2 mobilize." FY '99 core is 78 million hours.

3 A guiding principle through the DOD BRAC process  
4 was that DOD depot structures must be sized to core. The  
5 depot infrastructure should be sized appropriately to be able  
6 to do core work in-house, and other work may be done by the  
7 private sector. Workload is anticipated to be 94 million  
8 hours in FY '99.

9 The next slide, or the one on the right, is Air  
10 Force-wide depot figures. To ensure that the capacity  
11 numbers were solid, the depots reported the workload that  
12 they had actually performed on a commodity-by-commodity basis  
13 during their high water mark year in the late 1980s, plus the  
14 capacity they have built minus the capacity that has been  
15 demolished. In fact, it reports the capability that they had  
16 in the high water mark years, the workload that they were  
17 able to perform.

18 The total FY '99 Air Force depot capacity is 57  
19 million direct labor hours. The total FY '99 Air Force depot  
20 core workload is 27 million direct labor hours. The Air  
21 Force anticipates 29 million hours of workload in FY '99.  
22 All the numbers were reported by the Air Force as certified

zero nays.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the motion is adopted. And  
public in the room and observing this proceeding is  
sed that Brooks Air Force Base San Antonio Air Force Lab  
ains open by the vote of this Commission.

Director Lyles, is your staff prepared to go to Air  
de depots?

MR. LYLES: Yes, sir, we are, Mr. Chairman.

MR. OWSLEY: I would like to introduce the new  
ber who has arrived, Ms. Ann Reese, who is the deputy team  
er for the cross-service group.

The next category, as the Commission noted, is the  
Force depots. The slide depicts the entire universe of  
maintenance facilities within the Department of Defense  
is being displayed so that you can have a visual image of  
numbers and locations of DOD's depots.

My second slide displays a history of the base  
ure process in the depot maintenance area. I have only  
d those organizations that are considered depots. For  
mple, Newark Air Force Base is not listed because it is  
sidered a specialized support center. The depots that  
: not been closed are listed first in blue.

Those that have been proposed by the Department of  
nse for closure during this cycle are listed in green.

se that have been closed or proposed for closure - excuse  
Those that have been closed are listed in red.

The Army has either closed or proposed for closure  
f its original nine depots. The Navy has closed or  
osed for closure 10 of its 18 maintenance depot  
ities. The Air Force and Marine Corps have not closed  
tenance facilities.

We will now move to the Air Force depots, where Ms.  
e will pick up the presentation.

MS. REESE: Good morning. This slide depicts DOD-  
depot maintenance capacity, core workload in FY '99.  
imum potential capacity is defined as "The optimum depot  
uration and employment levels with no significant  
al improvements and no military construction  
nditures."

It's also important to point out that maximum  
tial capacity is one 40-hour shift capacity. The  
es reported capacity on a commodity-by-commodity basis  
anticipate fiscal year '99 capacity of 165 million hours.  
e" is defined as "That workload that the services have

1 data to the joint cross-service group. In FY '99, 47 percent  
2 of the capacity will be utilized with core hours and 51  
3 percent with workload.

4 The chart on the left displays the same data for  
5 each of the Air Force depots. And it's intended to give you  
6 a sense of the capacity utilization at each of the Air Force  
7 depots. Robins has the highest capacity utilization, 68  
8 percent; Kelly is 29 percent utilized on a single 40-hour  
9 work week.

10 This slide summarizes the missions on each of the  
11 Air Force ALC installations. In all cases, the air logistics  
12 center is the major tenant or the main tenant on the base.  
13 The air logistics center is primarily comprised of a depot  
14 maintenance and material management function. The chart  
15 lists across the top the products managed by the air  
16 logistics center.

17 The next row displays the specialty of that depot.  
18 A number of years ago, the Air Force adopted a technical  
19 repair concept in which commodities were single-sided.  
20 You'll often hear reference to "centers of excellence," and  
21 that's what this reference is.

22 The third row displays the force structure as of

1 1997. Please note that the National Guard units listed at  
2 McClellan are dependent on your decision to move them from  
3 Moffett Field through the BRAC '95 process. The bottom row  
4 summarizes the Air Force's operational concerns and mission  
5 impact with the installation full closure.

6 This chart shows the tiers that the Air Force  
7 determined for both installations and depots. The tier was  
8 determined by uniformed leaders and senior civilians on the  
9 Air Force Base Closure Executive Group. Their tier serves as  
10 proxy for military value. You'll note that I've ordered the  
11 columns according to the BCEG vote to establish the  
12 installation tier.

13 This chart display some data from the DOD Depot  
14 Maintenance Council indicators report. This report is  
15 prepared for the DOD Depot Maintenance Council and contains  
16 performance data on all DOD maintenance activities. The  
17 first slide on this chart shows actual '94 maintenance hour  
18 cost without the cost of material. You can see there the  
19 costs range from a low of \$53.53 at Robins to a high of  
20 \$62.15.

21 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Excuse me, Mrs. Reese, one  
22 second. I have a question, Mr. Chairman. Would you like us

MAN DIXON: I have no objection to asking a question as an appropriate question at this point in the hearing.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Okay. On your first line you threw numbers before us and said that on their labor cost was lower than all of the others. Would you please tell us what your source is and what the differences might be in opinion here?

MR. OWLSLEY: Yes. The source that I'm using is the maintenance indicator report. The report is prepared by the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for his council. The council is made up of representatives from each one of the military services.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: The data is agreed to by each one of the services. I think it is a thoroughly examined report. I have confidence in the data that's contained in it. I'm sorry. I'm not clear on the source of the data that was presented.

1 And then, they report an anticipated schedule and cost.  
2 I asked about added work packages, and they said if  
3 there are truly added work packages that increase the scope  
4 of the original job, that each ALC is then given schedule  
5 relief to that number of days for that package and that they  
6 do consider that in what they send forward to DOD in their  
7 final report.  
8 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Owsley.  
9 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you very much.  
10 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Mr. Chairman, I need to  
11 follow up, because I need to understand this more clearly.  
12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Robles.  
13 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Mr. Owsley, I need to make  
14 sure I understand in my simple mind how this works. The fact  
15 of the matter is, are you telling me that those numbers right  
16 there take into account the additional work that comes out of  
17 an aircraft overhaul once they break it down and realize that  
18 what they thought was going to take 10 hours may, in fact,  
19 take 20 hours, because there's a lot more damage underneath  
20 that? Is that what you're telling me?  
21 MR. OWLSLEY: No, sir.  
22 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Okay. I didn't think so.

Page 56

COMMISSIONER STEELE: But we did try to find that out.

MR. OWLSLEY: We did.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: And just lastly on this subject on time, I received some information from Kelly down there that said that Kelly delivered 1 out of 3 of 51 KC-135s in the same period, for a 6 percent over time. The numbers up there show very different results. I wonder if we know what the difference is in the information ought to be the certified information before us.

MR. OWLSLEY: I think I was given that one to check. I used in this data the depot maintenance information is forwarded to DOD by Air Force Materiel Command called the Air Force Materiel Command on the report that said that is a report that we should be using to give correct relative weightings to each center that there are many ways that centers look at the data of them they look at as a community also. I said in the end, they synthesize this and

Page 59

1 Because General Fogleman yesterday, we talked to him, who was  
2 the old TRANSCOM commander, he was very clear about that. He  
3 says the C-5 fleet has always been our most fragile fleet.  
4 And we flew the legs off of that fleet during Desert Storm,  
5 as I can attest to from my days over there.  
6 And so when you tear down a C-5 and all of a sudden  
7 think it's going to take a standard -- because they do  
8 standard work-ups -- and we find out that it's going to take  
9 twice that standard work-up because there's a lot more  
10 delayed Desert Storm damage or delayed erosion in there, that  
11 they go ahead and do the work, because it's prudent sense  
12 once you tear the aircraft down.  
13 And if this takes into account the new work and  
14 they have a standard model for these additional enhancements,  
15 then I'll think these are apples and apples. Otherwise, I  
16 think we're talking about apples and oranges here.  
17 MR. OWLSLEY: I really want to clarify that,  
18 commissioner. What I said is that the aircraft comes in.  
19 They're allowed to tear the aircraft down and then make a  
20 report back to AFMC headquarters, giving their estimate of  
21 how long it would take to repair that airplane and schedule  
22 in cost to do so. That is like a little negotiation that

Page 57

1. And it is, in fact, the Air Force position on deliveries. We could not as we got those in exactly how those lower numbers came about. It's difficult, because if some of the planes go out for additional work packages sent to them. And the schedules. And there's a lot of data kept out.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: I would point out again that we were limited in our ability to use the official reports and did go to the report of the Air Force and ask was this the information that should be using. And they did confirm that.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Okay. Just to close that out on the original work package on the C-5 at Kelly. I'm told, 5 percent, I am told. How does that impact on the schedule? And then we can make this real quick and move on.

MR. OWLSLEY: As you remember, that was brought up in the hearings in San Antonio. When I contacted AFMC they explained that the way the airplanes are scheduled and budgets is by the centers -- whichever center receives an airplane, they're allowed to schedule it within 30 days and get on it and inspect it.

Page 60

1 occurs.  
2 If there's added work, not work that should have  
3 been anticipated in a tear-down, that added work package is  
4 given. But if, for instance, an ALC underestimates or misses  
5 something like you're talking about, the schedules and  
6 budgeted price are not adjusted for that. We discussed that  
7 also, but they felt over a long period of time since the  
8 centers are not obligated for the whole fleet when they make  
9 one airplane tear down, that adjustments do occur as they get  
10 smarter on the condition of the airplanes coming in.  
11 But it certainly does not cover if an airplane, for  
12 instance, say -- 30 days isn't an extremely long time on a C-  
13 5, as you know. It might be on a fighter plane, but a C-5 is  
14 enormous and is old and has a lot more difficult ways of  
15 getting into the airplane than a modern airplane has. So  
16 they could, indeed, miss a big part of the work package, and  
17 that would afterwards make them miss schedules and budgets.  
18 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: And my only point was, on an  
19 airplane like the C-5A, which went through an enormous  
20 workload during Desert Storm, like our tanks in the Army did,  
21 you know, your standard convention is out. And it will be  
22 years before you figure out how all that worked out. So I

... that you were telling

CHAIRMAN DIXON: You may proceed, Mrs. Reese.  
MS. REESE: Thank you. I want to make one more  
ment about the cost data, just to be more complete with my  
wer to Commissioner Steele. The source of this data that  
ave on the screen is DOD data. I think you've also been  
sented with data that has been prepared by outside  
panies, private sector firms. This is all DOD data.

Turning to the next slide, the DOD BRAC  
ommendation to downsize all Air Force depots has two  
ponents. Two million square feet of depot space will be  
th-balled. This will eliminate the amount of square  
tage used by the depot but will not eliminate depot  
structure.

Slightly less than 2,000 personnel positions would  
eliminated. The personnel number is based on an  
mption that engineering of the depot process will result  
15 percent productivity improvement. This is the first  
that downsizing has ever been pursued through the BRAC  
cess. Downsizing will not reduce overhead costs. As a  
ult, costs per hour will increase.

1 9 percent personnel to provide base operating support at the  
2 receiving location, with the exception of Kelly, where we  
3 realigned all base operating personnel for Air Force tenants  
4 being contoned to Lackland, which is an issue that I'll talk  
5 about in a couple of minutes.  
6 The Defense Agency assumptions are scenario-based  
7 and will also be explained in detail on an upcoming slide.  
8 The Commission staff assumption is that eliminations are  
9 evenly phased over the last four years, and no personnel are  
10 eliminated or realigned until the up-front planning year.  
11 1997.  
12 COMMISSIONER COX: Ann, on that question, you all  
13 on the four-year time to close, which is really five because  
14 of the planning year, didn't evenly phase. When the Air  
15 Force assumption says six years, was that evenly phased over  
16 six years?  
17 MS. REESE: No, ma'am. The Air Force assumed that  
18 all of the position eliminations would occur in the very las  
19 year, in the sixth year.  
20 COMMISSIONER COX: So nothing would happen for six  
21 years, and then in the sixth year, everything would happen?  
22 MS. REESE: All the positions would be eliminated

The Commission has received a number of revisions  
to the downsizing recommendation. I am displaying two  
versions of the BRAC recommendations, the recommendation that  
was forwarded on the 1st of March, and the recommendation  
that the Secretary of the Air Force testified to last week.

The original downsizing recommendation requires  
\$1 billion of one-time costs and would result in steady-  
state savings, annual savings of \$89 million, and a net  
present value of \$991 million. Last week, Dr. Widnall used a  
scenario which would require \$234 million in one-time costs  
and result in savings of \$92 million a year and net present  
value of \$975 million.

As we reviewed the military department's COBRA  
assumptions, we saw significant differences between the results.  
When comparing the assumptions behind the military department's  
COBRAs, we also saw significant differences. This chart  
shows the differences in COBRA assumptions that impact  
one-time savings. And it shows the differences between the Air  
Force's assumptions and the Commission's staff assumption.  
The Air Force assumes a six-year period to close a  
depot installation. Based on discussions that we have had  
with the Air Force and based on historical experiences of the

... that have closed large industrial activities, we  
found that a three-year time to close is realistic. But to be  
conservative, we assumed a four-year period. Further, we  
assumed a one-year planning period so, in fact, the time to  
close is what the Commission staff assumed is five years.  
The Air Force COBRAs assume, we believe, an  
unusually small number of personnel eliminations.  
Based on the experience of the other military services with  
depot closures and drawing on Jim Owsley's 42 years of  
experience in the defense industrial business, we realize  
that personnel eliminations will result from closure and  
reduction of workload.

We assumed that 15 percent of selected air  
center personnel would be eliminated to include  
maintenance personnel, materiel management,  
engineering, and computer support personnel. We believe that  
is a very conservative estimate, and we base it in part  
on the Air Force's downsizing BRAC recommendation, which  
assumes 15 percent of direct labor depot personnel.  
We also assumed a 15 percent elimination of ALC  
facility personnel and management overhead personnel.  
If personnel realigned, we would realign an additional

1 at that point. Yes.  
2 COMMISSIONER COX: I see. Thank you.  
3 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you, Commissioner Cox.  
4 Proceed, Mrs. Reese.  
5 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Mrs. Reese, quick question.  
6 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Steele.  
7 COMMISSIONER STEELE: On your 15 percent assumption  
8 for elimination of selected ALC personnel, what kind of  
9 assumptions do the Navy and Army use? I respect Mr. Owsley's  
10 private sector service and experience immensely, but I would  
11 like to compare this within the Department, if I could,  
12 please.  
13 MS. REESE: The Navy and the Army have up-front  
14 position eliminations of 20 to 40 percent for industrial  
15 activities similar to what --  
16 COMMISSIONER STEELE: So you took a pretty  
17 conservative route, here?  
18 MS. REESE: I believe we did. That's right.  
19 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Thanks for clarifying that.  
20 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Proceed, Mrs. Reese.  
21 MS. REESE: Thank you. The next slide lists the  
22 COBRA assumptions that impact one-time cost. We did not

1 I think it appropriate to include civilian accrued leave cost  
2 as a BRAC cost, because it's the obligation of the government  
3 to pay regardless. We also thought it inappropriate to  
4 include an additional \$30 million to implement each closure,  
5 given that the COBRA already includes a factor which  
6 calculates this cost.  
7 The COBRA factor calculates a 4 to \$9 million  
8 amount for conversion agency cost, depending on the size of  
9 the depot closure. No other service, and with only one  
10 exception within the Air Force, is there an additional amount  
11 on top of the COBRA factor included.  
12 We also did not believe it reasonable to include  
13 the cost to send equipment through the excess system.  
14 Historical experience indicates that proceeds equal cost.  
15 Equipment buyers come out to the shop floor to buy the  
16 equipment and pay the cost to move it.  
17 To transition a product line requires the shut-down  
18 of one line and the start-up of another production line. If  
19 dollars were not an issue, one would probably set up two  
20 parallel lines.  
21 This is not practical, so typically, companies, as  
22 the other services have proposed, do a build ahead an interim

which embodied both; that is, parallel lines and factor support.  
 o disallowed the cost to procure new  
 The Air Force assumed that all equipment would  
 xcessed and repurchased. This assumption does  
 e that there is considerable duplication of  
 nd consolidating work would permit increased  
 specialized equipment that might otherwise be  
 more, the Air Force has already a schedule  
 replacements and funds set aside in their  
 o so. Finally, we used the DLA projections to  
 ry. They would bear the costs we have  
 with distribution depot closures.  
 de is an illustrative example of the  
 act of our COBRA assumptions. You can see that  
 personnel elimination in the ALCs and a 50  
 nel assumption in the management overhead  
 gnificant increase in the number of personnel  
 an ALC.

2 MS. REESE: Yes, that's right.  
 3 COMMISSIONER COX: And then the COBRA, their COBRA  
 4 proposals --  
 5 MS. REESE: For downsizing?  
 6 COMMISSIONER COX: No, for closure.  
 7 MS. REESE: For closure.  
 8 COMMISSIONER COX: When we asked for closure  
 9 COBRAs, that's where this 373 elimination comes from?  
 10 MS. REESE: That's right.  
 11 COMMISSIONER COX: Versus your projection of 1401?  
 12 MS. REESE: That's correct.  
 13 COMMISSIONER COX: Thank you.  
 14 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you, Commissioner Cox.  
 15 Proceed, Ms. Reese.  
 16 MS. REESE: Kelly Air Force Base was treated  
 17 differently by the Air Force and by ourselves. Kelly Air  
 18 Force Base is adjacent to Lackland Air Force Base. In fact,  
 19 some facilities on Kelly Air Force Base support units  
 20 assigned to Lackland. For example, the runway at Kelly is  
 21 used by the 76th Munitions Squadron, Wilford Hall, and the  
 22 Interagency Air Force Academy.

