DCN 974

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

April 22, 1995 Pages 1105-1144 Volume 53, No. 16

ECONOMICS & FINANCE/COVER STORY

Sen. Domenici has a plan to cut more than $1 trillion in spending over seven years — and a lot of hard work ahead 1111

ECONOMICS & FINANCE

Obstacles Loom for Budget-Cutters 1111

As the Senate and House Budget chairmen prepare packages of unprecedented spending cuts aimed at erasing the deficit by 2002, the enormity of the tasks they face is taking shape.

Targeting Health Entitlements 1112

Echoes of the Wars of 1985 1114

GOVERNMENT & COMMERCE

Congress Considers Amtrak Cuts 1116

Mass transit and Amtrak are likely to face budget cuts this year, setting off a debate over the value and the definition of publicly financed transportation.

Transportation Use and Investment 1118

DEFENSE & FOREIGN POLICY

Communities Try Base-Saving Strategies 1120

Retired military officers, former congressional aides and one-time staffers of previous base-closing commissions are advising localities on strategies to save their bases.

POLITICS

Gramm Combines Money and New Populism 1124

In his run for the GOP presidential nomination, Sen. Phil Gramm is emphasizing a theme that has served him well in the past: champion of the little guy and out to buck the Beltway.

Sen. Lugar Sets Sights on Presidency 1132

Court Considers Majority-Minority Districts 1133

Pryor Plans To Retire 1136

DEPARTMENTS

What's Ahead 1108

CQ Roundtable 1142

For the Record

Clinton's April 18 News Conference 1138

Cover: Richard Ellis

Congressional Quarterly Services

Customer Service (202) 887-8621
New Subscriptions (202) 887-6279
Washington Alert Sales (202) 887-6258

Advertising Sales (202) 822-1440
News Department (202) 887-8524
Other Departments (202) 887-8500

Toll-Free Customer Service 1-800-432-2250

The Congressional Monitor, also published by Congressional Quarterly Inc., provides daily and weekly news digests and schedules of congressional meetings. Daily abstracts of the Congressional Record are available in the Congressional Record Scanner.

The full text of the CQ Weekly Report is available electronically through CQ's Washington Alert Service or through DataTimes. Washington Alert also has committee and floor schedules, daily news summaries, the Billtrack service, the Reuter Transcript Service and full texts of congressional bills, the Congressional Record, committee reports, the Federal Register and bill digests of the Congressional Research Service.

Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report (ISSN 0010-5090). Published weekly, except the last Saturday in August and December by Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1414 22nd Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037. (202) 887-8500. All reproduction rights reserved for current editorial clients. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system. Second rights are reserved, including use of Congressional Quarterly material in campaign supplements, advertisements and handbooks without permission. Annual subscription rate for businesses and organizations, $1,365. Additional rates are furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. (USPS 081-620). POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, 1414 22nd Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

BASE CLOSINGS

Communities Hire Ex-Insiders To Defend Imperiled Bases

Retired officers and former government staffers put their expertise to new uses

Long before Alabama's Fort McClellan showed up on the Pentagon's base-closings list in February, officials from Calhoun County had been in touch with the two individuals they believed would be key to saving the Army installation: their Washington-based consultants.

Barry Steinberg, a retired Army colonel with a background in environmental law, and George Schlossberg, who served as legal counsel to the 1988 base-closing panel, had advised the county in 1991 and 1993 in what proved to be a successful campaign to get Fort McClellan and its chemical defense training facility taken off earlier Pentagon hit lists.

County officials remain hopeful that the team of Steinberg and Schlossberg can help spare them again this year.

As desperate communities nationwide fight what likely will be the final base-closing round for several years, the latest Washington revolving door is spinning full force. Retired military officers, former congressional aides and one-time staffers of previous base-closing commissions have found work as consultants, advising localities on strategies to save their bases.

Polls may show many Americans distrust the proverbial Washington insider, but officials from local chambers of commerce, towns, cities and states are seeking out these inside-the-Beltway denizens for their expertise and contacts.

Fearing potentially dire economic consequences of a shuttered base, localities are willing to spend tens of thousands of dollars on consultants — a small investment, they say, in return for saving thousands of jobs. Meanwhile, the base-closing process has grown more sophisticated as the military uses complex models to determine an installation's fate, forcing communities to rely on the more knowledgeable consultants.

And by law, the base-closing process keeps no secrets. Military documents, memoranda, summaries of base visits, testimony, transcripts of hearings, even a region's tourist brochure are all on file at the commission's library in Arlington, Va. Consultants send staff there nearly every day to search for the document that could help save a base or sink a competitor from California to Michigan, Texas to New York.

Communities face daunting odds. More than 90 percent of the bases on the military's recommended list remain there once the presidentially appointed commission has had its say. Nevertheless, localities raise hundreds of thousands of dollars to finance task forces working to keep a base open, to hire consultants and to get the message out through public relations firms.

"It's like being accused of murder. You think you have a good case, and you want good attorneys working for you," said Rep. Glen Browder, D-Ala., who is fighting for Fort McClellan, which is in his district.