Page 68  
 20 percent of the personnel savings accrue  
 agency actions. The Defense Logistics Agency  
 igs match the Defense Logistics Agency COBRAs  
 un. The resultant savings would be accrued by  
 ogistics Agency.  
 assumptions are based on the historical  
 it they've had with closing distribution depots.  
 ommissary personnel will be eliminated with the  
 installation. The Defense Finance and  
 gency personnel will be fully realigned to the  
 tion.  
 ormation Agency personnel are the  
 ccessing people that you've seen in the Defense  
 uring your visits to the air logistics centers.  
 the personnel from the Information Services  
 a letter that we've received from the  
 Defense indicating that, with a closure of an  
 ould also be the closure of the mega-center.  
 gned all Air Force tenants except the Air  
 rsonnel who support the Air Logistics Center,  
 ated those positions. Of the personnel  
 also realigned a 9 percent additional personnel

Page 71  
 1 Also, there are a number of tenant units on Kelly  
 2 not associated with the Air Logistics Center, that would be  
 3 expensive to relocate, which could be easily reassigned to  
 4 Lackland Air Force Base. The best example of this is the  
 5 433rd Air Lift Wing. The 433rd is an Air Force Reserve wing  
 6 that flies the C-5 aircraft.  
 7 The Air Force Kelly closure scenario would assign  
 8 all of the Kelly tenants not associated with the Air  
 9 Logistics Center to Lackland Air Force Base. The Commission  
 10 staff adopted the Air Force scenario -- close the Air  
 11 Logistics Center and all units associated with the ALC, but  
 12 keep the runway open and assign all remaining units to  
 13 Lackland Air Force Base.  
 14 COMMISSIONER COX: And I'm sorry. Then the only  
 15 base where we assume that the tenants would stay, as part of  
 16 Lackland?  
 17 MS. REESE: Yes, ma'am, that's correct.  
 18 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Proceed, Ms. Reese.  
 19 MS. REESE: This slide summarizes the results of  
 20 the Air Force closure COBRAs. The one-time costs range from  
 21 a low of \$575 million to a high of \$1.3 billion. Steady  
 22 state savings range from \$62 million to \$87 million. The

Page 69  
 operating services at the receiving location.  
 SIONER COX: Question for you. You indicated  
 unt to make sure I understand you -- that our  
 we use the 15 percent on the ALCs, I thought  
 d the COBRA numbers. What does that mean?  
 SE: I'm sorry. Would you repeat that?  
 SIONER COX: I thought you had said that the  
 mbers on -- staff numbers -- on the 15 percent  
 ow many eliminated that would be, matched the  
 ers.  
 SE: I'm sorry. I perhaps misspoke. The 15  
 assumed, of selected ALC personnel, was  
 because the Air Force used that assumption  
 sizing, but there were no position  
 ntained in the closure COBRAs that the Air  
 SIONER COX: I see.  
 SE: So we based our 15 percent, in part, on  
 roposal, which would eliminate 15 percent of  
 he depot category.  
 SIONER COX: They, themselves, in their own  
 ated 15 percent, not necessarily as a closure

Page 72  
 1 number of years for return on investment ranges from seven to  
 2 28 years.  
 3 You can see the results of the personnel  
 4 realignments and eliminations that follow the assumptions  
 5 that we just highlighted.  
 6 This chart -- Brian, could you put both up  
 7 simultaneously? Thank you. The chart on the right shows the  
 8 results of the COBRAs that the Commission staff prepared. We  
 9 simply adjusted the Air Force closure COBRAs with the  
 10 assumptions that I've reviewed with you. You can see that  
 11 the assumptions very much drive the results of COBRA.  
 12 The one-time costs to close come down slightly and  
 13 range from \$409 million to \$1.1 billion, and the steady state  
 14 savings improve substantially and range from \$153 million to  
 15 \$178 million. The period of time before a return on  
 16 investment is reduced markedly. The closure of Kelly and  
 17 McClellan return after one year  
 18 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Ms. Reese, could you explain  
 19 that one-year return, when that actually is? That isn't the  
 20 year after? Just please tell us what that means. How did  
 21 you get to 2007, say, on Hill?  
 22 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Do you understand the question,

MS. REESE: From the information we've displayed, the return would come -- of course, we have a one-year running year in our COBRAs that the Air Force did not. But the return would come in 2001, one year after the implementation period.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: So it's five years plus, then one year, and that's when your return on investment starts; correct?

MS. REESE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Okay. Thank you. And that's the same way that the DOD -- the COBRA numbers we got from DOD are?

MS. REESE: Right.

COMMISSIONER COX: The closure year plus whatever return on investment is?

MS. REESE: Right, using the same discount rates as the same assumptions there.

COMMISSIONER COX: Right. And I want to talk about discount rates later, but let's go ahead.

COMMISSIONER KLING: Ms. Reese?

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.

2 COMMISSIONER COX: So, for example, the C-5 hangar, which has been a big issue at Kelly --

3 MS. REESE: Yes. The Air Force assumptions of a \$52 million cost to replicate the C-5 hangar at another Air Force Base was both in the Air Force and our COBRA run.

4 COMMISSIONER COX: Okay. And that's true on every MILCON?

5 MS. REESE: That's true on every MILCON.

6 COMMISSIONER COX: Are there assumptions -- let's say the nuclear facility at McClellan -- where they said it would be really expensive to move it and we said, "Oh, we're not going to," or did, every time they say they were going to move something and pay for it, we took that same assumptions?

7 MS. REESE: We took all of the MILCON assumptions.

8 COMMISSIONER COX: Everything?

9 MS. REESE: The only assumptions that we've changed, I've highlighted on a line-by-line basis for you. We've changed no other assumptions than those I've given you a specific list for in the last two slides.

10 COMMISSIONER COX: Since we only changed the savings assumptions, we didn't change the costs?

Page 74

MS. REESE: Yes, sir?

COMMISSIONER KLING: I just want to be sure that we're understanding the same thing. We -- the staff -- went back to the Air Force and asked them to do these runs that we're looking at up here, to give us their cost to close, savings, and so forth.

MS. REESE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER KLING: So these figures that you're using were after we asked the Air Force to run these numbers for us?

MS. REESE: The chart on the right displays the COBRAs that the Air Force prepared.

COMMISSIONER KLING: Right.

MS. REESE: We took --

CHAIRMAN DIXON: The chart on the left, Ms. Reese.

MS. REESE: I'm sorry. Yes.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: The chart on the left.

MS. REESE: The chart on the left, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: We did ask them, that's their response.

MS. REESE: Right, those are their figures. We have a COBRA expert on the staff who took those COBRAs and

Page 75

1 MS. REESE: We affected one-time costs slightly. The annual savings were impacted because the difference in the positions eliminated we thought reasonable -- in fact, conservative -- in the phasing of those position eliminations.

2 COMMISSIONER COX: Essentially, there are a lot of -- not a lot -- there are several assumptions that you all changed, but the biggest dollar assumption was the positions eliminated?

3 MS. REESE: That's correct.

4 COMMISSIONER COX: That was the largest?

5 MS. REESE: That's correct.

6 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Proceed, Ms. Reese.

7 COMMISSIONER COX: I'm sorry. While we're on that since we're on it anyway, the --

8 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.

9 COMMISSIONER COX: -- the assumptions that the Defense Department used in all of their COBRAs and in their recommendations, and the assumptions that we have used, assume a 2.75 percent discount rate; is that correct?

10 MS. REESE: That's right.

11 COMMISSIONER COX: And what is that discount rate?

Page 75

12 We've changed assumptions -- took the very same COBRAs and made assumptions changes -- and the results are on the left.

13 COMMISSIONER KLING: And you are now in the process of going through what those assumptions were.

14 MS. REESE: Right. I've reviewed those assumptions, that's correct.

15 COMMISSIONER KLING: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER COX: Let me make sure I understand -- we've talked about the assumptions and the personnel and -- where it is the MILCON costs, for example -- did we use the assumptions on that, where they said, "We're going to build a C-5 hangar at Tinker" or "We're going to have a nuclear reactor at McClellan"? What assumptions did we use? Did we use theirs? Did we second guess those?

17 MS. REESE: We did not change any of the assumptions, any of the MILCON costs built into the Air Force COBRAs.

18 COMMISSIONER COX: So whatever they said they would do to move that work, and whatever cost they said was, we took it?

Page 76

19 Where do we get that? Where do they get that?

20 MS. REESE: Where do they get that?

21 COMMISSIONER COX: We didn't get it. We used theirs.

22 MS. REESE: That's right. And that was at the time the base closure preparation process began, that was the accepted discount rate and I think, for consistency, the decision was that that would remain the figure used throughout. We did not change that figure in our COBRAs.

1 COMMISSIONER COX: Right. Otherwise, we wouldn't be able to compare it to the original Defense numbers.

2 MS. REESE: Correct.

3 COMMISSIONER COX: However, as I understand it shortly thereafter, that assumption changed, as far as the government --

4 MS. REESE: I guess there was an update.

5 COMMISSIONER COX: -- assumption on what the cost

6 of money is, and most people would say a 2.75 percent cost of

7 money is really low. And that assumption changed, as I

8 understand it, and GAO also looked at this and recommended

9 that a more reasonable assumption on the cost of money would

10 be 4.85 percent; is that correct?

MISSIONER COX: And my understanding -- and that so much difference in some things and a lot of in those -- it could make a lot of difference, where you have a high one-time cost, because money is important; and so, even though I know 2.75 for a good reason, we can't compare it by other number.

you all able to run both their numbers and our this, using the GAO --

REESE: Yes.

MISSIONER COX: -- presumption of a 4.85 wonder if you could just tell us what did to the investment?

REESE: Yes. We have a slide that will show difference. The net present value changes slightly. on investment for those things that pay back later ghtly for those things that have an earlier return ent, cost of money --

MISSIONER COX: Doesn't change that much?

REESE: -- doesn't change that much, exactly.

RMAN DIXON: Have you concluded, Commissioner

1 distribution of work on a commodity-by-commodity basis, and

2 the commodities go down to a great level of detail.

3 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Okay.

4 MS. REESE: So, you know, when you look at it on a 5 commodity-by-commodity basis, you're really looking at the 6 capability of a depot to perform a certain type of work, a 7 capability to perform a certain commodity group.

8 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Okay. And it also does not 9 take into account any other depot capacity throughout the 10 Department?

11 MS. REESE: That's correct.

12 COMMISSIONER STEELE: This is just Air Force?

13 MS. REESE: That's precisely right. This is all 14 within the Air Force, yes.

15 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And did you have a question, 17 Commissioner Robles?

18 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Yes, I do. I just wondered, 19 now, since this is core workload, by definition, is this the 20 stuff we want to do in-house? There has been a conscious

21 corporate decision that that is workload to be done in-house, 22 right?

MISSIONER COX: Well, I just wanted to check. 're saying is, even though you would show less viously, over a 20-year period, still on Kelly and the return on investment here, you would still --

REESE: Is the same.

MISSIONER COX: -- make back your money, even at ent discount rate?

REESE: Yes, ma'am, that's correct.

RMAN DIXON: You may proceed, Ms. Reese.

MISSIONER COX: Thank you.

REESE: Thank you, Chairman.

hing gears from COBRA results, this slide workload would be distributed with a closure of two : have frequently been asked if workload can be ted with the closure of two Air Force depots. hart shows the distribution of core workload g depots. The basis of this distribution is the se Closure Executive Group meeting minutes and terials, and the Joint Cross-Service data.

air Force's study of potential depot closure listing of appropriate workload moving from

und Kelly to other depots. We can list the types a commodity-by-commodity grouping, and the hours. We can list it in great detail, in other u wish to see it.

ve also examined this Air Force distribution lity-by-commodity basis, and have confirmed that rload fits on a single shift within the capacity the remaining three depots.

MISSIONER STEELE: Ms. Reese?

REESE: Yes.

RMAN DIXON: Commissioner Steele.

MISSIONER STEELE: Okay. So the bottom line on I know there's excess capacity, but we all know ot capacity. You have to look at what it is and l the same with core.

REESE: Right.

MISSIONER STEELE: We all know there's more n there's core workload, but core is not core; types of core. This simple-looking chart, a level of detail to the item, based on DOD data. you're telling us today?

REESE: That's right. This chart reflects a

1 MS. REESE: That's right.

2 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: So another way to look at 3 this, the spin I put on this ball is, once you -- if you make 4 the decision to close two of those Air Logistics Centers, the 5 amount of capacity that's left, your surge capacity for core 6 work in wartime -- and please, I don't want to get into the 7 one-shift, two-shift, because you have to have a constant 8 base of analysis.

9 But, for normal peacetime operations, the amount 10 that's between the top of the yellow and the top of whatever 11 that chartreuse color is or whatever it is, is the excess 12 capacity left in the entire United States Air Force.

13 MS. REESE: That's the unused --

14 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: And could you kind of tell me 15 what that is? If you took that little piece and that little 16 piece and that little piece, how much capacity are we talking 17 about?

18 MS. REESE: Okay. Just a minute.

19 MR. OWSLEY: While she's looking for that number, 20 Commissioner, I would like to point out that this is a 21 single-shift basis and, in the recent desert conflict, each 22 of the ALCs was called on to do special things, and they did

1 it by either putting on a full second shift or one half a 2 shift, and were able to meet all of the surge requirements 3 with no problem. They all discussed that with us on our 4 visits.

5 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Mr. Owsley, in all deference, 6 I understand that. But the fact of the matter is that, 7 during World War II, we put women in hard hats in factories, 8 and wartime, which Desert Storm was, is a whole different 9 issue. Yes, you could. But, for analysis purposes, you want 10 to put this on a level playing field, and that's why you use 11 one shift.

12 There's a lot of things you could do under 13 extraordinary circumstances for a limited amount of time. 14 But we're talking about day-to-day peacetime operations, 15 which is, hopefully, the majority of the work we're talking 16 about here.

17 MS. REESE: The capacity would be 32 million hours; 18 the core work, of course, remains at 27 million hours. And 19 that is an 85 percent utilization so, in other words --

20 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: So what you're telling me is, 21 if you close two depots, you leave the United States Air 22 Force 15 percent excess capacity?

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: I want to make sure we remember that, because I'll talk about that later on.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: And I will probably add to that, that reasonable people could disagree that one shift would be the maximum that you look at for capacity on this issue.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: When we say 85 percent - and maybe, Mr. Owsley, you're the right person to answer this - in the airline business, if we can get to 85 percent load factor, we would consider that - you wouldn't even try to get past. I mean, that would be full capacity.

Is 85 percent - can you really run a depot at 100 percent? Don't you have down time? Do you have to allow for C-5s taking longer than people thought they might take? You have to allow for fixing the equipment.

I guess what I'm asking is, when we say 85 percent capacity, is that - in business, a lot of times that would be the most you would ever really get. I mean, that would be, for all intents and purposes, 100 percent.

MR. OWSLEY: If you operate at 85 percent, the

2 And my central question on this is, did you look at  
3 the critical path? The question is, you can move all this  
4 stuff and dense pack it in something, but is there a critical  
5 - does your analysis for that 15 percent capacity look at a  
6 critical path?

7 There are certain things. You may have all the  
8 ramp space in the world, and you may have all the hangar  
9 space in the world but, if you do a critical path analysis,  
10 everything has to go through this back shop operation, and I  
11 assume that none of that could be done, because we're talking  
12 about a very complex analysis.

13 MR. OWSLEY: Commissioner, excuse me. The Air  
14 Force did not have time to do that, nor did any of the other  
15 services, nor did we.

16 The only one we did look at is we tried to see what  
17 would happen with the C-5, because it did, in some ways,  
18 relate to the B-52 transfer that the ALCs experienced a  
19 number of years back, and that was the only place. But that  
20 is not a critical path analysis. That would take a great  
21 deal of time.

22 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: So this is really a gross

board of directors will leave you alone?

COMMISSIONER COX: Yes. That's for sure.

MR. OWSLEY: The thing that I would like to point out, that's pointed out by General Curtis, is that these figures do not contain the ability to do airplanes. Outside ramp spaces and certain logistics centers, such as San Antonio Warner Robins, do quite a bit of airplane work outside because of the -

COMMISSIONER COX: Outside, meaning on the aprons or ramps?

MR. OWSLEY: On ramps, tarmacs, and that. Because of the very nature of that, the services did not try to capture that when they reported depot capacity, so you have to remember all the time that this excludes airplane capacity on ramps and that, but it does include all the back shops - painting, machine shop - that support the airplane.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: And, Ms. Reese, does or doesn't -

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Steele.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: - does or doesn't it include inefficiencies of co-locating work?

MS. REESE: No. This is simply taking the core

1 macro-analysis?

2 MR. OWSLEY: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any further questions of  
4 Mr. Owsley or Ms. Reese on this graph?

5 COMMISSIONER COX: I'm sorry. To get back to that  
6 question -

7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.

8 COMMISSIONER COX: - realizing you didn't do a  
9 critical path, did we, though, look at specific commodities?  
10 When we say you could move - you'd have this capacity at  
11 Tinker or Robins or Hill if you closed McClellan and Kelly,  
12 it wasn't in overall man hours, it was a "Move this to that."  
13 it was a setting out, as the DOD would have done - did - in  
14 their own COBRA?

15 MR. OWSLEY: Most of this is from DOD. First of  
16 all, they gave it to us in their COBRAs.

17 Secondly, most of their COBRAs were based on a  
18 study called the AFMC-21 Study, which was done over a long  
19 period of time, which did, in fact, take commodity-by-  
20 commodity engine study, C-5 study for moving the C-5 from San  
21 Antonio to Tinker. It was done by Air Force experts in that  
22 business, and we used their scheduling and things to do that.

work that is distributed throughout five depots currently and making the same number of hours, and putting them on a commodity-by-commodity basis within three depots.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: So even though the workload could pick up on any of these categories, it says it would still plug along at the exact same rate even though it would be co-located?

MS. REESE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Yes, but let me make sure I understand that.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Robles.

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: I understand efficiencies, but you didn't factor in inefficiencies, either.

MS. REESE: No, sir, because -

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Because sometimes, when you're mixing apples and oranges and peaches and pears, you have some inefficiencies there.

And the second thing, 85 percent capacity, I think, at the time I checked, is optimal. You never want to squeeze anything down to much more than 85 percent capacity, because you take into account nothing for work stoppages, overhead

1 So this isn't like the Air Force has not looked at  
2 consolidating depots before. They have done it many times  
3 and the AFMC-21 Study was set up for how would we look in the  
4 future, and we used that a great deal, as did the Air Force  
5 report it in their COBRAs, that this data is from the AFMC-21  
6 Study.

7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: You may proceed, Ms. Reese.

8 MS. REESE: Thank you. This chart is an example of  
9 the cost advantage of consolidating maintenance work. We  
10 have averaged the labor hour rate of two Air Force depots  
11 that do engine work and we show here that the consolidation  
12 of engine work reduces hourly overhead rate such that there  
13 is a \$73 million annual savings. The savings is substantial,  
14 but it's not addressed or recognized by the COBRAs.

15 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Ms. Reese, I'm sorry, a quick  
16 question.

17 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Steele.

18 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Because there are a lot of  
19 questions on Kelly, and I want to make sure I have the full  
20 picture here.

21 Kelly, I believe, is the designated center of  
22 excellence for engines or whatever? What's the term I ought

REESE: Technical repair center.  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Technical repair center for you would assume the expertise is there. We're yes here, and averages make me nervous, because in specifics.  
ines came to Kelly, versus if engines went to C, is there a dramatic change in the savings or

COMMISSIONER STEELE: I think there's a change in about \$3 million, based on the labor hour cost. is slightly higher, and so there is somewhat of

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Okay. But the savings are consolidation; that is the main driver here?