The competition among the consulting groups and law firms is fierce, as the work draws top dollar.

Officials in Alabama have raised $200,000 to save bases statewide, budgeting $45,000 for Steinberg and Schlossberg, who also have other clients around the country.

In 1993, South Carolina amassed just over $1 million in an unsuccessful effort to save the naval station and shipyard in Charleston, spending much of the money on three consultants and a public relations firm. *(Box, p. 1122)*

San Diego has raised $200,000 for three minor bases, one slated for clo-

NATHANIEL D. HARARI

J. B. Davis, left, who represented an Arizona city seeking to keep a local base open, now serves on the base-closing panel, chaired by Alan Dixon, right.

Key Dates

May 17: Final chance for the independent commission to add bases to the Pentagon's recommended list.

July 1: Commission submits recommendations to President Clinton.

July 15: Deadline for the president to approve or reject commission recommendations in their entirety. If acceptable, Clinton sends them to Congress.

Lawmakers then have 45 days, or until adjournment sine die of the 104th Congress, to pass a resolution of disapproval or the commission's report becomes law.

By Donna Cassata

The Legal Limits on Consulting

There is no ban on retired military officers, former members of the base-closing commission or former commission employees making money as consultants to communities that are trying to save their military facilities in the 1995 round. But they cannot lobby.

Last summer, anticipating that one-time staff members would reappear at the commission's offices this year on behalf of localities that once had pleaded with the panel to spare their bases, the commission's acting general counsel sought the advice of the Office of Government Ethics (OGE).

> **"A former employee is not prohibited . . . from providing behind-the-scenes assistance."**
>
> —Stephen D. Potts, Office of Government Ethics

Mary A. Hook questioned whether the post-employment conflict of interest rules that apply to high-level federal workers, contained in Title 18 of the U.S. Code, Section 207, also apply to former employees of the commission.

The key issue, Hook said in a June 6, 1994, letter to the OGE, was whether a base that had survived a previous review should be considered as the same matter if it comes up in a new round of closures. She suggested that it should not, so former employees could advise localities behind the scenes.

After studying the commission's analysis, the OGE agreed with the panel's conclusion that a decision on a specific base in 1993 was "not the same 'particular matter'" for purposes of Title 18 and in subsequent base closure rounds.

"The restrictions . . . do not apply unless a former employee communicates to or makes an appearance before the United States on behalf of some other person," wrote Stephen D. Potts, director of the OGE. In this instance, United States refers to any employee, department, agency or court of the United States and would include the base-closings commission.

"Therefore, a former employee is not prohibited by [Title 18] from providing 'behind-the-scenes' assistance in connection with the representation of another person," Potts said in a June 30, 1994, response to the commission.

Restrictions on behind-the-scenes work do exist when the work involves providing advice to a foreign government. Former employees are also prohibited from revealing classified information.

These legal limits and the OGE's advice to the commission make it clear that consultants can provide advice to communities but cannot directly lobby the base-closings panel. Members of the current commission staff, community representatives and the consultants themselves say the work is assistance, not lobbying.

In fact, among the most prominent base-closings consultants, only Carl Smith of The Spectrum Group and Barry Steinberg are registered lobbyists with Congress — but on matters other than base closings. Both described their work for the communities as consulting rather than lobbying.

"I assiduously avoid that label," said Steinberg.

—Donna Cassata

sure and the other two, realignment.

"Let's be brutally frank: For a short period of time, this is a very profitable business," Steinberg said.

Who Are the Consultants?

Disconsolate communities see the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission as their last hope, since the independent panel has the power to add or remove bases from the military's hit list. While the commission holds a series of base visits and hearings around the country this month to prepare its final recommendations to President Clinton and Congress, localities are hoping their consultants will find the one bit of evidence to prove the military's analysis was wrong.

In a sparse, elongated room among the 14th-floor offices of the commission, there are eight rows of shelves containing boxes of documents from the 1991, 1993 and 1995 rounds. This is the commission's library, a storehouse of information in a world where knowledge can mean jobs and money.

A commission binder titled Memoranda of Meetings lists the date, time, subject, participants and purpose of each session from January to April. Consultants also sign in.

Prominent on the list of consulting firms is Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard, McPherson and Hand, which has 150 lawyers in offices in Washington; McLean, Va.; Houston and Austin, Texas; and Honolulu, Hawaii.

Partners in the firm include Harry McPherson, a member of the 1993 base-closing commission, and former Rep. James A. Courter, R-N.J., who chaired the commission in 1991 and 1993. Neither McPherson nor Courter is involved in base-closing consultation, said Rosemary Freeman, a spokeswoman for the firm.

But the firm has three former commission staffers working as consultants: Matt Behrman, who was commission staff director in 1991 and 1993; Barry Rhoads, the commission counsel in 1991; and Jackie Arends, the congressional liaison to the 1993 commission and a former aide to Sen. Larry Pressler, R-S.D.

The firm is representing Meridian Naval Air Station in Mississippi; the state of New Jersey, which could lose nearly 3,000 jobs if three bases are closed and one realigned; Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana; the Letterkenny Army Depot in Pennsylvania; and the cities of Louisville, Ky., and Oklahoma City.

Rhoads, a partner at Verner, Liipfert, said the firm's base-closing team assists a locality in presenting its case to the commission, getting retired military officers as advisers and searching the library for information.

"Knowing the library is critical," said Rhoads, who worked privately as a consultant to a handful of communities in 1993. "A congressional staff member

is very helpful, but very few of them can make this a full-time effort."

At R. Duffy Wall and Associates, Tim Rupli, an executive secretary on the 1993 commission, and J.R. Reskovac, who worked for former Rep. Dave McCurdy, D-Okla., are part of a 12-person team called Defense Realignment Advisors. Among their clients are Red River Army Depot in Texas and Hill Air Force Base near Ogden, Utah.

Scott Air Force Base and the Charles Melvin Price Support Center, both in Illinois, have hired Carl Smith and The Spectrum Group. Smith served as the counsel and minority staff director on the Senate Armed Services Committee from 1986 to 1988.

Jess Franco, a retired Army colonel who spent 28 years in the service and was the liaison to Congress until late last year, is a consultant for the Rome laboratory at Griffiss Air Force Base in New York.

The military uses eight criteria to determine which bases to select for closure, feeding information into a computer program to rank each facility. The top category is military value; the last, environmental impact. Former military officers, especially those who worked in the Pentagon, market their intimate knowledge and expertise, Franco said.

"We can speak that same language. We worked in the process, understand the steps the services have done, the analyses they've done," Franco said.

Role Is Examined

The role of consultants has been questioned by both the commission and senators. The commission's acting general counsel sought a ruling from the Office of Government Ethics last year regarding the work of former commission staff members. *(Box, p. 1121)*

At the Feb. 15 Senate confirmation hearing for members of the 1995 commission, one nominee, retired Air Force Gen. J. B. Davis, acknowledged that he had been employed in 1994 by The Spectrum Group and represented the city of Glendale, Ariz., which was trying to protect Luke Air Force Base from closure. *(Weekly Report, p. 539)*

At the hearing, Davis said he had severed his ties to Spectrum on Jan. 2 and would recuse himself from decisions on Luke and any other base with a similar mission. He was confirmed.

One consultant who has been the subject of some controversy is Schlossberg, the head of the firm Kutak Rock, which is representing Alabama and the city of San Diego. Published reports in California newspapers in February said Schlossberg would receive a $75,000 bounty from the Port of San Diego Ship Repair Association if the base-closing commission votes to shut down a chief rival, the Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

Millions of dollars in future Navy repair work likely would flow to San Diego if the Long Beach Naval Shipyard were closed.

Schlossberg did not return several telephone calls, but his colleague Steinberg and Howard Ruggles, the military affairs director for the San Diego Chamber of Commerce, disputed the story.

"It's not true," said Steinberg.

"No bonus, no bounty, just an hourly rate," said Ruggles.

Still, reports of a bounty have focused attention on the consultants and the fees they command.

In 1993, South Carolina suffered a blow when the military's hit list targeted several Charleston facilities. Just over $1 million was raised from state funds, county and city governments, contributions from corporations and donations from private citizens.

Howard Chapman, who was a special assistant to then-Mayor Joe Riley on base closures, said much of the money went to three consultants and a public relations company.

Steinberg and his one-time law firm of Jordan, Coyne, Savitz and Lopata received $205,000; Tom Williams, a retired Navy captain who had been in charge of all U.S. naval shipyards, got $175,000; International Planning and Analysis Center of Arlington, Va., which counts former Defense Secretary Frank C. Carlucci on its board, received $84,000; and Frank Mankiewicz's public relations firm, Hill and Knowlton, got about $90,000.

"Communities are desperate. They have to hire outside help," said Steinberg. "If they don't and lose, they're criticized for not doing it. They put a lot of money on the table for us."

Why Consultants Are Hired

With the chances of saving a base targeted by the military so slim, the question is why a community would spend hundreds of thousands of dollars for a few months of a consultant's advice.

In 1993, Charleston was still recovering from Hurricane Hugo when the military caught the naval shipyard, naval station, attendant supply center, defense depot and the county's naval hospital in its cross hairs. Closure would mean the loss of 19,000 direct military and civilian jobs. *(1993 Weekly Report, p. 679)*

"When your entire economy is about to be devastated, you do just about anything you can," said Chapman, who now serves as Charleston's director of traffic and transportation.

The South Carolinians sought con-

Tab for Charleston's Base-Closing Fight

What does it cost to mount a battle in behalf of a base? South Carolinians raised just over $1 million in 1993 and spent more than half of that on national consultants. The rest went for staff salaries, travel and other local expenses.