OWSLEY: We should point out that we did in each of the communities, on engines -- because two instances where you can compare something, and all this business that we're into here is business, even though the engines are different at -- they both furnished us with their figures and d to do is meld them together.

1 that and, really, if one looks at the total cost of engine  
2 work and that, the adapters are not the large thing.  
3 There would also be, if you recall in your visits,  
4 they test engines differently at the two places. Basically,  
5 tinker hangs them on an overhead stand; San Antonio has  
6 upward stands. So there would either have to be an  
7 adaptation made to the overheads or you would have to  
8 transport the Tinker stands for their engines -- I mean Kelly  
9 -- if you moved them to Tinker.

10 This was all taken into consideration in the Air  
11 Force studies. It was inputted in their COBRAs. As recently  
12 as yesterday I talked to Air Force headquarters about this  
13 and they said the numbers which they had given us in their  
14 COBRA for MILCON are correct for a movement of this nature.  
15 And we used -- if you recall earlier testimony -- we used the  
16 Air Force MILCON in these assumptions. We didn't try to go  
17 up or down on it.

18 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Robles.

19 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Ms. Reese, I apologize for  
20 the never-ending briefing, but, as you can see, some of the  
21 things we're drawing out here are going to be central to our  
22 later discussion.

Page 92

itn't make a great deal of difference, but we show one and the other. We tried to meld them how that there is significant savings by n without efficiencies being considered. gain, this study was done, and the AFMC-21 aid Kelly could do all of the engines in the Air t Tinker could do all of the engines in the Air

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Let me just ask one more il, please. The director of financial rom Kelly Air Force Base provided us a jet engine ability memorandum, and he says: both Tinker and Kelly have four large t cells, the equipment for each center was built manufacturers. Neither place can test all Air s. However, with modifications, additional equipment, and substantial taxpayer either depot could accommodate the requirement. we're within the same commodity, but we have es of machines we're talking about here. I'd ddress both the cost to modify, test cells one her, if you could please, and what percentage of

1 Let make sure I heard you correctly. You told me  
2 that core work, when you closed two and consolidated three,  
3 there's about 15 percent excess capacity left for core work.  
4 But, in the world of engines, if I heard you right, Kelly has  
5 7 million hours worth of capacity.

6 MS. REESE: That's right.

7 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Tinker has 5.

8 MS. REESE: That's right.

9 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: There's about 2-1/2 that's  
10 done in total workload, and that is a projected workload for  
11 forever?

12 MS. REESE: No. It's a workload for FY '99.

13 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: And how much engine workload,  
14 if any, is being done at Tinker right now?

15 MS. REESE: There's about 2-1/2 million hours --

16 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: So if you took the 2-1/2  
17 that's being done at Kelly and the 2-1/2 that's being done at  
18 Tinker, you max out Tinker's capability. So you're at 100  
19 percent of capacity on engine work; is that correct?

20 MS. REESE: The Tinker commander indicated that he  
21 has the capacity to do 5.1 million hours --

22 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: So he has .1 million hours

Page 95

Page 93

that at Kelly ALC?  
REESE: What percentage of workload?  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Yes.  
REESE: Okay. Each of the ALCs do about 2-1/2 s of engine work. I think that Kelly has about 7 s of capacity and Tinker has about 5 million icity for engine work. So the statement that's n that memo that you've just read, the statement i would fit either place?

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Correct.  
REESE: That is a correct statement. The bers that were provided to us assumed that there ry construction required and no significant vement costs required. There would be a cost to aybe Jim Owsley could speak to, in terms of the ills.

OWSLEY: You know, this was something we talked anders and, if you remember, when you were at hey did say there was a study that had been r moving to either direction on the engines. be adapters and cell modifications in types of but there would be no major MILCON involved in

1 worth of excess capacity or is there something I'm missing  
2 here?

3 MR. OWSLEY: May I correct that, please? At the  
4 Tinker presentation, it was 5.7 million hours that Tinker is  
5 able to do, not 5 million hours.

6 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Okay. What do you say it is,  
7 then? If you combine the two engine workloads, how much  
8 excess capacity to do engine work will be left in the United  
9 States Air Force?

10 COMMISSIONER STEELE: On a single shift.

11 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: On a single shift. And we're  
12 not going to get into this other shift till later.

13 MR. OWSLEY: It's about 10 percent, Commissioners.

14 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: 10 percent. So you now take  
15 15 percent overall excess capacity and you now have 10  
16 percent on engine work. And yes, there are various

17 permutations and combinations of that number, but I'm just  
18 trying to stick to a constant thread here.

19 MR. OWSLEY: Commissioner, I would like to point  
20 out to you that this is only talking about the U.S. Air  
21 Force. If you had followed the Cross-Service Team's  
22 recommendation, there would have been work going to

Page 96

So there was a look to move engines around to other places than just between the two Air Force depots, so there would be an ability, if needed, to do some of these things at other places.

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: And any notion about how much capacity there we're talking about?

MR. OWSLEY: I'm not prepared to --

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: I'm just interested in where else they do F-100 engines and how much is done in the private sector.

MR. OWSLEY: We would -- I'm sorry. I can't give you that capacity that's remaining in the United States. I do know that the Air Force looked. There are certain engines at Tinker and certain engines at Kelly that could be done fairly easily at Jacksonville, but Jacksonville does not seem to have the capacity that either Kelly or Tinker has.

And then there was some classes of engines that the Cross-Service Group -- which included the Air Force and the Navy in that -- looked at that could be done at Cherry Point, and I do not have those details here with us today.

they're doing right now.

MR. OWSLEY: Current workload is about 4.4 million hours.

COMMISSIONER COX: So the 5 million in '99 is actually an increase on the current?

MS. REESE: No, that's a more precise figure. I'm sorry. I was speaking in round numbers.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there further questions?

COMMISSIONER KLING: Yes.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.

COMMISSIONER KLING: Just a comment. It is fair to say, like the Roles Commission did say, the private sector is still out there, available to do an awful lot, if we get caught into it, right? Is that a fair statement?

MR. OWSLEY: That's correct. I'd like to just point one more thing out, very quickly. I talked at length to both of these centers, because the engines is a very important thing to anybody that wants to get in the air.

Most of the work in the Air Force depots is turning out now, is moving over to intermediate maintenance as opposed to depot maintenance, and they expect that trend to

Page 98

CHAIRMAN DIXON: You may proceed now, Ms. Reese.

COMMISSIONER COX: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: On that workload, basically 5 million -- between the two current workloads, Tinker and Kelly, that's about 5 million man hours. Is that all core workload today or are we doing some non-core in the depots?

MS. REESE: The Air Force reported that that's their core work.

COMMISSIONER COX: That's all core workload. And what is the projection? You mentioned in 1999 the number was different, that we weren't necessarily going to be doing whatever we're doing today in 1999. Do we have a way to look at a projection over the years? Is it likely to go up. Are we going to have more engines, less engines? Do we have to do more work because we're using them more often?

MR. OWSLEY: Excuse me. It is likely that there will be less engine hours, because, as both Air Force centers told us, the hours in between maintenance are going down, or the hours between are increasing, because the engine manufacturers have become more reliable in the engines that they're now putting out.

Page 101

1 even increase in the out years, and what that essentially means is that the nature of an engine overhaul becomes less today because they find preventative maintenance is much better than waiting until you blow a hole in an engine and it becomes a major overhaul repair.

So they have to have less complicated equipment in total, but they have to have more of the equipment, because there are more engines.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: More numbers here. I'm just registering what you just said. 4.4 million is the projected workload for '99?

MS. REESE: FY '99. Yes.

COMMISSIONER COX: And 5.7 million is the capacity?

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: The commander of Tinker indicated that his capacity was 5.7 million hours for engine work.

COMMISSIONER COX: So that's more than a 10 percent excess capacity? I thought we were talking about 5 and 5.7?

MR. OWSLEY: I can tell you at this point, I'm not sure I can multiply.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Well, try to answer the question

Page 99

I would also like to say that, you know, on core, we don't want to discredit it, because we use it a lot and we have to work with it, but at Kelly, for instance, they're doing, you know, a fair number of ship engines that are not related to the Air Force, and the Navy does have, both in Navy facilities and private facilities, ability to do that, but they sent them to Kelly because they got a better price doing those engines at Kelly. So there is some flexibility in there, albeit we don't have it defined here today.

COMMISSIONER COX: But we're projecting the same core on out into the future?

MS. REESE: The core figures were reported for FY '99.

COMMISSIONER COX: And they are the same, I'm sorry, as this year, for example?

MS. REESE: The core in '99 -- I haven't looked at this year. I believe that the core work will be reduced from what it was in '99. I know that the services are going through a process of looking at the Roles and Missions Commission report that recommends that all of the depot work be privatized, and I know that the Air Force's initial position was that, just to get to core, they'd have to put about 20

Page 102

1 that the Commissioner Cox is asking. This is very serious business. Let's proceed. Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: It would be over a 20 percent excess capacity --

MR. BORDEN: It's 29.5.

COMMISSIONER COX: There we go. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: All right.

MR. OWSLEY: Thank you, Ben.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any further questions?

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Yes, just one quick question.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Robles.

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: You said that the commander of Tinker said that?

MS. REESE: Yes, when asked --

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: In all deference to the commanders at depots, I understand what they get paid to do. What does the United States Air Force say?

MS. REESE: 5.1 million hours capacity.

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Okay. Let's not get mesmerized by what a depot commander says. Remember, they're in the business of doing workload. And, having been one for most of my adult life, commanders have a sense in their

Hart Senate Office Building  
Room 216  
Washington, D.C.

Friday, June 23, 1995

5 had a very productive day yesterday. We considered and acted  
6 on all of the recommendations in the cross service and Air  
7 Force areas. Out of a total of 174 base closure and  
8 realignment recommendations before the commission, we acted  
9 on 66 of them yesterday, or almost 40 percent.  
10 Today we will begin with the Navy and then proceed  
11 to the Army and the defense agencies. All of the commission  
12 staff were sworn in at the beginning of our deliberations  
13 yesterday.  
14 Now, all the commissioners are here. Some are  
15 coming in a little bit more slowly than others, but let me  
16 say to my fellow commissioners it is the view of the chair we  
17 can finish today. I intend to press for that with very short  
18 breaks and a short lunch to achieve closure today in the real  
19 sense of the commission's closure.  
20 Is there any commissioner had any objection to  
21 trying to achieve the end of this process today?  
22 (No response.)

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

- Alan Dixon
- Alton W. Cornella
- Rebecca C. Cox
- J.B. Davis
- S. Lee Kling
- Benjamin Montoya
- Wendy Louise Steele
- Josue Robles

Page 2

Page 5

1 CHAIRMAN DIXON: All commissioners feel prepared to  
2 go forward then. Is there any commissioner has any comment  
3 before we begin?  
4 (No response.)  
5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: With that, we are ready to begin  
6 and the commission staff director, Mr. David Lyles, will  
7 begin the Navy presentation.  
8 David Lyles.  
9 MR. LYLES: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. We are  
10 ready to start with the Navy presentation and Alex Yellin,  
11 the Navy team chief, will begin.  
12 MR. YELLIN: Good morning, Mr Chairman. I would  
13 like to begin by discussing our Navy facilities in Guam and  
14 Eric Lindenbaum will present the staff findings.  
15 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Good morning,  
16 Chairman. The key to understanding the Guam recommendations  
17 is understanding where the military sea lift command, or MSC  
18 vessels, need to be home ported. The MSC ships, where they  
19 go, so goes the Ship Repair Facility, the Fleet Industrial  
20 Supply Center, the helicopter squadron, AC-5, and the  
21 majority of the support personnel which make up Naval  
22 Activities Guam.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Navy Team	5
Army Team	358
MOTIONS: 25, 30, 32, 34, 37, 55, 60, 99, 107, 117, 132, 137, 143, 156, 160, 163, 166, 171, 183, 185, 218, 222, 225, 227, 251, 260, 264, 268, 271, 308, 312, 315, 319, 327, 339, 342, 344, 346, 348, 351, 355, 361, 371, 373, 423, 426, 428, 471, 473, 485, 487, 494, 497, 500, 508, 512, 518, 522, 530, 532, 536, 538, 542, 547, 551, 556, 583, 585, 597, 614, 617, 619, 627, 629, 631, 633, 639, 643, 645, 649, 651, 653, 659, 661, 685, 690, 703, 706, 708, 710, 713, 715	

Page 3

Page 6

1 Shifting deployment patterns in the western Pacific  
2 have greatly lessened the requirement to maintain a fully  
3 functioning Naval base on Guam. They have also lessened the  
4 requirement to home port the military sea lift command, or  
5 MSC vessels in Guam. This, in no way, lessens the strategic  
6 value of Guam. The military, in fact, will continue to have  
7 a substantial presence on Guam if all the recommendations as  
8 they presently are written are accepted. In fact, there will  
9 be over 7,000 active duty military people remaining on Guam.  
10 To start off with Naval Activities Guam, the  
11 recommendation I will briefly summarize, is to realign Naval  
12 Activities Guam, relocate all ammunition and support  
13 personnel and vessels to Naval Magazine Lualualei, Hawaii;  
14 relocate all combat logistics force ships and associated  
15 personnel to Naval Support Pearl Harbor; and, relocate the  
16 military sea lift command personnel and Diego Garcia support  
17 functions also to Naval Station Pearl Harbor; disestablish  
18 the Naval Pacific Meteorology and Oceanographic Center  
19 WESTPAC, except for moving the typhoon warning center, which  
20 relocates to Naval Pacific Meteorology and Oceanographic  
21 Center Pearl Harbor; disestablish Afloat Training Group and  
22 all other Department of Defense Activities present on Guam

As you can see from the figures and the COBRA is up there, this is a very large savings for the Navy, combined with the four other Guam recommendations, it totals a net present value savings of over \$1.85 billion over the life cycle and a savings of \$133.1 million per year.

Mr. Chairman, now I would like to turn to the unless you have any questions on the figures for the COBRA analysis.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Please do, Commander.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Thank you, sir. The first point again deals with the shifting deployment of ships in the western Pacific and the relocation of the sea lift command ships. It is certainly not meant to change the original language of the recommendation that the MSC and the associated support should forever be moved to Guam; on the contrary, just by the fact that deployment patterns are shifting shows that needs change over time.

5 facilities. Presently there are over 3,600 acres of Navy property on the GLUP '94 process. And just to emphasize, the GLUP process is outside -- presently outside the Base Closure and Realignment Commission process.

If all GLUP properties are accepted for closure, then the DOD footprint on Guam will be reduced from greater than one third to less than one quarter. The GLUP process also serves to underscore the working relationship the military has with the government of Guam and, hopefully, this will form the basis of a successful economic revitalization process because, easily, the greatest concern of both the community and the government of Guam is over re-use of an excess facilities and/or lands.

The RNA staff feels the position of the DOD and the correct position is represented in a letter from Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Secretary Perry, of which you have a copy at each of your places. I would like to quote one paragraph from that.

This is why alternate language has been addressed Navy Guamanian officials and operational commanders. Alternate language would remove all references to a specific location and would leave the receiving site up to the implementation process. This has been agreed upon in principle by all sides involved.

The next point I would like to elaborate on relates to the weather center on Guam. Originally, it appeared that the Navy had said there was no excess capacity in the weather center category. The on-scene commander, during his presentation during the base visit, stressed the operational importance of the weather center there on Guam. Upon questioning, the Navy showed excess capacity in the weather center on Guam to be closed was allowed by the Guam recommendation itself. The Navy also allowed that through a phased implementation plan and the installation of satellite retransmission equipment which -- and that equipment is included in the COBRA analysis -- that there will be no operational impact by the closing of the weather center on Guam.

Next I would like to comment on the Naval magazine on Guam. It was requested by several --

"It is our objective to convey through long-term leases, outright transfers, or any other mutually agreeable arrangement, as much of the land and facilities as possible from the affected activities on Guam so as to stimulate local economic growth."

Finally, on the Navy Activities issues, the community and the government of Guam have asked for a two-year delay in the implementation of any recommendation which would delete or realign any billet off of Guam. This recommendation was passed to the Navy for analysis and the Navy has calculated it will cost over \$242 million to delay the implementation of the savings on Guam. This is not consistent with the goals of the BRAC process, this part of the recommendation.

Mr. Chairman, are there any further questions on Naval Activities Guam?

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Well, let me ask you this question, Commander Lindenbaum, because I believe that there will be some different actions contemplated here. I have heard everything you have said. Now, are you saying that this letter from the Navy contemplates what the Navy feels is appropriate with respect to Guam outside the recommendations

MR. YELLIN: Put up A-4, please. Excuse me.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: It was requested by several members of the Guam legislation that the Naval magazine on Guam be closed or consolidated. We sent this in and this request -- excuse me, we sent the request to the Navy to look at and they conducted an analysis.

The first scenario they looked at dealt with closing the magazine outright and moving it up to Anniston Air Force Base, which is on the northern end of the island. This would come at a cost of \$355 million and would involve taking all ammunition when it is brought to the island and then when it is taken off the island through the town of Agana on trucks. This alone is a safety risk that the Navy felt was not doable.

To get rid of this safety risk they decided they would have to build pier facilities at the northern end of the island. To do this it would cost \$1.22 billion to create pier facilities at the northern end, which would mean you would not have to drive the ammunition through downtown Agana.

Both of these alternatives, the Navy felt and our staff agreed with, were not economical and not feasible

already given us by the Department of Defense and that we should make no other accommodations because of cost?

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Yes, sir. The people that I have talked to, both at the base structure analysis team and the base structure evaluation team, have always said all along had it always been there intentions to maximize the amount of re-use that the community can have. In fact, it is to their economic benefit for the Navy to foster a spirit of re-use on the island to allow them to take over as much of the facilities as possible so the government would not have to either mothball, which doesn't work well on Guam, or would have to maintain some type of holding status on any properties or facilities.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Now, you have talked about deferring this for a couple years and the cost of a couple hundred million dollars, and I would suggest that we ought not to contemplate a cost of that kind.

There is some other discussion about the fleet supply center. What about that?

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: I will be getting to each of the -- those fall under four other separate recommendations.