Contributors	Amount
State of South Carolina	$445,000
Private corporate and individual contributions	378,000
Cities of Charleston and North Charleston	175,000
Charleston Naval Shipyard Joint Steering Committee (employees)	56,000
TOTAL	1,054,000

Expenditures	
Retired Navy Capt. Tom Williams	$175,000
Law firm of Jordan, Coyne, Savits and Lopata	205,000
International Planning and Analysis Center of Arlington, VA	84,000
Hill and Knowlton public relations firm	90,000
TOTAL	554,000

SOURCE: Howard Chapman, a special assistant to the mayor of Charleston for base closings in 1993, and Ginger Norvell, a spokeswoman for the city's Chamber of Commerce

Air Force Depots in Cross Hairs

With the base-closing process moving into a crucial phase, the Air Force's maintenance depots are looming as clear targets for shutdown.

After additional base visits and regional hearings, the base-closing commission is scheduled to meet May 10 to decide whether to add military installations to the list of 146 bases the Pentagon has selected for possible closure or realignment. No one is predicting what will happen, but it is certain that the commission will take a hard look at the five Air Force depots.

Echoing criticisms contained in a recent General Accounting Office (GAO) report, commission members have taken the Air Force to task for relying on questionable data in proposing to realign the depots rather than shut down two of the facilities, as it initially planned. *(Weekly Report, p. 1075).*

At an April 17 hearing, commission Chairman Alan J. Dixon, formerly a Democratic senator from Illinois, said the information provided by the Air Force to justify its decision "raises considerable questions for us."

Dixon was skeptical of the Air Force's claim that closing Kelly Air Force Base in Texas, the site of one of the maintenance depots, would result in the elimination of only 7 percent of the base's 19,104 jobs. "It's hard for us to accept that," Dixon said. Shutting down a base normally results in the elimination of at least 40 percent of its jobs, he noted.

Air Force Maj. Gen. Jay D. Blume Jr. defended the data and the service's decision to realign rather than close the depots. Blume argued that the upfront costs of shutting down installations are prohibitive. He rejected the GAO's contention that the Air Force's procedures were subjective and poorly documented.

"If they can read, they should be able to follow the Air Force's process," he said.

The commission's May 10 meeting will be closely watched on Capitol Hill. Republicans have pointed to the decision to spare Kelly and McClellan Air Force Base in California — two major employers in states rich with electoral votes — as evidence that the Pentagon's list was influenced by political considerations.

The commission can vote to add bases for possible closure at that meeting. Its final recommendations on the installations to be closed and realigned must be submitted to President Clinton by July 1.

—Carroll J. Doherty

sulting firms that offered "access. They had people who knew the business. They could look at the material and say, 'This is wrong,'" Chapman said of the data the Pentagon offered to support the service's recommendations.

In the end, Charleston lost its naval shipyard and naval station, but the 1993 commission decided to concentrate the Navy's electronics systems and repair centers in the South Carolina complex. Charleston managed to save about 3,000 jobs. *(1993 Weekly Report, p. 1755)*

"You want to be able to say to your constituency, 'We went out and got as much help as we possibly could,'" Chapman said. The last thing a community's leadership wants to tell residents is that it "wasn't willing to spend thousands when they were going to lose millions."

That view was echoed by Sen. Olympia J. Snowe, R-Maine, who recalled hiring Smith in 1991, when Loring Air Force Base in her state was on the closure list. Snowe said the congressional delegation realized that reviewing the military's information and preparing a presentation for the commission was too much for Capitol Hill staff.

"Everybody wants to make the best case possible," Snowe said. "You don't want to leave any stone unturned."

Judy Ann Miller, an assistant to California Gov. Pete Wilson and the director of the state's Office of Military Base Retention, said the process has grown more sophisticated as the military uses special computer models — known as Cost of Base Realignment Actions — to determine costs, savings and investment returns on proposed closures and realignments. The preparation of responses demands professional consultants.

"It is a business. A lot of cottage industries have developed," said Miller, who worked in the Defense Department for 11 years under Presidents Reagan, Bush and Clinton.

Rick Zehrer, the defense liaison for the state of Alabama and a retired Air Force brigadier general, said the consultants monitor the base-closing process, attend the hearings, contact the commission staff, collect information and feed it all back to the state's base-closing task force.

Communities or states that "don't take advantage of experts, they're just being foolish," Zehrer said.

Ruggles recalled receiving boxes of material from his consultants. Sending someone cross-country to do the same amount of photocopying at the commission library would have been too costly for San Diego, he said.

"We know the town, the bases, and are fairly familiar with the Hill and the Pentagon. But we're not cognizant around the commission and the staff," Ruggles said. "They give us advice on how best to do things."

Walt Phillips of the Calhoun County, Ala., Chamber of Commerce remembered the advice of two former base-closing commissioners, Hansford T. Johnson and Howard Hollis "Bo" Calloway.

Johnson, a retired four-star Air Force general who served on the 1993 commission, and Calloway, who served as Army secretary from 1973 to 1975 and as a member of the 1991 commission, praised the consultants for their background work.

But Phillips said they cautioned: "Never let them be out front. They're your hired guns." ■

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

ALAN J. DIXON, CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONERS:
AL CORNELLA
REBECCA COX
GEN J. B. DAVIS, USAF (RET)
S. LEE KLING
RADM BENJAMIN F. MONTOYA, USN (RET)
MG JOSUE ROBLES, JR., USA (RET)
WENDI LOUISE STEELE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

Washington, DC, April 4, 1995 --The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission announced its Chicago hearing schedule today. The purpose of this regional hearing is to receive testimony from communities affected by the Secretary of Defense's recommendations to close or realign domestic military installations.

For oral testimony at regional hearings, each state will be given a block of time in which to make a presentation for **all** installations affected in that state. The overall time is determined by the Commission on the basis of the number of affected installations and the direct military and civilian personnel lost in each state.

Seating should be ample, but admission is on a first-come, first-served basis.

ROSEMONT, ILLINOIS
The Rosemont Convention Center
9301 West Bryn Mawr

April 12, 1995

10:00-10:10 a.m.	Opening remarks by Chairman Dixon	
10:10-11:00 a.m.	Illinois	50 minutes
11:05-12:05 p.m.	Missouri	60 minutes
12:10-12:40 p.m.	Public comment: Illinois, Missouri	
12:40-1:30 p.m .	Break	
1:30-2:15 p.m.	Indiana	45 minutes
2:20-3:05 p.m.	Kentucky	45 minutes

3:10-3:50 p.m.	Michigan	40 minutes
3:50-4:00 p.m.	Break	
4:00-4:25 p.m.	Ohio	25 minutes
4:30-4:35 p.m.	Wisconsin	5 minutes
4:40-4:45 p.m.	Kansas	5 minutes
4:50-5:20 p.m.	Public comment: Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Kansas	

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: Individuals needing special assistance should contact the Commission in advance of each event to facilitate their requirements.

30

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM

Frank - I am sorry I failed to deliver - however AO square has these for you.

I will deliver 150 copies of SecAF/CSAF ~~talent~~ on Thursday 2 Mar - At which time I need to discuss the area of freelancing -

Carl

Steve I think team HQS should see this March 1 NF Notification but please verify

PS
This will be useful when we update closure report

CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION FACT SHEETS:

This information addresses Air Force domestic base closure/realignment actions announced by the Office of the Secretary of Defense on March 1, 1995. Twenty-six installations have been previously designated for closure or partial closure and subsequent conversion to civilian use as a result of the recommendations of the 1988 Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure and the 1991 and 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commissions. Since January 1988, the Department of Defense has announced that the Air Force will withdraw from or reduce its presence at 32 main operating bases and 214 sites overseas. These overseas actions impact approximately 45,800 full-time military, 2,600 US civilians, and 7,700 foreign national employees. Continuing defense budget reductions necessitate many difficult decisions in order to provide the full range of capabilities needed in a smaller, more efficient Air Force. Actions required to achieve the Fiscal Year 1996-1997 President's Budget will be released at a later date.

Base Closure and Realignment Background:

As a result of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (PL 101-510), the Department of Defense initiated its base closure process. Department of Defense criteria for closing and realigning military installations considers: military value, return on investment, ability of existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces/missions/personnel, and the economic/environmental impacts of a potential action. Of the above criteria, the Department of Defense is required to give priority consideration to military value.

The Air Force's 1995 selection process shares the fundamental approach used in the 1991 and 1993 processes. The basis for recommendations was the DoD Force Structure Plan approved in January 1995 by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the eight selection criteria approved by the Secretary of Defense.

Using the approved DoD selection criteria, the Air Force Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG) reviewed and considered all Air Force installations in the United States and its territories which had at least 300 direct-hire DoD civilian manpower authorizations. The bases were categorized for analysis primarily according to their predominant mission.

The Air Force base closure and realignment recommendations were determined through an in-depth, base-by-base analysis. An extensive capacity review was performed using the approved DoD Force Structure Plan to determine base structure requirements. Bases deemed militarily/geographically unique or mission essential, and categories and subcategories of the bases which were determined to have insufficient excess capacity to permit a base to close, were excluded by the Secretary of the Air Force (SECAF) from further study. Excluded bases remained eligible as receivers. All remaining active component bases were examined individually on the basis of the eight selection criteria. Because Air Reserve Component (ARC) category bases do not readily compete against each other, they were evaluated to identify closures which could

achieve reasonable savings by realigning units onto active duty, civilian, or other ARC installations.

Under Deputy Secretary of Defense direction, the BCEG, and the SECAF considered and analyzed the results of the efforts of Joint Cross-Service Groups in the areas of Depot Maintenance, Laboratories, Test and Evaluation, Undergraduate Pilot Training, and Military Treatment Facilities (including Graduate Medical Education). The Military Departments responded with comments and cost analyses of the alternatives, and engaged in a dialogue with the Joint Groups regarding potential closure and realignment actions, consistent with the internal analytical processes of each Military Department.

Installations/Facilities Recommended for Closure:

Moffett Federal Airfield Air Guard Station, California

Moffett Federal Airfield Air Guard Station is recommended for closure. The 129th Rescue Group and associated aircraft will relocate to McClellan AFB, California.