5 don't you do that? Why don't you just go through the list.  
6 MR. YELLIN: We can go ahead, Mr. Chairman, and go  
7 through all of the Guam discussions.  
8 CHAIRMAN DIXON: I apologize to the commander. I  
9 thought that that was the extent of the contribution.  
0 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: This is just  
1 Naval Activities. Now I would like to go on to Ship Repair  
2 Facility Guam.  
3 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you. Who is doing the ship  
4 repair?  
5 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Correction. Let  
6 me go to Naval Air Station, please.  
7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Naval Air Station, okay.  
8 MR. YELLIN: That's A-5 and A-6.  
9 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: The former Naval  
0 Air Station Guam in Agana was closed as part of the 1993  
1 recommendation and part of that recommendation to Intel air  
2 squadrons, VQ-1 and VQ-5, and a helicopter squadron, HC-5,

5 fuel farm facility. The retention of this facility insures  
6 both military control of the facility, but also continues  
7 fuel support of the remaining DOD activities on Guam such as  
8 Anniston Air Force Base and the Navy Telecommunications  
9 Center.  
10 Mr. Chairman, are there any questions in regards to  
11 the supply center on Guam, or FISC Guam?  
12 COMMISSIONER STEELE: I just one this one, when we  
13 were in Guam, is it not correct that we heard that it was  
14 actually an oversight by the Navy to -- even in the  
15 disestablish had the potential of losing the fuel farm  
16 because we need it both for war reserves and just for the  
17 operations of activities that remain on the island?  
18 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: I'm not quite  
19 sure if oversight is the correct word. The Navy --  
20 COMMISSIONER STEELE: That was the word used but --  
21 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: One section of it  
22 would like to get out of the fuels business and they believed

1 were sent up to Anniston Air Force Base.  
2 What this recommendation you see before you does is  
3 allows VQ-1 and VQ-5 to be relocated to CONUS and allows HC-  
4 5, the helicopter squadron, to be relocated where the MSC  
5 ships go. The HC-5 is a true follower activity of the MSC  
6 ships because the MSC ships have the helicopters embarked  
7 with them when they deploy.  
8 As you can see from the issues slide, it can be  
9 broken down into two parts. First the VQ-1 and VQ-5. They  
0 have already left the island and have been consolidated by  
1 the operational commander with other like intelligence  
2 squadrons back in the continental United States.  
3 The HC-5, which would be relocated wherever the MSC  
4 ships go, does have one issue, and that is if they do leave  
5 there will be no organic SAR capability left on Guam, or  
6 search and rescue. The Coast Guard has been notified of this  
7 and is aware of the issue.  
8 Are there any questions on Naval Air Station Agana  
9 before I move on?  
0 (No response.)  
1 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Okay, the Ship  
2 Repair Facility, please. The recommendation for Ship Repair

1 Facility Guam is to close the Ship Repair Facility Guam,  
2 except retain the piers, floating drydock as typhoon  
3 anchorage and recompression chamber and floating crane and  
4 transfer that to Naval Activities Guam.  
5 The part of what is retained there would allow the  
6 access to be maintained to Guam. And this goes back, once  
7 again, to the strategic importance of Guam and its location.  
8 Under the issues for Guam you will see that SRF Guam  
9 presently has excess capacity. It is presently operating at  
0 72.4 percent of its capacity and the MSC ships, which could  
1 possibly leave under the recommendation, represent 35 percent  
2 of that 72.4.  
3 Re-use issues. Once again, I believe the DOD's  
4 position is summarized in Secretary Perry's letter, which I  
5 have already quoted the applicable part from.  
6 Are there any questions in regards to SRF Guam  
7 before I move on?  
8 (No response.)  
9 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: I would like to  
0 go to the Fleet Industrial Supply Center Guam. The Fleet  
1 Industrial Supply Center Guam, or FISC Guam, the  
2 recommendation is to outright disestablish the Fleet

1 that a private firm might be able to come in and take over  
2 the fuel farm and privatize it and then the Navy would buy  
3 back from it fuels.  
4 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Commissioner Steele, being  
5 present at that same conversation, I heard the same words  
6 that you did.  
7 COMMISSIONER STEELE: It was said pretty clearly.  
8 And I realize you weren't there at that part of that  
9 conversation, but it was stated as an oversight and because  
10 if commercial activity took it over they couldn't use 80  
11 percent of the fuel farm anyway because it's a different type  
12 of fuel and the tanks are below ground and all sorts of  
13 stuff. We probably don't need to get into the detail here,  
14 but it was something needed for war reserves and daily  
15 operations. I just wanted to make sure my colleagues were  
16 aware of that.  
17 MR. YELLIN: Commissioner Steele, I think as Eric  
18 was explaining, there is a difference of opinion in the Navy.  
19 We went back and asked them about this and the official  
20 position of the Navy that developed the base closure  
21 recommendations through the Secretary said that they didn't  
22 need it. But you are absolutely right, the operational

1 commander has clearly indicated that he needs to -- he wants  
2 to keep it. You are absolutely right. There is that  
3 controversy there within the Navy on that.  
4 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Thank you.  
5 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: I would like to  
6 shift to Public Works Center Guam, please. Public Works  
7 Center Guam was removed from the list by the Secretary of the  
8 Navy for excessive job loss reasons.  
9 On the slide you can see two possible alternatives.  
10 The first one is the commission alternative to close. The  
11 figures you see were passed to the Navy for their analysis  
12 and you can see a 42-year tumbback on a return on investment.  
13 The second alternative is to realign. The realign  
14 does have a positive economic return. You can see an  
15 immediate return on investment. What the realignment does is  
16 take the center and it will realign it to a detachment at  
17 Public Works Center Pearl Harbor, and they will be able to  
18 remove some of their excess overhead. This will then make  
19 the center more economical to run and they will be able to  
20 pass on lower costs to their clients. They do operate in  
21 that regards as a DBOF activity. Excuse me for the acronym.  
22 Defense Base --

I would save some money. The community has indicated they feel that this sends the wrong sign to the eyes there at the public works center at a time when other organizations in Guam will be having personnel cuts.

The Navy has indicated that this is not a major concern for them, that they could operate either way and, in a DBOF, or industrially funded activity, a public works center sizes its work force to the workload so that it can be done no matter what we would do here.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: As a matter of fact, Mr. Yellin, I have, as you know, I am familiar with this world of the Navy and I have had some later on discussions with Commissioner Steele will probably be offering a motion to permit flexibility to have that command-remain in place but to be able to downsize over time, as the rest of the Navy does. So we are going to be recommending the command

5 The answer is we don't know the answer, but it allows -- for  
6 a good reason. It allows the Navy to determine what they  
7 would like to do, meaning if they choose for operational  
8 reasons to put the MSC ships in one place or another, it is  
9 fully their decision to make that choice. And they, I  
10 believe, have sent us letters saying that that flexibility  
11 would be fine. They haven't said they want them in Hawaii;  
12 they haven't said they are going to keep them in Guam. It  
13 just provides them the flexibility to work with the  
14 government of Guam to proceed in the best course for both  
15 parties.

16 COMMISSIONER KLING: So, really, what you are  
17 saying is that the Navy is comfortable with this.

18 COMMISSIONER STEELE: That is fully my  
19 understanding. Would you concur?

20 MR. YELLIN: Commissioner Kling, the staff's  
21 assessment would be that we would use the original -- the  
22 COBRA information we have displayed to you. The Navy has a

1 DEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: One final part of  
2 Public Works Center Guam I would like to add is the former --  
3 center housing at the former Naval Air Station Agaña is  
4 presently by Public Works Center Guam. The community  
5 is looking for this housing to be excessed. To excess this  
6 would be consistent with the GLUP process since this  
7 is a stand alone housing. It does not abut upon any  
8 military base and it is on the only thing left over  
9 from the Naval Air Station. And the RNA staff also believes  
10 this would be the correct thing to do and consistent  
11 with the GLUP process.

12 MR. YELLIN: That concludes our presentation on  
13 activities.

14 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there questions of staff,  
15 commissioners?  
16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there questions of staff? Are  
18 there any comments by any commissioners and, particularly, the  
19 ones that visited there that want to make some observations  
20 on this?

21 COMMISSIONER STEELE: I would just state that at  
22 least I feel very comfortable that the motions that we

1 affected, though you will hear substantially deviated  
2 from the original -- that is because changes needed to be  
3 made there isn't a substantial deviation in the sense of  
4 the way the Navy's flexibility to achieve great savings.  
5 On the flip side for Guam as well, the substantial

6 savings, the new language, allows for the government of  
7 Guam to have maximum flexibility for re-use of assets.  
8 And I just feel very comfortable that the language  
9 we are proposing to use as motions, and Commissioner  
10 Steele as well, is the best of all worlds for all parties  
11 involved.

12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.

13 COMMISSIONER KLING: Following through what  
14 Commissioner Steele just said, what are the amount of savings  
15 the Navy's recommendation to the one that Commissioner  
16 Steele is going to do? What are we losing in the way of  
17 savings? What is the difference? Tell me the major  
18 cost and the major cost of it.

19 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Actually, I can answer that.

20 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Does the commander understand what  
21 Commissioner Steele's motions will be?

22 DEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Yes, sir.

1 lot of options in the motions that I believe you are going to  
2 propose and so they could do the implementation, in essence,  
3 in the way they had anticipated.

4 COMMISSIONER STEELE: In some ways -- I'm sorry,  
5 I just want to add to that, there is some words that say the 1994  
6 Guam Land Use Plan. These are additional properties on Guam  
7 that the Navy has been trying to excess for a number of  
8 years. In fact, if they can get those off their books and  
9 transferred to the government of Guam there would be some  
10 savings there as well for the Navy.

11 COMMISSIONER KLING: But just to answer the  
12 question, the Navy is comfortable with the direction we're  
13 going?

14 MR. YELLIN: Yes, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cornella.

16 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: You know, I would add to  
17 that because this is something we spent a tremendous amount  
18 of time on. I mean, if there is one issue that we have spent  
19 the majority, at least of this commissioner's time, it has  
20 been spent on Guam and on the issues regarding Guam.

21 On June 14th we posed the questions that will arise  
22 here today to the Navy and they agreed to the language that

1 is contained in these motions.

2 Is that not correct?

3 MR. YELLIN: Yes, sir.

4 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Okay. Thank you very much.

5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: May I ask you that then this, Mr.

6 Yellin, and I would urge my colleagues who have some  
7 exceptional knowledge because of their visitation to  
8 enlighten the chair and perhaps other commissioners as well.  
9 I count nine motions here.

10 COMMISSIONER STEELE: No, sir. I see some  
11 alternative motions.

12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Or at least the potentiality of  
13 nine are in my draft book here.

14 MR. YELLIN: Mr. Chairman, some of those are  
15 alternatives.

16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Okay.

17 MR. YELLIN: Are exclusive -- I mean, some of them  
18 would not be -- if one within that group is accepted for a  
19 specific facility, the others would not be.

20 CHAIRMAN DIXON: All right. Now, here is one  
21 accepting the Secretary's recommendation and then there are  
22 variations doing a variety of things in what I see is eight

5 MR. YELLIN: Yes, sir.  
6 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Can we do that?  
7 MR. YELLIN: Yes, sir.  
8 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Does anybody want to offer a  
9 motion?  
10 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Yes, sir.  
11 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Steele.  
12 M O T I O N  
13 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Mr. Chairman, you will love  
14 this one. It's about 30 lines long. I move that the  
15 commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated  
16 substantially from final criteria one and, therefore, the  
17 commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Naval  
18 Activities Guam and, instead, adopt the following  
19 recommendation:  
20 Realign Naval Activities Guam; locate all Military  
21 Sea Lift Command assets and related personnel and support at  
22 available DOD activities or in rented facilities as required

1 to support operational commitments; disestablish the Navy  
2 Pacific Meteorology and Oceanographic Center WESTPAC, except  
3 for the Joint Typhoon Warning Center, which relocates to the  
4 Naval Pacific Meteorology and Oceanographic Center Pearl  
5 Harbor, Hawaii; disestablish the Afloat Training Group  
6 WESTPAC; all other Department of Defense activities that are  
7 presently on Naval Activities Guam may remain either as a  
8 tenant of Naval Activities Guam or other appropriate Naval  
9 activity; retain waterfront assets for support, mobilization,  
10 and contingencies to support the Afloat tender and to support  
11 shared use of these assets consistent with operational  
12 requirements, if appropriate; dispose of property owned by  
13 Naval Activities declared releasable under the 1994 Guam Land  
14 Use Plan with appropriate restrictions. The commission finds  
15 this recommendation is consistent with the force structure  
16 plan and final criteria.  
17 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I second that motion.  
18 CHAIRMAN DIXON: All right. The motion is offered  
19 by Commissioner Steele and seconded by Commissioner Cornella.  
20 Now, Mr. Yellin, this motion rejects the Secretary's  
21 recommendation and makes substantial modifications.  
22 Would you enlighten us?

1 MR. YELLIN: Yes. Commander Lindenbaum will  
2 discuss that.  
3 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commander Lindenbaum.  
4 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Yes, sir. The  
5 first thing it does is it allows operational flexibility to  
6 station the MSC ships where the Navy best feels they should  
7 be. The second part that it does is includes the GLUP, or  
8 the Guam Land Use Plan, lands in the BRAC process. The  
9 reason why they want that is they had the first process was  
10 1977 and they still have lands which are being held up in the  
11 court system. If you include it in the BRAC process it goes  
12 through quicker. Economic revitalization can also occur  
13 faster.  
14 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And is the Secretary of the Navy  
15 comfortable with this motion?  
16 LIEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Yes, sir.  
17 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Let me add one more  
18 embellishment, if I could, please. Mr. Chairman, it makes  
19 one more difference. On the line that says, "retain  
20 waterfront assets for support, mobilization, and  
21 contingencies to support the Afloat tender," we add, "and to  
22 support shared use of these assets consistent with

5 winner, Commissioner Steele. You're ahead on this one.  
6 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Well, I'm being fair, sir.  
7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there any further comment?  
8 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes, sir.  
9 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Okay, Commissioner Davis.  
10 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I realize you have not been  
11 able to cost the difference, or have you, between the  
12 original request of the Department of Defense and this one?  
13 MR. YELLIN: The reason why it's difficult to cost  
14 this is that it does not specify a specific location for the  
15 MSC ships to go. The location that is called out in the  
16 original recommendation scenario, which says Hawaii, is still  
17 an applicable option for the Navy for this. And the  
18 assumption is that the Navy will work in their best interest  
19 top do things that are operationally and economically  
20 beneficial.  
21 So that is why the staff is recommending that you  
22 would use the original COBRA results as, right now, our best

1 assessment of this alternative. It does give the Navy  
2 flexibility and the assumption is that the Navy will do what  
3 is in their best interest as a balancing of operational and  
4 cost issues to do that.  
5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: May counsel call the roll?  
6 Counsel will call the roll.  
7 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.  
8 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
9 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella.  
10 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
11 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox is recused on this  
12 issue. Commissioner Davis.  
13 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
14 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.  
15 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
16 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.  
17 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
18 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.  
19 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
20 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
22 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the votes are seven

1 ayes and zero nays.  
2 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Seven ayes and no nays.  
3 Commissioner Cox recused herself. And that motion to deviate  
4 from the Secretary's recommendation is adopted.  
5 Is there a further motion?  
6 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.  
7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Steele.  
8 M O T I O N  
9 COMMISSIONER STEELE: I move that the commission  
10 find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially  
11 from final criteria one and, therefore, the commission reject  
12 the Secretary's recommendation on Naval Air Station Agana,  
13 Guam, and, instead, adopt the following recommendation:  
14 Change the receiving site specified by the 1993  
15 commission (1993 Commission Report at page 1 - 21) for the  
16 "aircraft, personnel, and associated equipment" from the  
17 closing Naval Air Station Agana, Guam, from "Andersen Air  
18 Force Base Guam to other Naval or DOD air stations." The  
19 commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the  
20 force structure plan and final criteria.  
21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And is there a second to the  
22 motion of Commissioner Steele?

ion?  
EUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Sir, this allows helicopter squadron to be co-located to wherever the ssels go.  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Is the Secretary of the Navy able with it?  
EUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Yes, sir.  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any other comments? (o response.)  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.  
S. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
S. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella.  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
S. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox is recused.  
sioner Davis.  
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
S. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.

5 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
6 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
7 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the votes are seven  
8 ayes and zero nays.  
9 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Seven ayes, zero nays.  
10 Commissioner Cox recuses herself. And the motion carries  
11 unanimously. Are there any further motions?  
12 M O T I O N  
13 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Yes, sir. I move that the  
14 commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated  
15 substantially from final criterion one and, therefore, the  
16 commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Fleet  
17 Industrial Supply Center Guam and, instead, adopt the  
18 following recommendation:  
19 Disestablish the Fleet Industrial Supply Center  
20 Guam; retain appropriate assets in the FISC fuel facilities,  
21 including Piers D and E, tanks farms, and associated  
22 pipelines and pumping systems under DOD operational control

COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
S. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.  
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
S. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.  
COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
S. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
S. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the votes are seven  
l zero nays.  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Seven ayes, zero nays.  
sioner Cox recuses. And that motion is adopted.  
re there any further motions?  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I have a motion, sir.  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cornella.  
M O T I O N  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I move that the commission  
: the Secretary of Defense did not deviate  
ially from the force structure plan final criteria  
efore, that the commission adopt the following  
endation of the Secretary of Defense:  
ose the Naval Ship Repair Facility Guam, except  
appropriate assets, including the piers, floating

1 to support military service fuel requirements. The  
2 commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the  
3 force structure plan and final criteria.  
4 CHAIRMAN DIXON: You hear the motion by  
5 Commissioner Cornella. Is there a second?  
6 COMMISSIONER STEELE: I second the motion.  
7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox seconds (sic).  
8 Mr. Yellin.  
9 MR. YELLIN: Sir, what this does is it takes in the  
10 operational commander's wishes to retain the fuel farm assets  
11 and also it means in the COBRA analysis a less savings of \$46  
12 million over the net present value life cycle time.  
13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: The Secretary of the Navy  
14 acquiesces?  
15 LEUTENANT COMMANDER LINDENBAUM: Sir, I think  
16 there is still some controversy but I think it has been  
17 acceptable to them because of the operational commander's  
18 concerns.  
19 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions?  
20 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Just a legal comment.  
21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.  
22 COMMISSIONER STEELE: That is what I was going to

, its typhoon base and anchorage, the recompression  
and the floating crane, to Naval Activities Guam.  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a second to the motion  
Commissioner Cornella?  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: I second the motion.  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Seconded by Commissioner Steele.  
in, Commander Lindenbaum, do you have any comment?  
R. YELLIN: This is a direct acceptance of the DOD  
endation and that's still in accordance with the Navy  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions by any commissioner?  
(o response.)  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.  
S. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella.  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
S. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.  
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
S. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox is recused on this  
ommissioner Kling.  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
S. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.  
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.