The station is tentatively planned to close by 1997, with 88 full-time military, 382 drill, and 230 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $15.2 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $4.8 million, with a return on investment expected in 4 years.

North Highlands Air Guard Station, California

North Highlands Air Guard Station is recommended for closure. The 162nd Combat Communications Group and its 149th Combat Communications Squadron will relocate to McClellan AFB, California.

The station is tentatively planned to close by 1997, with 5 full-time military, 177 drill, and 37 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $1.3 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $0.2 million, with a return on investment expected in 8 years.

Ontario International Airport Air Guard Station, California

Ontario International Airport Air Guard Station is recommended for closure. The 148th Combat Communications Squadron and the 210th Weather Flight will relocate to March Air Reserve Base, California.

The station is tentatively planned to close by 1997, with 1 full-time military, 151 drill, and 19 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $0.8 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $0.1 million, with a return on investment expected in 8 years.

Buffalo, New York

The Air Force will disestablish its Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor activity and transfer the required test activities and equipment to the Air Force Flight Test Center at Edwards AFB, California. All remaining equipment will be disposed of.

The activity is tentatively planned to be disestablished by 1998, with 2 full-time military and 1 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $1.7 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $0.9 million, with a return on investment expected in 1 year.

Rome Laboratory, New York

Rome Laboratory is recommended for closure. Rome Laboratory activities will relocate to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, and Hanscom AFB, Massachusetts. Specifically, the Photonics, Electromagnetic & Reliability, Computer Systems, Radio Communications and Communications Network activities will relocate to Fort Monmouth. The Surveillance, Intelligence & Reconnaissance Software Technology, Advanced C^2 Concepts, and Space Communications activities will relocate to Hanscom AFB. The Test Site (e.g., Stockbridge and Newport) O&M operations will remain at their present location and report to Hanscom AFB.

The Laboratory is tentatively planned to close by 1999, with 10 full-time military and 923 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. This is after a programmed military to civilian manpower conversion associated with the Fiscal Year 1996-1997 President's Budget occurs. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $52.8 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $11.5 million, with a return on investment expected in 4 years.

Roslyn Air Guard Station, New York

Roslyn Air Guard Station is recommended for closure. The 213th Electronic Installation Squadron (ANG) and the 274th Combat Communications Group (ANG) will relocate to Stewart International Airport Air Guard Station, New York. The 722nd Aeromedical Staging Squadron (AFR) will relocate to suitable leased space in the existing recruiting area.

The station is tentatively planned to close by 1997, with 7 full-time military, 466 drill, and 37 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $2.4 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $.72 million, with a return on investment expected in 4 years.

Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, Ohio

Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station is recommended for closure. The 178th Fighter Group, and the 251st Combat Communications Group with its 269th Combat Communications Squadron will relocate to Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio.

The station is tentatively planned to close by 1997, with 63 full-time military, 871 drill, and 255 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $23.4 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $4.2 million, with a return on investment expected in 6 years.

Greater Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania

Greater Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station is recommended for closure. The 911th Airlift Wing will inactivate and its C-130 aircraft will be distributed to Air Force Reserve C-130 units at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Georgia, and Peterson AFB, Colorado.

The station is tentatively planned to close by 1997, with 1,074 drill and 347 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $22.3 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $13.1 million, with a return on investment expected in 2 years.

Fort Worth, Texas

The Air Force will disestablish its Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator activity and transfer essential capabilities, test activities, and equipment to the Air Force Flight Test Center at Edwards AFB, California. All remaining equipment will be disposed of.

The activity is tentatively planned to transfer in 1998, with 4 full-time military and 1 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time costs to implement this action is $5.8 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $0.8 million, with a return on investment expected in 7 years.

Bergstrom Air Reserve Base, Texas

Bergstrom Air Reserve Base is recommended for closure. The 924th Fighter Wing will inactivate, and its F-16 aircraft will be redistributed or retired. Tenth Air Force, will relocate to Naval Air Station Fort Worth, Joint Reserve Base, Texas.

The base is tentatively planned to close by 1997, with 16 full-time military, 794 drill, and 581 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $13.3 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $20.9 million, with an immediate return on investment.

Brooks AFB, Texas

Brooks Air Force Base is recommended for closure. The Human Systems Center, including the School of Aerospace Medicine and Armstrong Laboratory, will relocate to Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio; however, some portion of the Manpower and Personnel function, and the Air Force Drug Test Laboratory, may relocate to other locations. The 68th Intelligence Squadron will relocate to Kelly AFB, Texas. The Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence will relocate to Tyndall AFB,

Florida. The 710th Intelligence Flight (AFR) will relocate to Lackland AFB, Texas. The hyperbaric chamber operation, including associated personnel, will relocate to Lackland AFB. All activities and facilities at the base including family housing, the medical facility, commissary, and base exchange will close.

The base is tentatively planned to close by 2001, with 1,932 full-time military, 38 drill, and 1,537 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $185.5 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $27.4 million, with a return on investment expected in 7 years.