1 say. Just since Commissioner Cox is recused, make sure it  
2 says Commissioner Steele as second. That's all. Or anyone  
3 else.  
4 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Did I say Commissioner -- I  
5 apologize. Commissioner Steele seconds. Commissioner Cox  
6 recused herself. I apologize.  
7 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: One last comment, sir, on  
8 this. This is the issue that we discussed just a moment ago  
9 where the operational commanders, both the Commander in Chief  
10 of the Pacific Fleet and the Commander in Chief Pacific, have  
11 indicated that we need these facilities for war reserves an  
12 for Andersen Air Force Base. So I think it is important that  
13 we accept this recommendation.  
14 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any further comments  
15 before counsel calls the roll?  
16 (No response.)  
17 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.  
18 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella.  
19 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
20 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox is recused.  
21 Commissioner Davis.  
22 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

5 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.  
 6 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
 7 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.  
 8 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
 9 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
 10 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
 11 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the votes are seven  
 12 ayes and zero nays.  
 13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Motion carries. Are there any  
 14 further motions?  
 15 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Yes, sir.  
 16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Steele.  
 17 M O T I O N  
 18 COMMISSIONER STEELE: I move that the commission  
 19 find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially  
 20 from final criteria five and, therefore, the commission  
 21 recommend the following: Realign Public Works Center Guam to  
 22 match assigned workload; close the officer housing at the

5 Are we doing the right thing here? Is this what  
 6 people want us to do?  
 7 MR. YELLIN: Mr. Chairman, there are significant  
 8 excess housing, military housing, available on Guam so this  
 9 would not impact -- in the staff's opinion, the Navy's  
 10 position is that they would prefer not to have the commission  
 11 determine which housing to excess and which to keep. They  
 12 would like to do that themselves.  
 13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is this what both Commissioner  
 14 Cornella and Commissioner Steele think we ought to do after  
 15 looking at things over there?  
 16 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I do, sir. There are other  
 17 dynamics into this situation and I can't go into because  
 18 of --  
 19 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Ah, there are big secrets here.  
 20 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Well, they're not that big.  
 21 And if I had to make one suggestion for future commissions, I  
 22 would say that all commissioners should sit in on all

1 former Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam. The commission finds  
 2 this recommendation is consistent with the force structure  
 3 plan and final criteria.  
 4 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a second to Commissioner  
 5 Steele's motion?  
 6 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Second.  
 7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cornella seconds the  
 8 motion. Commander Lindenbaum, do you have any comment on  
 9 that particular subject?  
 10 MR. YELLIN: Mr. Chairman.  
 11 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Mr. Yellin.  
 12 MR. YELLIN: The issue here related to the workload  
 13 sizing in the Public Works Center, that fits every statement  
 14 we have had from the Navy about what their plans are for the  
 15 Public Works Center.  
 16 Concerning the housing, the Navy's response on the  
 17 housing in Guam is that their preference would be to look at  
 18 the housing as a unit after they do all the realignments and  
 19 determine at that time what housing they would like to keep  
 20 or dispose of. So for this part of this motion, the Navy's  
 21 official position is that they would like us not to do that.  
 22 COMMISSIONER STEELE: May I ask you a clarifying

1 classified briefings. But that aside, I would say -- where  
 2 is that housing located, Mr. Yellin?  
 3 MR. YELLIN: Mr. Chairman, the housing is at the  
 4 Naval Air Station.  
 5 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: What is the situation  
 6 regarding the Naval Air Station? Where is that at in this  
 7 process?  
 8 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cornella, I don't  
 9 think we need to go at it any more. Commissioner Montoya, I  
 10 think, also agrees that this is probably the right thing to  
 11 do. Is there any commissioner that things otherwise because,  
 12 if not, we don't need to go into it more.  
 13 MR. YELLIN: I didn't mean to mislead anyone. The  
 14 staff certainly believes that there is plenty of housing  
 15 available on Guam, even if this is closed.  
 16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Okay, good. Counsel will call the  
 17 roll.  
 18 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.  
 19 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
 20 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella.  
 21 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
 22 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox is recused.

1 questions?  
 2 MR. YELLIN: Sure.  
 3 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Does not the Navy have  
 4 adequate housing on the island of Guam, in fact, excess  
 5 housing due to Andersen and other places?  
 6 MR. YELLIN: Commissioner Steele, the amount of  
 7 reductions of personnel in Guam that are anticipated show  
 8 that there is significant housing available even if this  
 9 housing is closed. You are absolutely right.  
 10 COMMISSIONER STEELE: And at this point there are  
 11 doctors, I believe, living in the housing instead of folks  
 12 that were working at the Naval Air Station?  
 13 MR. YELLIN: The housing at the Naval Air Station  
 14 was always part of the Navy's overall housing so it housed  
 15 people from all over the activities. But you are right, this  
 16 does not house people that were at the Naval Air Station in  
 17 the past.  
 18 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Thank you.  
 19 CHAIRMAN DIXON: But now let me see if I understand  
 20 this now. We are closing here officer housing.  
 21 MR. YELLIN: Yes, sir.  
 22 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Now, the Congress has just -- I

1 Commissioner Davis.  
 2 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
 3 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.  
 4 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
 5 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.  
 6 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
 7 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.  
 8 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
 9 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
 10 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
 11 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is seven ayes  
 12 and zero nays.  
 13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: The motion is adopted. Are there  
 14 any further motions?  
 15 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Mr. Chairman, I would like  
 16 to make a comment. I have been associated with in and around  
 17 Guam since the mid-1960s and some of these issues we have  
 18 talked about today have been around since before  
 19 Representative Underwood was born, I think. And these two  
 20 commissioners and what they have done, they have advanced  
 21 Guam Navy relations tremendously, even in the face of some  
 22 very difficult issues for Guam. They deserve a lot of credit

space in Fairfax, Virginia, to existing space at Fort C. There has only been one issue identified with this recommendation is that the Army plans to back-fill the space SSC currently occupies with tenants in other lease in the Washington area. They haven't made a final decision, but the tenants under consideration have comparable lease costs with So there would be some lease savings. Again, this is tent with the Army recommendation to reduce lease I'll entertain any questions?  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions for Mr. Kennedy? (No response.)  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any statements by Commissioners? (No response.)  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: Yes, sir.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.  
 M O T I O N  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: I move the Commission find the

3 Mr. Chairman, the recommendation is to close the Publications  
 4 Distribution Center Baltimore, Maryland, and relocate its  
 5 activities to the U.S. Army Publication Center, St. Louis,  
 6 Missouri.  
 7 Our analysis revealed that the DOD-wide study seems  
 8 to be focusing on consolidation within the Defense Logistics  
 9 Agency. However, its completion and implementation are  
 10 uncertain.  
 11 In the interim, the Army requires only one  
 12 publication center. The St. Louis center is better suited to  
 13 bulk storage. The St. Louis center is completely automated  
 14 while the Baltimore center is not, and any requirement for  
 15 additional space will be temporary and will be in an Army-  
 16 owned facility. Subject to your questions, Mr. Chairman,  
 17 that completes our presentation.  
 18 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any questions?  
 19 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have  
 20 two questions?  
 21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Steele?  
 22 COMMISSIONER STEELE: I understand, Mr. Brown, that

Page 620  
 try of Defense did not deviate substantially from the Structure Plan and Final Criteria and therefore the mission adopt the following recommendation of the try of Defense close by relocating Information Systems re Command to Fort Meade, Maryland.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a second?  
 COMMISSIONER STEELE: I second the motion.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Seconded by Commissioner Steele. Are any comments or questions?  
 No response.)  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.  
 AS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
 AS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?  
 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
 AS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?  
 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
 AS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?  
 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
 AS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
 AS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?

Page 623  
 1 DOD is currently considering a service-wide consolidation of  
 2 its publications distribution mission. In light of DOD's  
 3 fluctuating PDC mission over the next several years,  
 4 especially as it converts to more diverse and streamlined  
 5 mission, doesn't it make sense, most business sense -- excuse  
 6 me. I've got too many notes on here. Does it not make the  
 7 most business sense -- good grieve. I'm sorry. The late  
 8 hour is catching up with me. Why are we eliminating the most  
 9 flexibility facility, Mr. Brown, from the background I've  
 10 received on this.  
 11 MR. BROWN: It's our analysis, Commissioner Steele.  
 12 that within the Army there is a need for only one  
 13 distribution center, and the St. Louis center provides for  
 14 flexibility. However, within the entire Department of  
 15 Defense, there are a number of installations, and there is no  
 16 certainty how many would be required.  
 17 We have no idea when a study would be completed,  
 18 how that study would result, and in the interim, it's prudent  
 19 for the Army to get down to one publication center.  
 20 COMMISSIONER STEELE: But I understand that the  
 21 Army's PDC mission focuses mainly on readiness and quick  
 22 response times, and other services do not. But is it true

Page 621  
 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
 S. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
 S. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
 S. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is 8 ayes and  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the motion is adopted. Space Strategic Defense Command, Alabama.  
 COMMISSIONER COX: Mr. Chairman?  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox?  
 COMMISSIONER COX: This was a Commission add. Included it as an alternative to the ATCOM move to Red rd given the last vote, I suggest we simply move on.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there anybody who wants to make a motion on this question in Alabama?  
 No response.)  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Anybody want to make a motion?  
 No response.)  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Space and Strategic Defense Command lease facility Alabama is open. Okay. Minor issues at. Baltimore Publications Distribution Center,

Page 624  
 1 that the Army's facilities could carry out the missions of  
 2 the other services; whereas, the Navy and the Air Force could  
 3 not effectively carry out the Army's mission?  
 4 MR. BROWN: I can't comment on the capabilities of  
 5 the other two services, Commissioner Steele.  
 6 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Can anyone address that  
 7 issue?  
 8 MR. BROWN: We did not look into it because it was  
 9 not part of this recommendation and the analysis of this  
 10 recommendation.  
 11 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: I will make just a quick  
 12 comment that --  
 13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Robles?  
 14 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: -- that this is part of a  
 15 bigger issue that has been simmering for several years that  
 16 came out of the Defense Management Review of the early '90s  
 17 in which seems like all printing was transferred to the Navy,  
 18 and they were looking at electronic line printing and a whole  
 19 series of high tech information technology assertions to  
 20 streamline the whole process.  
 21 That has been studied and is continually being  
 22 study, and I share Mr. Brown's concern that you'll be

4 study to complete, which may exceed our lifetimes, at least  
5 we ought to get the Army's publication structure down into  
6 one facility, because that's all the requirement is.  
7 And I guess what you said is their military value  
8 judgment is that the St. Louis facility is the most flexible  
9 and the one they'd like to stick with as being the core  
10 facility.  
11 MR. BROWN: That's correct, Commissioner Robles.  
12 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Thank you.  
13 COMMISSIONER COX: Could I just ask a question on  
14 that?  
15 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.  
16 COMMISSIONER COX: Given the fact that there is at  
17 least some thought of cross-servicing, and this may or may  
18 not be available for others, let me just ask this question.  
19 This is below threshold, isn't it?  
20 MR. BROWN: It is.  
21 COMMISSIONER COX: So, in fact, if the Army wanted  
22 to do this in the next year or two, having completed their

3 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
4 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
5 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: No.  
6 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?  
7 COMMISSIONER COX: No.  
8 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
9 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
10 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?  
11 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
12 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?  
13 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
14 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?  
15 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
16 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is 6 ayes and  
17 2 nays.  
18 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the motion is carried.  
19 Bellmore Logistics Activity in New York.  
20 MR. BROWN: The Department of Defense's  
21 recommendation is to close Bellmore Logistics Activity. No  
22 issues have been identified during our analysis of this.

Page 626

1 study, they could do it? I mean, they don't need us to close  
2 this facility?  
3 MR. BROWN: That is correct, Commissioner Cox.  
4 COMMISSIONER COX: Thank you.  
5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any other questions or  
6 comments?  
7 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Mr. Chairman.  
8 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Davis.  
9 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I have one just real vague  
0 question. We lost several million records in St. Louis many  
1 years ago due to a fire. Is this the same place?  
2 MR. BROWN: No, it's not, Commissioner Davis.  
3 Those were retiree records, as I recollect, and personnel  
4 records. These are forms, publications.  
5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Thank you very much,  
6 Mr. Brown. You give me great confidence.  
7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any further questions?  
8 (No response.)  
9 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any further statements?  
0 (No response.)  
1 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?  
2 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Mr. Chairman, I have a

Page 629  
1 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any questions -  
2 MR. BROWN: There are no tenants on this  
3 installation, Mr. Chairman.  
4 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any questions of  
5 Mr. Brown? Any comments or questions?  
6 (No response.)  
7 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I have a motion, Mr.  
8 Chairman.  
9 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cornella.  
10 M O T I O N  
11 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I move the Commission find  
12 the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from  
13 the Force Structure Plan and Final Criteria and therefore the  
14 Commission adopt the following recommendation of the  
15 Secretary of Defense: Close Bellmore Logistics Activity.  
16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Anything  
17 else from any of my colleagues?  
18 (No response.)  
19 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.  
20 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
21 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
22 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?

Page 627

motion.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Robles.  
M O T I O N  
COMMISSIONER ROBLES: I move the Commission find  
the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially in the  
Force Structure Plan and Final Criteria and therefore the  
Commission adopt the following recommendation of the  
Secretary of Defense: Close by relocating the U.S. Army  
Publications Distribution Center, Baltimore, to the U.S. Army  
Publications Center, St. Louis, Missouri.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a second?  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Second, Mr. Chairman.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Seconded by Commissioner Kling.  
Are there any more comments or questions?  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: I would just comment that in  
light of the testimony this evening I feel confident that  
everyone here is confident that the other facility would have  
a little more flexibility. So thank you for bringing me up  
to speed on that. I appreciate it.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you, Commissioner Steele.  
Counsel will call the roll.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?

Page 630  
1 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
2 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
3 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
4 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling is aye by proxy.  
5 Commissioner Montoya?  
6 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
7 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?  
8 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
9 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?  
10 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
11 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?  
12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
13 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, there are 8 ayes and 0  
14 nays.  
15 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And that motion is unanimously  
16 adopted. Big Coppett Key, Florida.  
17 MR. BROWN: The recommendation is to close this  
18 installation. It's another one with no tenants, and no  
19 issues have been identified, Mr. Chairman.  
20 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions of Mr. Brown?  
21 (No response.)  
22 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any statements?

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cornella.  
MOTION

COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I move the Commission find Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from Force Structure Plan and Final Criteria and therefore the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Big Coppett Key.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Any other comments?  
(No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel call the roll.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?  
COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling is aye by proxy.  
COMMISSIONER MONTROYA?

3 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?  
4 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the Chairman votes aye, and we  
6 are awaiting -- there is a proxy being obtained from  
7 Commissioner Robles that I would appreciate your bringing in  
8 here before I announce the vote.  
9 May I have the unanimous consent from the  
10 commissioners, the vote now being seven to nothing, and this  
11 motion obviously having carried, to permit Commissioner  
12 Robles to vote when he returns, his vote being a vote that  
13 will not change the result. Any objection? I thank you.  
14 Commissioner Robles votes aye. And the vote on that question  
15 is eight ayes and no nays, and the motion is unanimously  
16 adopted.  
17 Camp Kilmer, New Jersey.  
18 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the recommendation on  
19 Camp Kilmer is to close it, except for an enclave for minimum  
20 necessary facilities to support the reserve components. No  
21 issues have been identified on this installation.  
22 COMMISSIONER COX: Mr. Brown, if I might ask a

COMMISSIONER MONTROYA: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?  
COMMISSIONER COX: He stepped out for a moment.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: The Chair votes aye, and Commissioner Robles had told me he wanted to vote aye by proxy. Do I have unanimous consent it will not change the vote?  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, that makes the vote 8 to 0 nays.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the motion is carried unanimously. Camp Bonneville, Washington.  
MR. BROWN: The recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is to keep Camp Bonneville. There are no tenants on this camp, and no issues have been identified.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there any question of Mr. Brown Commissioner?  
(No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any statement?  
(No response.)

1 question. I understand that the Army has plans later in this  
2 decade -- the year 2000 or so -- to build a facility at Camp  
3 Kilmer. Would this be inconsistent with those plans?  
4 MR. BROWN: I do not believe so, Commissioner Cox.  
5 If the enclave is established, and the Army has a requirement  
6 for that facility, I feel certain it would be put on that  
7 enclave.  
8 COMMISSIONER COX: Thank you.  
9 MR. BROWN: And if the Army has a plan to build a  
10 facility there, I would hope that when they establish the  
11 enclave, they would take that into consideration.  
12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any further questions or  
13 statements? Is there a motion on Camp Kilmer, New Jersey?  
14 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Yes, sir, I have a motion.  
15 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cornella.  
16 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I move the commission find  
17 the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from  
18 the force structure plan and final criteria; and therefore,  
19 the commission adopt the following recommendation of the  
20 Secretary of Defense. Close Camp Kilmer, except for an  
21 enclave for minimum necessary facilities to support the  
22 reserve components.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I have a motion, sir?  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cornella.  
MOTION  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I move the Commission find Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from Force Structure Plan and Final Criteria and therefore the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Camp Bonneville.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second that motion. Any other comments?  
(No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions?  
(No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel call the roll.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?  
COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling is aye by proxy.

1 CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Any  
2 comments? Counsel will call the roll.  
3 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella.  
4 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
5 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox.  
6 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
7 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.  
8 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
9 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.  
10 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
11 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.  
12 COMMISSIONER MONTROYA: Aye.  
13 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles is aye by proxy.  
14 Commissioner Steele.  
15 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
16 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
17 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
18 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes  
19 and zero nays.  
20 CHAIRMAN DIXON: That motion carries. Camp  
21 Pedricktown, New Jersey.  
22 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the recommendation is to

4 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Mr. Chairman.  
5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cornella.  
6 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I move the commission find  
7 the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from  
8 the force structure plan and final criteria; and therefore,  
9 the commission adopt the following recommendation of the  
10 Secretary of Defense. Close Camp Pedricktown, except the  
11 Seavers-Sandburg reserve center.  
12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Any  
13 comments? Counsel, call the roll.  
14 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella.  
15 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
16 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox.  
17 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
18 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.  
19 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
20 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.  
21 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
22 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.

3 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.  
4 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
5 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles votes aye, proxy.  
6 Commissioner Steele.  
7 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
8 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
9 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
10 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes  
11 and zero nays.  
12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: The motion carries unanimously.  
13 East Fort Baker, California.  
14 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the recommendation is to  
15 close East Fort Baker, relocate all tenants to other  
16 installations that meet mission requirements and return all  
17 real property to the Golden Gate National Recreation area.  
18 No issues have been identified.  
19 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions or statements?  
20 (No response.)  
21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion.  
22 COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman.