Reese AFB, Texas

Reese AFB is recommended for closure. The 64th Flying Training Wing will inactivate and its assigned aircraft will be redistributed or retired. All activities and facilities at the base including family housing, the hospital, commissary, and base exchange will close.

The base is tentatively planned to close by 1997, with 900 full-time military and 219 civilian manpower authorizations being affected. The estimated one-time cost to implement this action is $37.3 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $21.5 million, with a return on investment expected in 2 years.

Installations/Facilities Recommended for Realignment:

McClellan AFB, California

McClellan AFB is recommended for realignment. In order to reduce excess depot maintenance capacity, the Air Force will consolidate/relocate 14 commodity workload functions within the Air Logistics Centers (ALC). This action will create or strengthen Technical Repair Centers at the receiving locations in the respective commodities. Minimal workload in each of the commodities may continue to be performed at the other ALCs as required. A consolidation of: composites and plastics, hydraulics, instruments/displays, electrical/mechanical support equipment, and injection molding commodity workloads is planned at McClellan AFB, while airborne electronic automatic equipment software, airborne electronics, sheet metal repair and manufacturing, tubing manufacturing, machining manufacturing, plating, electronic manufacturing (printed wire boards), and foundry operations commodity workloads will transfer from McClellan AFB to other ALCs. All other activities and facilities associated with McClellan AFB will remain open.

Realignment actions are tentatively planned to take place by 1998. These actions result in a net increase of 15 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement the entire ALC realignment is $183 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $89 million, with a return on investment expected in 2 years.

As a result of other 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the following functions are tentatively planned to relocate to McClellan AFB: (1) The 129th Rescue Group and associated aircraft will relocate from Moffett Federal Airfield Air Guard Station, California. (2) The 162nd Combat Communications Group and its 149th Combat Communications Squadron will relocate from North Highlands Air Guard Station, California. (3) A portion of the installation functions of the 485th Electronic Installation Group will transfer from Griffiss AFB, New York.

The above actions for McClellan AFB result in a overall increase of 130 full-time military, 528 drill, and 269 civilian manpower authorizations.

Onizuka Air Station, California

Onizuka Air Station is recommended for realignment. The 750th Space Group will inactivate and its functions will relocate to Falcon AFB, Colorado. Detachment 2, Space and Missile Systems Center will relocate to Falcon AFB. Some tenants will remain in existing facilities. All activities and facilities associated with the 750th Space Group, including family housing, the clinic, commissary, and base exchange will close.

Realignment actions are tentatively planned to take place by 1998. These actions result in a net decrease of 673 full-time military and 246 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $124.2 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $30.3 million, with a return on investment expected in 8 years.

Eglin AFB, Florida

Eglin AFB is recommended for realignment. The Electromagnetic Test Environment, consisting of eight electronic combat threat simulator systems and two electronic combat pod systems will relocate to the Nellis AFB, Nevada. Those emitter-only systems that are required to support Air Force Special Operations Command, the USAF Air Warfare Center, and Air Force Materiel Command's Armaments/Weapons Test and Evaluation activities will remain at Eglin AFB. All other activities and facilities associated with Eglin AFB will remain open.

Realignment actions are tentatively planned to take place by 1998. These actions result in a net decrease of 27 full-time military and 25 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $2.2 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $2.6 million, with a return on investment expected in 1 year.

As a result of other 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center is tentatively planned to relocate from Kirtland AFB, New Mexico.

The above actions for Eglin AFB result in a overall increase of 420 full-time military and 196 civilian manpower authorizations.

Robins AFB, Georgia

Robins AFB is recommended for realignment. In order to reduce excess depot maintenance capacity, the Air Force will consolidate/relocate 14 commodity workload functions within the Air Logistics Centers (ALC). This action will create or strengthen Technical Repair Centers at the receiving locations in the respective commodities. Minimal workload in each of the commodities may continue to be performed at the other ALCs as required. A consolidation of: tubing manufacturing, airborne electronic automatic equipment software, sheet metal repair and manufacturing, machining manufacturing, airborne electronics, electronic manufacturing (printed wire boards), and plating commodity workloads is planned at Robins AFB, while composites and plastics, hydraulics, electrical/mechanical support equipment, and foundry operations commodity workloads will transfer from Robins AFB to other ALCs. All other activities and facilities associated with Robins AFB will remain open.

Realignment actions are tentatively planned to take place by 1998. These actions result in a net decrease of 503 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement the entire ALC realignment is $183 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $89 million, with a return on investment expected in 2 years.

Malmstrom AFB, Montana

Malmstrom AFB is recommended for realignment. The 43rd Air Refueling Group and its KC-135R aircraft will relocate to MacDill AFB, Florida. All fixed-wing aircraft flying operations at Malmstrom AFB will cease and the airfield will be closed. A small airfield operational area will support the 341st Missile Wing's helicopter operations. All base activities and facilities associated with the 341st Missile Wing will remain.