Page 638

1 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
2 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles is aye, by proxy.  
3 Commissioner Steele.  
4 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
5 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
6 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
7 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes  
8 and zero nays.  
9 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the motion is unanimously  
10 adopted. Caven Point, U.S. Army Reserve Center, New Jersey.  
11 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the recommendation is to  
12 close that installation and relocate it reserve activities to  
13 Fort Hamilton, New York, provided the recommendation to  
14 realign Fort Hamilton is approved. There is also in the  
15 Secretary of Defense's letter on the 14th of June -- he  
16 stated that the relocation of units from Caven Point is no  
17 longer supportable since an unanticipated new construction is  
18 required to execute the move that would made the economics of  
19 this recommendation --  
20 CHAIRMAN DIXON: The Secretary of Defense has asked  
21 that we reject his earlier recommendation.  
22 MR. BROWN: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Page 641

1 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Mr. Kling.  
2 COMMISSIONER KLING: I move the Commission find the  
3 Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the  
4 force structure plan and final criteria and therefore, the  
5 Commission adopt the following recommendation of the  
6 Secretary of Defense: Close East Fort Baker, relocate all  
7 tenants to other installations that meet mission  
8 requirements, return all property to the Golden Gate National  
9 Recreation area.  
10 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Second the motion. Any further  
11 comments?  
12 (No response.)  
13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.  
14 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.  
15 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
16 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.  
17 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
18 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles votes aye, proxy.  
19 Commissioner Steele.  
20 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
21 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.  
22 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

Page 639

1 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Keep open Caven Point?  
2 MR. BROWN: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.  
3 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion.  
4 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I have a motion.  
5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cornella.  
6 M O T I O N  
7 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I move the Commission find  
8 the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final  
9 criterion two and, therefore, the Commission reject the  
0 Secretary's recommendation on Caven Point and, instead, adopt  
1 the following recommendation: Keep open Caven Point US Army  
2 Reserve Center. The Commission finds this recommendation is  
3 consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.  
4 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Second the motion. Any comments?  
5 (No response.)  
6 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel, call the roll.  
7 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella.  
8 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
9 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox.  
0 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
1 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis:  
2 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

Page 642

1 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella is aye, by  
2 proxy.  
3 CHAIRMAN DIXON: All right, can I have unanimous  
4 consent to -- the Chair votes aye. How many votes is that?  
5 MS. CREEDON: That's seven.  
6 CHAIRMAN DIXON: May I have unanimous consent of  
7 the Commission to vote Commissioner Cox when she returns  
8 since her vote will not change the result?  
9 COMMISSIONER KLING: Yes, sir.  
10 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Would Commissioners in the future,  
11 if they want to have their votes recorded, leave a proxy  
12 temporarily with the Chair.  
13 The vote is -- how do you want to vote?  
14 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
15 CHAIRMAN DIXON: The vote is eight ayes, no nays.  
16 The motion is adopted. Fort Missoula, Montana.  
17 MR. BROWN: The recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is to  
18 close Fort Missoula except ban enclave for minimum essential  
19 land and facilities to support the reserve component units.  
20 No issues have been identified.  
21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there any question of Mr.  
22 Brown?

No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: What's the pleasure of the  
ission with respect to Fort Missoula, Montana.  
OMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman.  
HAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.

MOTION

OMMISSIONER KLING: I move the Commission find the  
ry of Defense did not deviate substantially from the  
tructure plan and final criteria and therefore, the  
ission adopt the following recommendation of the  
ry of Defense: Close Fort Missoula except an enclave  
imum essential land and facilities to support the  
component units.

HAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Any  
nts?

No response.)

HAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel, call the roll.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.

OMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.

3 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes  
4 and zero nays.

5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: That motion carries. Recreation  
6 Center #2, North Carolina.

7 MR. BROWN: The recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is  
8 close this facility. No additional issues have been  
9 identified.

10 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?

13 COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman, I move the  
14 Commission find the Secretary of Defense did not deviate  
15 substantially from the force structure plan and final

16 criteria and therefore, the Commission adopt the following  
17 recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Recreation  
18 Center #2, Fayetteville, North Carolina.

19 CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Any  
20 comments?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel, call the roll.

Page 644

OMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.  
OMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.  
OMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella is aye, by  
Commissioner Cox.

OMMISSIONER COX: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.

OMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.

HAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes  
o nays.

HAIRMAN DIXON: That motion carries.

MR. BROWN: The next one, Mr. Chairman, is Hingham  
t, Massachusetts. The recommendation is to close this  
tion. No issues have been identified.

HAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions?

No response.)

HAIRMAN DIXON: Any statements?

No response.)

Page 647

1 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.

2 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.

3 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.

4 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.

5 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.

6 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.

7 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.

8 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.

9 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella votes aye, by  
10 proxy. Commissioner Cox.

11 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.

12 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.

14 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.

15 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

16 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight to  
17 zero.

18 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the motion is adopted  
19 unanimously. Rio Vista Army Reserve Center, California.

20 MR. BROWN: The recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is to  
21 close this facility. No issues have been identified.

22 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions of Mr. Brown?

Page 645

HAIRMAN DIXON: A motion.

MOTION

OMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman, I move the  
ission find the Secretary of Defense did not deviate  
tially from the force structure plan and final  
and therefore, the Commission adopt the following  
endation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Hingham  
t.

HAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.

OMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.

OMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.

OMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.

OMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella votes aye, by  
Commissioner Cox.

OMMISSIONER COX: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.

OMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

Page 648

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?

3 COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman, I move the

4 Commission find the Secretary of Defense did not deviate  
5 substantially from the force structure plan and final

6 criteria and therefore, the Commission adopt the following

7 recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Rio Vista  
8 Army Reserve Center.

9 CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second Mr. Kling's motion. Will  
10 the Counsel please call the roll.

11 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.

12 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

13 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.

14 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.

15 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.

16 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.

17 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.

18 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.

19 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.

20 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.

21 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella, by proxy.

22 Commissioner Cox.

MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes and zero nays.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Branch US Disciplinary Barracks, Long Park, California. I didn't skip one, did I?  
MR. BROWN: Yes, you did.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: I apologize. Sudbury Training Annex.  
MR. BROWN: The recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is to close Sudbury Training Annex. No issues have been identified.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any questions?  
(No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?  
MOTION  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman, I move the Commission find the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and therefore, the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Sudbury

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella votes aye by proxy. Commissioner Cox.  
COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.  
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes and zero nays.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the motion is adopted. Valley Grove US Army Reserve Center, West Virginia.  
MR. BROWN: The recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is to close this installation. However, on the 14th of June the Secretary of Defense stated that the recommendation is no longer viable since it was learned that construction of a new maintenance shop for this mission is in progress at the Wheeling-Ohio County Airport.

Training Annex.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Counsel will call the roll.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.  
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.  
COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella, by proxy. Commissioner Cox.  
COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.  
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes and zero nays.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the motion is adopted. Branch US Disciplinary Barracks, California.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Okay. Is there a motion? Are there any questions?  
(No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?  
MOTION  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman, I move the Commission find the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criterion two and, therefore, the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Valley Grove Air Maintenance Support Activity and instead, adopt the following recommendation: Keep open Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity. The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Are there any other comments?  
(No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.  
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.

MR. BROWN: The recommendation, Mr. Chairman, is to close this installation. No issues have been identified.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there any question of Mr. Brown?  
(No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any statements?  
(No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?  
MOTION  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman, I move the Commission find the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and therefore, the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Close Branch US Disciplinary Barracks, California.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Any comments?  
(No response.)  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.  
COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella.  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox.  
COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.  
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, there are eight ayes and zero nays.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: The motion is adopted. Now, I will ask you gentlemen, Mr. Yellin and whoever else is going to be involved in this one -- I think you were -- this is the Oakland question that we deferred over an hour ago. Can we get back to that in our books because it's been a couple hours ago probably. Fleet and Industrial Supply Center. Oakland California; is that correct?  
MR. YELLIN: Yes, sir.

under the Navy. Mr. Chairman, in the previous  
k you'll find the motions for that.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Now, to refresh everybody's  
tion this one got highly complicated and pretty  
ed and we had all kinds of suggestions about what the  
s ought to be.  
nd as I understand it, Mr. Yellin, considerable  
onversations have taken place, I think, with the folks  
nd. Is that substantially true?  
R. YELLIN: Yes, sir, with Oakland, Alameda,  
nd, Port Authority.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: All right. And have we arrived at  
rstanding that reflects a consensus on this?  
R. YELLIN: Among the communities and the  
ssion staff, yes sir.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Among the communities and the  
sion staff. And have those who were interested, and I  
was particularly Commissioner Cox, I may be  
g someone else that had some interest, been consulted  
?  
COMMISSIONER COX: Yes, sir.

3 MS. CREEDON: That's correct.  
4 COMMISSIONER COX: Thank you, very much. Under  
5 those circumstances I think the Navy, which had indicated  
6 that they wanted to do this and all of the communities are in  
7 agreement.  
8 MR. YELLIN: I want to go back on the record that  
9 the Navy's official position is still that the Secretary's  
10 recommendation was that because of economic -- because of job  
11 losses they do not want to go ahead with this.  
12 COMMISSIONER COX: But the Navy does not object  
13 assuming --  
14 MR. YELLIN: We have not gotten any official Navy  
15 comment on this.  
16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Let me ask Commissioner Cornella,  
17 he had indicated interest. Commissioner Cornella, are you  
18 satisfied with this result.  
19 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I think we're ready to move  
20 ahead, sir.  
21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Pardon me.  
22 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I think we're ready to move

Page 656  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Does somebody have a motion?  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: May I ask one question, Sir.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Sure.  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: In closing Oakland Army Base,  
ia, does that at all impact a recommendation to  
? functions to other government owned facilities in  
?  
R. YELLIN: No, it does not. That was certainly  
on available. But we feel there are other government  
available in the area, or that they need to really  
for them. That's certainly the most economical  
h to this implementation.  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: I just wanted to double  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Let me ask Commissioner Cox --  
ommissioner Cox you were very interested in this and  
nsulted with you, do you know what the situation is  
Can you advise your fellow commissioners?  
COMMISSIONER COX: Yes, sir. As I understand it,  
ere several issues here regarding some land at the  
One piece of land had two leases on it and the  
ity of two further leases on it having to do with the

Page 659  
1 ahead.  
2 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you. Are there any other  
3 questions.  
4 (No response.)  
5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion.  
6 COMMISSIONER KLING: There are two motions, Mr.  
7 Chairman.  
8 CHAIRMAN DIXON: That's just what we need, two.  
9 M O T I O N  
10 COMMISSIONER KLING: First of all, I move that the  
11 Commission find the Secretary of Defense deviated  
12 substantially from final criteria five and six and therefore,  
13 that the Commission adopt the following recommendation:  
14 Realign Fleet Industrial Supply Center, Oakland, California.  
15 Close Point Millot Naval Refueling Station, Richmond,  
16 California, close Naval Supply Annex, Alameda, California.  
17 The Commission finds this recommendation is consistent with  
18 the force structure plan and final criteria.  
19 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox do you second?  
20 COMMISSIONER COX: Second.  
21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: She seconds that motion.  
22 COMMISSIONER STEELE: May I inquire. I thought we

Page 657  
oment at the port. Two other parts of the land were in  
e areas, one in the City of Richmond and one in the  
Alameda.  
here was concern that if we acted without being  
what we were doing that we would in some way  
ize the negotiations in the leases that had gone on  
the Navy and the port, and conversations between the  
nd the city.  
s you pointed out when you opened, we have now had  
ortunity to talk to the Port of Oakland, the City of  
l, the City of Alameda and the City of Richmond. And  
understanding that they are all in agreement that it  
be a good thing for us to move forward and close it  
he BRAC statute and that would allow them to move  
l on the leases. And I do want to ask one question,  
record, of the Counsel on that point.  
: is there understanding and my understanding -- I  
like the counsel to opine on this -- that one, the  
hat they have already signed would not be affected by  
forward under BRAC; is that correct?  
MS. CREEDON: That's correct.  
COMMISSIONER COX: And, in fact, that under the

Page 660  
1 were closing the FISC and that was the agreement we reached  
2 with all those phone calls.  
3 COMMISSIONER COX: Commissioner Steele, that is, in  
4 fact, the agreement, and that will be the second motion. But  
5 for reasons involving working it out with each of these  
6 cities, the City of Alameda and the City of Richmond wanted  
7 to be considered under a separate motion.  
8 CHAIRMAN DIXON: You're right on top of things.  
9 Commissioner Steele. Let's get rid of this motion and we'll  
10 get to the one you like. Any more comments about this  
11 motion.  
12 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Just so we get to the one I  
13 like --  
14 CHAIRMAN DIXON: All right, we're going to get to  
15 it. Counsel will call the roll.  
16 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.  
17 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
18 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.  
19 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
20 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.  
21 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
22 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.

COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox.  
COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.  
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes

and zero nays.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: The motion is adopted.

Commissioner Kling.

### MOTION

COMMISSIONER KLING: The second motion is: I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria five and six and therefore, that the Commission adopt the following recommendation: Close Fleet Industrial Supply Center, Oakland, California, relocate defense finance and accounting service and military Sealift Command to government owned space. The Commission finds this recommendation is

3 (A brief recess was taken.)  
4 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Mr. Cook and Ms. Wasleski, are you  
5 folks ready to begin?  
6 MR. COOK: We are, Mr. Chairman.  
7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Help me a little bit, are we  
8 starting with Defense Logistics Agency Stand Alone  
9 Distribution Depots?  
10 MR. COOK: We are, sir.  
11 CHAIRMAN DIXON: That's where we're beginning. Who  
12 is going to begin for us?  
13 MR. COOK: I will, sir.  
14 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Mr. Cook.  
15 MR. COOK: Good evening, Mr. Chairman. The  
16 Interagency Issues Team is responsible for the direct  
17 analysis of defense agencies. This evening we will be  
18 presenting that analyses on the Defense Logistics Agency and  
19 the Defense Investigative Service.  
20 With me is Marilyn Wasleski, senior analyst, who  
21 will do a number of the presentations. The Defense Logistics  
22 Agency, or DLA, divided their installations into four

Page 662

consistent with the force structure plan and final criteria.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER COX: Second the motion.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox seconds the motion. Are there any further comments?

COMMISSIONER STEELE: I'm okay now.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: You're okay now. Commissioner Steele is okay now.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: You threw me for a loop there.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: God bless you. Any further comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel, call the roll.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.

COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles.

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.

Page 665

1 categories shown. We will brief those categories which are  
2 highlighted, as they are the only ones which contain  
3 recommendations.

4 The first category is distribution depots, not to  
5 be confused with maintenance depots which have already been  
6 discussed. Distribution depots are responsible for receipt,  
7 storage and issues of items purchased by item managers. It  
8 is basically a warehousing function.

9 DLA has added distribution depots to their list of  
10 recommendations because they simply have too much capacity in  
11 the system. In the out years requirements for storage  
12 capacity will continue to decline due to force structure  
13 reductions, outsourcing and management initiatives tied to  
14 commercial practices.

15 Distribution depots are further divided into two  
16 types, co-locate and stand alone. Co-located depots are, as  
17 the name implies, connected with service maintenance depots  
18 and exist primarily because of that maintenance function.

19 Yesterday the Commission closed Kelly, McClellan  
20 and Letterkenny maintenance depots and the associated  
21 distribution depots at those installations. Those actions  
22 had an impact on the overall storage capacity system-wide.

Page 663

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella.

COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox.

COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes and zero nays.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: And that motion is adopted. Now, ladies and gentlemen, we've concluded the Army section, cleaned up some other things we had to do, we have one agency -- interagency work still to do. We estimate that that's going to take about 45 minutes or so. I want to thank Ed Brown and his Army team for their outstanding work, job well done. We greatly appreciate what you did. We're indebted to you and the country is indebted to you.

We're going to take a seven minute recess, drop the gavel promptly at quarter to 9:00. I have that right don't I, General Davis?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes, sir.

Page 666

1 reducing the availability by approximately 64 million  
2 attainable cubic feet. And that's the measure of storage  
3 capacity.

4 We will now discuss issues relating to stand alone  
5 depots and recognize that any decisions concerning the  
6 closure of these depots will also have an impact on the  
7 overall storage capacity.

8 Change the slide, please. DLA ranked six stand  
9 alone depots in the order shown. After their analysis DLA  
10 removed the two most highly rated, San Joaquin and  
11 Susquehanna from further analysis because they were costly  
12 mega-depots within close proximity of air and water ports of  
13 embarkation.

14 Additionally, they were designed as primary  
15 distribution sites and are considered the distribution focal  
16 points for support of the two major regional conflict  
17 concept. The three highlighted depots had specific  
18 recommendations. The depots in Memphis and Odem are  
19 recommended for closure and the depot in Columbus is  
20 recommended for realignment. Slide.

21 The concept for operations for DLA stand alone  
22 depots is shown. As you can see, it calls for two primary

ations.  
fully implementing the concept of operations will  
shortfall ramifications. I'll speak to those  
separately.  
Here is a map showing the location of the six stand  
alone depots with the ones involved in DLA recommendations  
highlighted. The map doesn't accurately reflect the true  
nature of the storage locations, however, so the next map  
shows all storage locations, both stand alone and co-  
located. These depots -- the depot is either closed or  
intended for closure are highlighted. The map provides a  
top-down perspective of the total storage system. Next slide,  
I spoke about the declining inventory and the  
significant decline in the need for capacity. I show this  
to display the capacity and inventory relationship of the  
distribution system over time after the Commission's  
analysis. Actual and potential are factored in.  
The sharp decline in capacity in 1996 and 1997 will  
occur if the depots at Memphis and Ogden are closed. The

3 Now, DLA indicated even when they had a total of  
4 potential 48 million shortfall they wanted to handle that in-  
5 house. We had some problems with that on the staff. As I  
6 said, we're fully intending to recommend that they retain  
7 some capability.  
8 COMMISSIONER COX: But DLA had indicated that they  
9 would rather take the 48 million?  
10 MR. COOK: That's correct.  
11 COMMISSIONER COX: That would be acceptable?  
12 MR. COOK: That's what came to us in writing.  
13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Yes, but you were saying, Mr.  
14 Cook, that at the point where we are now after the action  
15 taken on a prior occasion on Red River that you and staff are  
16 comfortable with this question.  
17 MR. COOK: Yes, sir. I think there is sufficient  
18 capability in the commercial sector -- if the Commission  
19 chooses to go that way there is adequate capability in the  
20 commercial sector to handle that shortfall.  
21 COMMISSIONER KLING: Just so I can understand what  
22 you're saying, Mr. Cook, what you're saying is that prior to

Page 668  
decline in 1999 and 2000 will occur as a result of  
closures of McClellan, San Antonio and Letterkenny.  
The total impact in the storage system, if all  
actions are implemented, equals a shortfall of approximately  
10 million attainable cubic feet. Again, that's the measure  
of storage capacity.  
COMMISSIONER COX: Mr. Cook, before you go on on  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.  
COMMISSIONER COX: That would show potential small  
capacity in 2000 and beyond. What would be the  
of the Roles and Mission study? Do they go into this?  
MR. COOK: They do, they had an extensive section  
on aerial management and outsourcing of it. Let me have  
slide 15, please.  
Roles and Missions Commission report, as I said,  
extensive discussion concerning material management  
options. In it they indicated that the preferential way of  
handling shortfalls was outsourcing, even to the tune of  
increasing surge capacity in time of war.  
COMMISSIONER COX: Even in the private sector for  
surge capacity?

Page 671  
1 any of our actions it was 48 that was the acceptable amount  
2 to DLA?  
3 MR. COOK: Yes, sir. Prior to Red River remaining  
4 open 48 million was a shortfall. DLA indicated that they  
5 would like to accept that we as a staff had some problem with  
6 that.  
7 COMMISSIONER KLING: But now, we're going to have  
8 less than that.  
9 MR. COOK: Now, we've got 25.7.  
10 MS. KING: So, they're going to be twice happy -- I  
11 mean, twice as easy and comfortable. And you're more  
12 comfortable.  
13 MR. COOK: Yes, sir.  
14 MS. KING: You're more comfortable than you were  
15 prior to any of our actions.  
16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: He looks very comfortable.  
17 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Mr. Cook, can I ask you a  
18 question, please?  
19 MR. COOK: Yes, sir.  
20 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Robles.  
21 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: I'm just trying to get my  
22 handle on this capacity number because the ever elusive

Page 669  
MR. COOK: Absolutely.  
COMMISSIONER COX: And let me ask you a question,  
told about capacity and all kinds of -- 85 percent is  
rough -- too much, 100 percent is too much -- is that  
right, 20 some-odd thousand, is that a lot, a small  
lot, is that applicable, are we concerned?  
MR. COOK: 25 million -- not as concerned as I was  
yesterday. Let me have backup slide 1A. I would  
like to see Commissioner Cox, how we got the shortfall, and why  
it's not cause as much concern as it might have.  
The slide shows that the closure of Memphis, Ogden,  
Letterkenny and Red River would have given us a shortfall of  
10 million ACF, attainable cubic feet. When the closures of  
McClellan and San Antonio were added in that gave a total  
shortfall of over 48 million cubic feet. That provided staff  
concern because that seemed to be beyond the capability  
of the military to handle with their management practices and so on.  
We were fully prepared to recommend that something  
be considered for retention. However, when the Red River  
Depot was added along with the associated distribution  
building that knocked the shortfall down to a little over 25  
million 26 million attainable cubic feet. According to the

Page 672  
1 capacity shows up in different venues. Are the capacity  
2 number that you're using, i.e., the requirement numbers, are  
3 they after all these initiatives that DLA has been engaged in  
4 since the early '90s?  
5 Having been an active participant in the 900 series  
6 of DMDs and DMRs, are you telling me this is after DLA rings  
7 out all its efficiency, just in time inventory, gets rid of  
8 lines, all that whole series of 901 and all those other  
9 initiatives, this is where you end up or is it before that?  
10 MR. COOK: It's before that, Commissioner Robles.  
11 DLA is currently engaged in a couple programs similar to just  
12 in time inventory. They're also involved in rewarehousing,  
13 they're bringing some new facilities on line. That does not  
14 even begin to account for the private sector capability.  
15 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Thank you.  
16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any further questions of  
17 Mr. Cook.  
18 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: I have one.  
19 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Montoya.  
20 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Does this capacity number at  
21 Red River include the potential completion of that huge  
22 storage building that they're working on?

So far no major problems have surfaced. Two final issues I would like to present deal with land and economics. The community contends that the one used by DLA are substantially understated and that costs are overstated. Their estimates include a \$23 extra for one-time costs \$208 million for operation cost avoidance and \$136 million for equipment. However, the staff could not support their contention these costs would be required if the depot were closed. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the question of economic impact while not appearing to be severe, is somewhat interesting. There would be a negative .6 percent impact on the community as a whole, if the depot were closed. However, the impact on the African American community in Memphis would be a rise in unemployment from the current 9 percent to 10 percent since 80 percent of the employees at the depot are African American.

Next slide. Mr. Chairman, closing the depot at Ogden would bring with it the pros and cons we have listed on the chart. The annual savings of \$23.8 million and the

of excess capacity in the storage system by 31.1 million cubic feet is the reason this facility has been commended for closure by DLA.

Are there any questions?  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions of Mr. Cook?  
COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Just a question -- more of an opinion, but in the form of a question. You know, I understand the DLA approach, which is to not have any stand-alone depots. They're trying to get the number of primary distribution sites down to just a couple. They want to locate the distribution depots next to their maintenance facilities, or collocate them with maintenance facilities, they're trying to reduce infrastructure. But, you know, I just don't understand this -- that once in a while you just got to take a step back and wait a minute, what about this? I mean, I got -- we arrived at the regional hearing, and I've gotten some additional briefings on the fact that Federal Express has located at a hub, and Memphis is becoming a cargo-handling center of excellence a la Silicon Valley for that industry, a center 120 in Boston for the high-tech industry, and more and more companies are gravitating there,

there is going to be some great technology sharing, economies, and other benefits to be gained. And so I understand -- and plus the basic infrastructure of the depot is modern, very specialized, lots of storage space, et

did any of that factor into DLA's analysis? Or did it just use a cookie-cutter approach that says, "Slam, if not collocated with a maintenance depot, that's where it goes." And for whatever their military ranking value is, "We only want these two PDSs." I'd like a little more insight into this thinking.  
MR. COOK: There were two measures of merit for the depot, Commissioner Robles. One was the military value, and the other was the installation military value. And those depots that were collocated with other facilities that share the overhead received a higher installation military value. The two depots, Memphis and Ogden, suffered in that regard. The overhead was spread over a larger base -- that were collocated with another facility.  
COMMISSIONER ROBLES: See, that doesn't seem to be

And instead of this really has military value because it's geographically located in the right place, the technology is such, its infrastructure is modern and new, the maintenance costs are low. All the things that, at least in my simple mind, constitute military value.

So I just wonder why they use a different model for military value than the traditional model.

MR. COOK: In the depot world, there are warehouses, there are mechanization, there's expendability, and there's suitability for the mission. Obviously the collocated depots to support the maintenance mission. In the stand-alone depots, the two coastal mega-depots are obviously ones that are the primary distribution centers for going to war on each coast.

That left four others. One was designated to be the slow movers, up in Columbus. That left three, Ogden depot and Richmond. Richmond had the best facilities in terms of being new. So the long-term investment in maintenance of facilities at Richmond was lower than the other two. Additionally, it was collocated with an inventory

control point and was in close proximity to the Norfolk port. So they had a higher installation military value than the other two. And that left Memphis and Ogden.

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: I don't understand the Norfolk port tie-in.

MR. COOK: They do a lot of support. They have -- of the Norfolk area, Commissioner Robles.

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Oh, but it has nothing to do with the port.

MR. COOK: No, sir. I'm sorry.  
COMMISSIONER ROBLES: It has to do with the Norfolk facility storage.

MR. COOK: Strictly storage.  
COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Okay, I can understand that.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any other questions or statements?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: This synergism of the Memphis area. I mean, if you go to heaven and hell if you're a package, you got to go to Memphis, because -- with FedEx and company. And that is a hub. Is there great synergism with that capability that exists at Memphis already?

MR. COOK: The capability is there. Within 24 hours, you can get to about 42 percent of the GIs in the

United States, from Memphis, in 24 hours. No doubt that they are centrally located and perform a mission. But that same mission now is going to be picked up partially by Red River, partially by Tinker, and the collocated depots, because they've got storage capacity.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yeah, but Red River is still quite a ways from Memphis.

MR. COOK: It sure is. It sure is. Yes, sir.  
COMMISSIONER COX: On that issue -- wasn't there an issue earlier that they were doing a pilot program with FedEx at Memphis.

MR. COOK: Yes, they sure were Commissioner Cox. It's just being implemented, as I remember it. I'll get some data for you before I finish this briefing.

COMMISSIONER COX: But I also recall that FedEx indicated they didn't have to be in Memphis.

MR. COOK: That's true.  
MS. WASLESKI: It's an overnight delivery program for fast-moving items, but FedEx could do that independent of the --

COMMISSIONER COX: Wherever it --  
MS. WASLESKI: Well, independent of the depot being

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any other questions? Any statements? Is there a motion?  
 COMMISSIONER COX: Mr. Chairman.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Cox.  
 COMMISSIONER COX: Are we ready for motions. Okay.  
 M O T I O N  
 COMMISSIONER COX: I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria, and therefore that the Commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.  
 Close Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, Tennessee. Material remaining at the DDMT at the time of closure will be relocated to optimum storage space within the Department of Defense distribution system. As a result of DDMT, all DLA activity will cease at this location, and DDMT will be excessed to DLA needs.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a second to that motion?  
 I second that motion. Is there any further comment?

only two primary distribution sites for the two-MRC scenario.  
 The staff found that the cost from the San Joaquin depot in California to the west coast ports and locations are cheaper than from Ogden to the same ports and location, although some second destination costs would be less expensive from Utah to inland locations.  
 Ogden believes that DLA is reducing their depot structure too rapidly, and that less shortfall rather than more should be the guideline. The R and A staff is convinced that the shortfall created by the closure process does not an unmanageable risk for DLA over the two-MRC scenario.  
 A unique mission currently performed at Ogden involves the deployable system, commonly called DEPMEDS. The versatile allows anything from a very small clinic to a full-up hospital to be quickly established via modules. The executive agent for DEPMEDS is the Army, and they've indicated a preference for retaining the mission in the Ogden area, where the climate and an experienced workforce can support the mission.

Counsel, call the role.  
 MS. KING: Commissioner Cox.  
 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
 MS. KING: Commissioner Davis.  
 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
 MS. KING: Commissioner Kling.  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
 MS. KING: Commissioner Montoya.  
 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
 MS. KING: Commissioner Robles.  
 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Nay.  
 MS. KING: Commissioner Steele.  
 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
 MS. KING: Commissioner Cornella.  
 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
 MS. KING: Mr. Chairman.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
 MS. KING: Mr. Chairman, the vote is seven ayes and one nay.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: That motion is adopted, seven to one.  
 MR. COOK: The next depot under consideration is

We found that movement of DEPMEDS' mission equipment is best accommodated from a central location, in this case Ogden. During Desert Storm, those assets went through New Orleans, a point nearer Ogden than California, and therefore cheaper and quicker. DLA has indicated that they will relocate the DEPMEDS mission to Hill Air Force Base to accommodate the Army's desire. The staff concurs.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any questions of Mr. Cook?  
 COMMISSIONER STEELE: I do. You sort of answered it. You said staff concurs. My question would be, with our actions yesterday on ALCs, both from a cost standpoint -- actually pre-ALC action of moving those. Because, as you know, they're really closely located, Hill Air Force Base and this DDOU.  
 Does it still make sense, both cost-wise and does Hill Air Force Base still have the room, given what we have just handed the Air Force as a management issue, to move the DEPMEDS up to Hill?  
 MR. COOK: We looked at that and discussed that issue with them, Commissioner Steele. Hill Air Force Base has the inside storage to accommodate the mission and the

the one at Ogden, Utah. Like Memphis, it's a good facility in a desirable location, with an active involvement by the community in its defense. As with Memphis, we've listed the most important issues surfaced by the community, along with DOD and R and A positions.  
 The Ogden community from the beginning indicated that the analysis by DOD was invalid, in that the two depots at San Joaquin and Susquehanna should not have initially been eliminated from further consideration. They felt that the DLA action was inappropriate.  
 We previously sent a point paper to each Commissioner on the issue. In essence, the staff, counsel, and the GAO opinion is that DLA actions were legal and this BRAC decision was not predetermined.  
 The community believes that the depot should have been designated as a primary distribution site because they clearly the demonstrated capability. They also contend that the destination costs for most manufacturers to the depot, and then on to ports or other inland users, are cheaper from Ogden depot than from the California depots. The result, in their opinion, is an adverse impact on military readiness.  
 The staff determined that, from a capability

inside storage requirements for DEPMEDS. There is some concern about contiguous storage space for the modules themselves, although that is being worked out. There are some options to keep it in the area, and I'll discuss those in just a second.  
 The inside storage for the DEPMEDS that you saw when you were there can be accommodated at Hill, even with the movement of assets from --  
 COMMISSIONER STEELE: And we got that answer from both Hill Air Force Base?  
 MR. COOK: We did. We asked them both.  
 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Okay. Thanks.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Thank you, Mr. Cook. Is there a motion?  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.  
 M O T I O N  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: I move that the commission find that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from final criteria 2 and 3, and therefore that the Commission reject the Secretary's recommendation on Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Utah, and instead adopt the

or minimum essential land and facilities for a component enclave. Material remaining at Defense Ogden Utah at the time of closure will be relocated to a storage space within the Department of Defense location system.  
As a result of the closure of DDOU, all DLA will cease at this location and DDOU will be reallocated to DLA needs. The Commission finds this reallocation is consistent with the force structure plan and criteria.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Are there any comments?  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Steele.  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: It's just a clarification. I believe Mr. Cook was about to say there were questions in the area regarding the DEPMEDS, and I'm wondering if what you didn't present might impact the reallocation and do we need to hear that first, sir.  
MR. COOK: I'll be happy to tell you that,

3 COMMISSIONER ROBBE: Aye.  
4 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele.  
5 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
6 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornelia.  
7 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
8 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox.  
9 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
10 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis.  
11 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
12 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman.  
13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
14 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes  
15 and zero nays.  
16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: The motion is unanimously adopted,  
17 Defense Logistics Agency -- Inventory Control Points, Defense  
18 Industrial Supply Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.  
19 MR. COOK: Thank you, sir.  
20 Ms. Wasleski will cover the ICPs.  
21 MS. WASLESKI: The next category will brief if  
22 inventory control points. An inventory control points, or

Commissioner Steele. The community presented a proposal to which seems to have some merit. In the event the Ogden depot was closed, the community proposes it obtain depot land from DOD and then lease the required land back to DLA to cover not only the necessary long-term needs, but as a vehicle to cover any shortfall.  
DLA has endorsed the notion of leasing, and this provides an acceptable solution to any shortfall. I would add that the concept could just as easily apply to the Ogden depot as the one at Ogden to cover any shortfall.  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Just one question on there. Regarding the movement of DEPMEDS -- I mean, if there's a lack of space, could they save money by just keeping that depot there? Or should -- if this closes, I suppose they would do that anyway. I'm not trying to mess it up here, but we don't want to spend money we don't need to spend.  
MR. COOK: Part of the recommendation is to provide the minimum essential land at the Ogden depot for an inventory reserve containment area. So that's going to be there. Now, to expand that containment to cover the DEPMEDS could easily be done. To answer your question, it would be more expensive because they'll have to lease the

1 ICP, mission is to procure and direct the storage and  
2 shipment of wholesale industrial weapons system items, such  
3 as nuts and bolts, general items, such as light bulbs and  
4 film, and troop support items, such as food, clothing, and  
5 medical items for the military services. Next slide.  
6 DLA began their analysis by grouping the inventory  
7 control points, which have like missions, and rating those  
8 like missions together. The Defense Construction Supply  
9 Center, the Defense General Supply Center and the Defense  
10 Industrial Supply Center were all grouped and rated together  
11 because they all buy weapon systems and general items for the  
12 military services.  
13 The Defense Personnel Support Center was rated  
14 separately because it is the only inventory control point  
15 within DLA which purchases the commercial-type items such as  
16 food, clothing and medical items. These items are  
17 collectively known as troop support items.  
18 The Defense Fuel Supply Center was also rated  
19 separately as it is the only ICP, which purchases fuels for  
20 the military services. Next slide.  
21 DLA's concept of operations is to have four  
22 inventory control points grouped together by like items, two

as opposed to moving it to Hill, where it's already there.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any other statements or questions?  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: At this late hour I'm not going to make a big deal about this. I'm just worried that because it's a late hour, we might be locking in something that would save some money if we did it differently. And, I would like to depart as much as everybody else.  
Mr. Cook, do you feel it is worthy to amend a motion in any way, or should we just proceed?  
MR. COOK: I do feel the motion should be amended, Commissioner Steele. I think DLA has the latitude through its mission --  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Enough said. I'm happy. Thank you.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel, call the roll.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Did we have a second to that motion?  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I seconded.  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya.

1 weapon systems ICPs, one troop and general support ICP, and  
2 one fuel system ICP. The items were grouped this way in  
3 order to improve management oversight.  
4 The troop and general support items are more  
5 conducive to commercial support and thus managed differently  
6 than weapon system items or fuel.  
7 The DLA concept of operations is to have the  
8 Defense Construction Supply Center and the Defense General  
9 Supply Center as the weapons systems inventory control  
10 points; the Defense Personnel Support Center as the troop and  
11 general support inventory control point; and the Defense Fuel  
12 Supply Center as the Defense fuels inventory control point.  
13 DLA plans to disestablish the Defense Industrial  
14 Supply Center in order to obtain this concept. Next slide.  
15 This map indicates the locations of the five  
16 inventory control points. I would like to point out that the  
17 location of an ICP is not geographically dependent. Two of  
18 the ICPs are located in Philadelphia, that is the Defense  
19 Industrial Supply Center and the Defense Personnel Support  
20 Center.  
21 The Defense Industrial Supply Center is located in  
22 Columbus, Ohio, and the Defense General Supply Center is

4 on this map because it is the primary focus of the DOD  
5 recommendation. For future discussions, we will not address  
6 the Defense Fuel Supply Center as not involved in the DOD  
7 recommendation. Next slide.

8 This chart highlights the effect of the DOD  
9 recommendation. There will be a one-time cost of \$55.1  
0 million with annual savings of \$18.4. Economic impact on the  
1 communities effected by this recommendation is minimal. Next  
2 slide, please.

3 This map illustrates the movement of the items in  
4 order to reach DLAs concept of operations. The Defense  
5 Construction Supply Center will be moving approximately 46  
6 percent of its general item workload to the Defense Personnel  
7 Support Center.

8 The Defense Supply Center will be disestablished  
9 and sending approximately 63 percent of its weapons system  
0 workload to Defense General Supply Center, and 7 percent of  
1 its general workload to the Defense Personnel Support Center.

2 The Defense General Supply Center will be moving

4 the items will not be moving with their items to Richmond.  
5 This is because the movement of items is a transfer  
6 workload non-function, since the Richmond inventory control  
7 point performs similar functions as the Defense Industrial  
8 Supply Center.

9 The community believes serious performance  
10 degradation issues will ensue. We believe there will only be  
11 a moderate impact of military readiness. This is because DLA  
12 has prior experience in moving items. In fact, DLA has  
13 recently completed the transfer of 700 thousand items from  
14 the military services over the past three years.

15 In addition, the people at the Defense General  
16 Supply Center have experience managing weapons systems items  
17 and will be able to assist in the transfer. Further, we  
18 believe that DLAs concept of operations will ultimately  
19 provide better service to the customer.

20 Another issue raised was the issue of job rights.  
21 The community is concerned that, because their organization  
22 is being disestablished, employees have no job rights, which

1 approximately 49 percent of its general item workload to the  
2 Defense Personnel Support Center. In total approximately 2  
3 million items will be transferred, however, only about one-  
4 third of these items are active items.

5 The Defense Construction Center in Columbus was  
6 selected as a weapons system inventory control point, because  
7 it currently manages a large number of weapon systems items,  
8 and it is also host to a number of DLA and non-DLA activities  
9 which allows them to share overhead.

10 The Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, as  
11 selected as the other weapons system inventory control point  
12 because it also hosts a number of DLA and non-DLA activities  
13 and is, in addition, among the best facilities DLA has.

14 The Defense Personnel Support Center was chosen as  
15 the troop and general support inventory control point,  
16 because no other inventory control point manages troop items,  
17 and the general items would be managed like the troop items,  
18 which is commercial-type buying.

19 The box in the lower right-hand corner of this map  
20 illustrates the net civilian manpower impact, as a result of  
21 this recommendation. Philadelphia will lose 369 jobs,  
22 Columbus 358, and Richmond gains 323. We have simplified the

1 movement because locations will be losing and receiving  
2 manpower allocations. Next slide, please.

3 The community was very involved and raised a number  
4 of issues. We have summarized their position on the major  
5 issues on this slide, along with the position of the DOD,  
6 where applicable and the R and A staff findings.

7 The first issue we looked at was the location  
8 selected for the weapons system inventory control points.  
9 The community believes that because of their knowledge and  
0 number of weapon system items managed, the Defense Industrial  
1 Supply Center should have been retained as a weapon system  
2 ICP. We agree with the DOD position to have Columbus and  
3 Richmond, however, as the weapon systems inventory control  
4 points, because of the reasons I just previously stated and  
5 why DOD selected them.

6 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any further questions of  
7 Ms. Wasleski?

8 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aren't you going to go  
9 through the rest of those categories?

10 MS. WASLESKI: Yes, if you want me to.

11 CHAIRMAN DIXON: All right, go ahead, Ms. Wasleski.

12 MS. WASLESKI: All right. The second impact -- the

1 is true. As I previously mentioned, this is a workload  
2 transfer, not a transfer of function. Although there are no  
3 direct job rights, DLA has stated that employees from the  
4 Defense Industrial Supply Center will be offered positions  
5 within the new Troop and General Support Inventory Control  
6 Point to be created in Philadelphia. We believe DLA will  
7 offer those employees those jobs.

8 The community questioned, also, some of the DLA's  
9 COBRA information. The major item questioned was the cost to  
10 transfer the items from one ICP to another that was not  
11 included in the COBRA. The community stated that this cost  
12 can range anywhere from \$57 million to \$153 million,  
13 depending on how many items are transferred and how automated  
14 the process is. DLA agreed that the cost to transfer the  
15 items was omitted and revised the COBRA to include one-time  
16 item-movement costs of \$24 million, and that's the numbers  
17 you have, that we gave you earlier.

18 We believe that DLA's estimate on the cost to move  
19 the items is on the low side and the community's costs are on  
20 the high side. The General Accounting Office believed the  
21 costs to be around \$66 million. We ran a sensitivity  
22 analysis using a one-time cost of \$75 million. The analysis

1 increased the return on investment from one year to four  
2 years, which still makes it an attractive recommendation to  
3 pursue.

4 The community's recommendation, however, is to  
5 transfer the items outside the BRAC time limits. The  
6 community believes that the number of items that need to be  
7 transferred, which includes more items still to be  
8 transferred from the services, is too great and will impact  
9 military readiness due to performance degradation issues, if  
10 done too quickly. The community recommends that the Defense  
11 Industrial Supply Center and the Defense Personnel Support  
12 Center be merged under one command and the items moved over a  
13 longer period of time. We believe, however, that DLA has  
14 enough experience in moving the items and can complete the  
15 transfer within the BRAC requirements.

16 That's it.

17 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Do you have more, Ms. Wasleski?

18 MS. WASLESKI: No. Any questions?

19 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any questions of Ms.

20 Wasleski?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any statements?

COMMISSIONER KLING: Yes, sir.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.

MOTION

COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman, I move that the commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final criteria and, therefore, that the commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: the Industrial Supply Center is disestablished. Relocate the management of federal supply classes within the following Defense Logistics Agency inventory control units: Create one ICP for the management of troop and support items in the Defense Personnel Support Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Create two ICPs for the management of weapons-systems-related FSCs at the Defense Contract Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio, and the Defense Contract Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Are there any comments?  
(No response.)

3 Next slide, please.  
4 This will be what the realignment would look like.  
5 Basically, the reason for it is the allocation of the  
6 contractors are not as great in the South as they are in the  
7 Northeast and the Southwest. Frankly, at one time, DLA had  
8 nine of these, and now they're down to two, and I suspect in  
9 the near future they'll go down to none, with the technology  
10 we've got.  
11 If you have any questions, I'll be happy to  
12 entertain them.  
13 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any questions of Mr.  
14 Cook?  
15 (No response.)  
16 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any statements?  
17 (No response.)  
18 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any motions?  
19 COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman?  
20 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.  
21 MOTION  
22 COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman, I move that the

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?  
COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?  
COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?  
COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?  
COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?  
COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight ayes

CHAIRMAN DIXON: And the motion carries unanimously.  
Defense Contract Management District South,

1 commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate  
2 substantially from the force structure plan and final  
3 criteria and, therefore, that the commission adopt the  
4 following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense:  
5 Disestablish Defense Contract Management District South and  
6 relocate missions to Defense Contract Management District  
7 Northeast and Defense Contract Management District West.  
8 CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion.  
9 Are there any comments or questions?  
10 (No response.)  
11 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel, call the roll.  
12 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?  
13 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
14 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?  
15 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
16 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?  
17 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
18 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?  
19 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
20 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
21 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
22 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?

Georgia.  
MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, we have three recommendations in this category. All of them are below the threshold.  
Let me have slide C-3, please.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: You mean Marietta, El Segundo, and...  
MR. COOK: Yes, sir.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: -- should be considered as a --  
MR. COOK: No, sir. We'll discuss them individually, but they're -- one's a redirect, and the other is under threshold.  
CHAIRMAN DIXON: Okay.  
MR. COOK: Defense Contract Management Districts contract administration functions. They're middle management. The DLA has recommended that they disestablish units in the South.  
Slide C-4, please.  
These are the numbers associated with the recommendation. I'll take each one individually.  
Leave C-4 up, please, and let me have C-5.  
These are the lines of the district as they're

1 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
2 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
3 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
4 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?  
5 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
6 MS. CREEDON: Eight ayes.  
7 CHAIRMAN DIXON: The motion is adopted unanimously.  
8 Are there any questions concerning Defense Contract  
9 Management District West, El Segundo, California, or any  
10 statements?  
11 (No response.)  
12 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?  
13 COMMISSIONER KLING: Yes, sir.  
14 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.  
15 MOTION  
16 COMMISSIONER KLING: I move that the commission  
17 find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate  
18 substantially from the force structure plan and final  
19 criteria and, therefore, that the commission adopt the  
20 following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: This  
21 is redirect of the following BRAC '93 commission  
22 recommendation. "Relocate the Defense Contract Management

Authority, City of Long Beach." The current recommendation is expanded to read, "Relocate the Defense Contract Management District El Segundo, California, (a) to government property in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area or (b) to space obtained from exchange of land between the Navy and the Port Authority, City of Long Beach or (c) to a purchased office building, whichever is the most cost-effective for the Department of Defense.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion. Is there any comment or any question or any statement?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel, call the roll.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?

COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.

Page 710

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?

COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?

COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: There are eight ayes and zero nays.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: The motion passes unanimously.

Are there any questions of Mr. Cook or Ms. Wasleski concerning Dayton, Ohio?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER KLING: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling?

M O T I O N

COMMISSIONER KLING: I move that the commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force structure plan and final

Page 711

criteria and, therefore, that the commission adopt the following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense: Realign the Defense Contract Management Command International Dayton, Ohio, and merge its mission into the Defense Contract Management Command Headquarters, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion.

Are there any comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Are there any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?

COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?

COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?

COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?

COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?

COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.

MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?

Page 713

1 COMMISSIONER KLING: Yes, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.

3 M O T I O N

4 COMMISSIONER KLING: I move that the commission find that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate

5 substantially from the force structure plan and final

6 criteria and, therefore, that the commission adopt the

7 following recommendation of the Secretary of Defense:

8 Relocate the Defense Investigative Service Investigation

9 Control and Automation Directorate from Fort Holabird,

10 Maryland, to a new facility to be built on Fort Meade,

11 Maryland. This proposal is a revision to the 1988 Base

12 Closure Commission's recommendation to retain the Defense

13 Investigative Service at Fort Holabird. Once DIS vacates the

14 building on Fort Holabird, the base will be vacant.

15 CHAIRMAN DIXON: I second the motion.

16 Are there any questions or statements?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Counsel will call the roll.

19 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling?

Page 714

1 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.

2 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?

3 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.

4 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?

5 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.

6 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?

7 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.

8 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?

9 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.

10 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?

11 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.

12 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?

13 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.

14 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?

15 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.

16 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, eight ayes and no nays.

17 CHAIRMAN DIXON: The motion is unanimously adopted.

18 MR. COOK: Sir, with the loss of that last

19 facility, Fort Holabird is now excess to the Army needs.

20 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any questions?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Any statements?

to response.)  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling? Commissioner  
 his is the last one. You've just got to stay on the  
 3.  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: Oh, I'm sorry. Don't let me  
 s one.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Apply yourself, apply yourself.  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: Is everybody ready?  
 aughter.)  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: Is there anybody that's not  
 to response.)  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: Okay.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Kling.  
 M O T I O N  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: I move that the commission  
 t the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially  
 ial criteria 1 and, therefore, that the commission  
 ie following recommendation: close Fort Holabird,  
 id. The commission finds this recommendation is

3 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Dixon.  
 4 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
 5 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
 6 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
 7 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?  
 8 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
 9 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
 10 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
 11 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?  
 12 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
 13 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?  
 14 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
 15 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?  
 16 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
 17 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?  
 18 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
 19 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman, the motion passes,  
 20 eight to zero.  
 21 CHAIRMAN DIXON: The motion is adopted.  
 22 Ladies and gentlemen, we have now completed our

Page 716  
 nt with the force structure plan and final criteria.  
 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I'd like to second.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: And Commissioner Cornella -- or  
 d that?  
 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Davis.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Commissioner Davis seconds that  
 tion, with great authority.  
 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I do, too.  
 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: I think we all do.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: It's thirded, fourthed, fifthed,  
 All right.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Kling?  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Montoya?  
 COMMISSIONER MONTOYA: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Robles?  
 COMMISSIONER ROBLES: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Steele?  
 COMMISSIONER STEELE: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cornella?  
 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Cox?

Page 719  
 1 voting, and the list of closures and realignments recommended  
 2 by the 1995 Base Closure Commission is now complete. The  
 3 process has been a painful one, and the real pain will now  
 4 begin in dozens of communities whose defining characteristic  
 5 over the years has been their unswerving support of the men  
 6 and women of the American military.  
 7 I will not try to console those whose jobs will be  
 8 eliminated by talking about some greater good. I know that's  
 9 not much of a consolation. However, I must repeat something  
 10 I said at the beginning of these deliberations, both because  
 11 it is so important and because I believe it so strongly.  
 12 Closing bases now is the key to the continued  
 13 readiness and future modernization of our military forces. I  
 14 also strongly believe we have done our job fairly,  
 15 independently, and openly, as was intended by the law that  
 16 set up the commission.  
 17 We will now place all the recommendations we have  
 18 made into a report which we will deliver to the President of  
 19 the United States no later than July 1, 1995. The president  
 20 or the Congress may accept or reject our recommendations in  
 21 total, but they may not change them. Under the present law,  
 22 this commission will go out of business on December 31 of

Page 717  
 COMMISSIONER COX: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Commissioner Davis?  
 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Mr. Chairman?  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: Aye.  
 MS. CREEDON: Eight ayes and no nays.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: The motion is unanimously adopted.  
 low, folks, just a moment. We've got some clean-  
 it, Mr. Cook and Ms. Wasleski and everybody involved,  
 ou all for your immensely fine service. You're a  
 ntribution to this commission and our country.  
 here anything else out there? Are you  
 I we've got it all in a box?  
 MR. LYLES: We are, Mr. Chairman.  
 CHAIRMAN DIXON: My fellow commissioners, on the  
 of counsel, I move the commission staff be allowed to  
 inor editorial changes of a technical and grammatical  
 o the recommendations that we have adopted, in order  
 ble the commission's report, which we must submit to  
 ident of the United States by July 1, 1995. Is there  
 ?  
 COMMISSIONER KLING: I second that, Mr. Chairman.

Page 720  
 1 this year.  
 2 Our report to the president will contain a  
 3 recommendation that Congress authorize another round of base  
 4 closures in the year 2001, after the Department of Defense  
 5 has had time to assess the true impact of four rounds of  
 6 previous closures on excess infrastructure.  
 7 Our report will also contain the commission's  
 8 thoughts on how the federal government can improve its  
 9 performance in helping communities replace closed bases in  
 10 their local economies. There is life after base closure, and  
 11 although today is not the day people might want to focus on  
 12 that, the federal government owes it to these communities to  
 13 assist them in converting their economies from military to  
 14 civilian.  
 15 Finally, I'd like to take a moment to thank the  
 16 Base Closure Commission staff, one of the most capable and  
 17 dedicated groups of public servants it's ever been my honor  
 18 to know. Their work was necessarily done in a highly charged  
 19 atmosphere, and they carried out their duties with remarkable  
 20 sensitivity. I'll not take the time to name them all, but  
 21 they have my gratitude and that of all the commissioners, I  
 22 know.

...without their leadership, we would not have  
5 accomplished as much as we did.  
6 My friends, with that, the final deliberations of  
7 the 1995 Base Closure and Realignment Commission are  
8 concluded. We stand adjourned.  
9 (Whereupon, at 9:40 p.m., the meeting was  
10 concluded.)

SUMMARY OF VOTING FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 30, 1991  
(IN ORDER)

1. AVIATION SYSTEMS COMMAND/TROOP SUPORT COMMAND

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart [motioned to realign per DoD]  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Comissioner Callaway [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Smith  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for realignment per DoD list

2. FORT HAMILTON

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Comissioner Callaway [motioned to remove from list]  
Y Commissioner Smith [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for removal from list

3. FORT TOTTEN

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart  
Y Commissioner Ball [seconded the motion]  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Comissioner Callaway  
Y Commissioner Smith  
Y Commissioner Cassidy [motioned to remove from list]

Final vote count: 6-0 for removal from list

4. MARCUS HOOK

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Smith  
Y Commissioner Cassidy [moved to not consider Hook]

Final vote count: 6-0 for removal from list

5. LETTERKENNY

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter [motioned to realign per DoD]  
Y Commissioner Callaway  
Y Commissioner Smith  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for realignment per DoD

6. ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart [moved to realign per DoD]  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway  
Y Commissioner Smith [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for realignemtn per DoD

NOTES: Commissioners voted in favor of DoD recommendation to realign with concerns over MILCON dollar amounts which are to be reworked. Concerns over disputed dollar amount to be reiterated strongly in Commission report to President.

7. FORTS AP HILL, BUCHANAN, PICKET, INDIANTOWN GAP AND MCCOY

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway [seconded the motion]

Y Commissioner Smith [motioned to remove from list]  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for removal from list

8. HUNTER'S POINT ANNEX

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Ball [motioned to close per DoD]  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway  
Y Commissioner Smith  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for closure per DoD

9. SAND POINT

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart  
Y Commissioner Ball [seconded the motion]  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway [motioned to close per DoD]  
Y Commissioner Smith  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for closure per DoD

10. MOFFETT NAVAL AIR STATION

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Ball [motioned to close per DoD]  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway  
RECUSED Commissioner Smith  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 5-0 for closure per DoD

11. DAVISVILLE

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart [motioned to close per DoD]  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway  
Y Commissioner Smith [seconded the motion]

Y            Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for closure per DoD

12. MIDWAY

VOTE

Y            Commissioner Stuart  
Y            Commissioner Ball  
Y            Chairman Courter  
Y            Commissioner Callaway [motioned to realign per DoD]  
Y            Commissioner Smith [seconded the motion]  
Y            Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for realignment per DoD

13. TREASURE ISLAND

VOTE

Y            Commissioner Stuart  
Y            Commissioner Ball [motioned to remove from list]  
Y            Chairman Courter  
Y            Commissioner Callaway [seconded the motion]  
Y            Commissioner Smith  
Y            Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for removal from list

14. EAKER AIR FORCE BASE

VOTE

Y            Commissioner Stuart [motioned to close per DoD]  
Y            Commissioner Ball  
Y            Chairman Courter  
Y            Commissioner Callaway  
Y            Commissioner Smith [seconded the motion]  
Y            Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for closure per DoD

15. GRISSOM AFB

VOTE

Y            Commissioner Stuart [motioned to close per DoD]  
Y            Commissioner Ball  
Y            Chairman Courter  
Y            Commissioner Callaway  
Y            Commissioner Smith  
Y            Commissioner Cassidy [seconded the motion]

Final vote count: 6-0 for closure per DoD

16. RICHARDS-GEBAUR

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart [motioned to close per DoD]  
Y Commissioner Ball [seconded the motion]  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway  
Y Commissioner Smith  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for closure per DoD

17. RICKENBACKER

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway [motioned to close per DoD]  
Y Commissioner Smith  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for closure per DoD

18. WURTSMITH AFB

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Smith [motioned to close per DoD]  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for closure per DoD

19. WILLIAMS AFB

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway  
Y Commissioner Smith [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Cassidy [motioned to close per DoD]

Final vote count: 6-0 for closure per DoD

20. MATHER, BEALE, MARCH, AND MOUNTAIN HOME AIR FORCE BASES  
(AIR FORCE CHANGES IN BRAC 1988)

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway [motioned to change BRAC 1988 recs]  
Y Commissioner Smith [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Cassidy

Final vote count: 6-0 for changing BRAC 1988 recommendations

21. GOODFELLOW

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway [seconded the motion]  
Y Commissioner Smith  
Y Commissioner Cassidy [moved to remove as a closure and  
realign per DoD]

Final vote count: 6-0 for removal from list as a closure, and  
realign per DoD

22. LOWRY AFB

VOTE

Y Commissioner Stuart  
Y Commissioner Ball  
Y Chairman Courter  
Y Commissioner Callaway  
Y Commissioner Smith [motioned to close per DoD]  
Y Commissioner Cassidy [seconded the motion]

Final vote count: 6-0 for closure per DoD