The realignment is tentatively planned to take place by 1997. This action results in a decrease of 719 full-time military and 19 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $17.4 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $5.1 million, with a return on investment expected in 4 years.

Kirtland AFB, New Mexico

Kirtland AFB is recommended for realignment. The 58th Special Operations Wing will relocate to Holloman AFB, New Mexico. The Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center will relocate to Eglin AFB, Florida. The Air Force Office of Security Police will relocate to Lackland AFB, Texas. The Air Force Inspection Agency and the Air Force Safety Agency will relocate to Kelly AFB, Texas. The Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) will relocate to Kelly AFB (Field Command) and Nellis AFB, Nevada (High Explosive Testing). Some DNA personnel (Radiation Simulator operations) will remain in place. The Phillips Laboratory and the 898th Munitions Squadron will remain in cantonment. The AFR and ANG activities will remain in existing facilities. The 377th ABW inactivates and all other activities and facilities at Kirtland AFB, including family housing, commissary, and base exchange will close. Air Force medical activities located in the Veteran's Administration Hospital will terminate.

Realignment actions are tentatively planned to take place by 2001. These actions result in a net decrease of 4,150 full-time military and 685 civilian manpower authorizations. These manpower numbers reflect a planned military to civilian manpower conversion for those Air Force Materiel Command units remaining at Kirtland AFB. The estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $277.5 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $62.0 million, with a return on investment expected in 3 years.

Grand Forks AFB and Minot AFB, North Dakota

Grand Forks AFB is recommended for realignment. The 321st Missile Group will inactivate, unless prior to December 1996, the Secretary of Defense determines that the need to retain ballistic missile defense options effectively precludes this action. If the Secretary of Defense makes such determination, Minot AFB will be realigned and the 91st Missile Group will inactivate. If Grand Forks AFB is realigned, the 321st Missile Group will inactivate. The Minuteman III missiles will relocate to Malmstrom AFB, Montana, be maintained at depot facilities, or be retired. A small number of silo launchers at Grand Forks AFB may be retained if required. The 319th Air Refueling Wing will remain in place. All activities and facilities at the base associated with the 319th Air Refueling Wing, including family housing, the hospital, commissary, and base exchange will remain open.

If Minot AFB is realigned, the 91st Missile Group will inactivate. The Minuteman III missiles will relocate to Malmstrom AFB, be maintained at depot facilities, or be retired. The 5th Bomb Wing will remain in place. All activities and facilities at the base associated with the 5th Bomb Wing, including family housing, the hospital, commissary, and base exchange will remain open.

The realignment is tentatively planned to take place by 1998. This action results in a decrease of 1,506 full-time military and 53 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $11.9 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $35.2 million, with an immediate return on investment.

Tinker AFB, Oklahoma

Tinker AFB is recommended for realignment. In order to reduce excess depot maintenance capacity, the Air Force will consolidate/relocate 14 commodity workload functions within the Air Logistics Centers (ALC). This action will create or strengthen Technical Repair Centers at the receiving locations in the respective commodities. Minimal workload in each of the commodities may continue to be performed at the other ALCs as required. A consolidation of: airborne electronic automatic equipment software, machining manufacturing, airborne electronics, and plating commodity workloads is planned at Tinker AFB, while industrial plant equipment software, sheet metal repair and manufacturing, instruments/displays, composites and plastics, tubing manufacturing, and hydraulics commodity workloads will transfer from Tinker AFB to other ALCs. All other activities and facilities associated with Tinker AFB will remain open.

Realignment actions are tentatively planned to take place by 1998. These actions result in a net decrease of 1,143 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement

the entire ALC realignment is $183 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $89 million, with a return on investment expected in 2 years.

As a result of other 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the electronic installation functions of the 485th Electronic Installation Group are tentatively planned to transfer from Griffiss AFB, New York.

The above actions for Tinker AFB result in a overall increase of 171 full-time military and a decrease of 887 civilian manpower authorizations.

Kelly AFB, Texas

Kelly AFB is recommended for realignment. In order to reduce excess depot maintenance capacity, the Air Force will consolidate/relocate 14 commodity workload functions within the Air Logistics Centers (ALC). This action will create or strengthen Technical Repair Centers at the receiving locations in the respective commodities. Minimal workload in each of the commodities may continue to be performed at the other ALCs as required. A consolidation of: foundry operations, industrial plant equipment software, and plating commodity workloads is planned at Kelly AFB, while airborne electronic automatic equipment software, sheet metal repair and manufacturing, composites and plastics, tubing manufacturing, machining manufacturing, hydraulics, and electrical/mechanical support equipment commodity workloads will transfer from Kelly AFB to other ALCs. All other activities and facilities associated with Kelly AFB will remain open.

Realignment actions are tentatively planned to take place by 1998. These actions result in a net decrease of 468 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement the entire ALC realignment is $183 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $89 million, with a return on investment expected in 2 years.

As a result of other 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the following functions are tentatively planned to relocate to Kelly AFB: (1) The Air Force Inspection Agency, the Air Force Safety Agency, and the Defense Nuclear Agency's Field Command will relocate from Kirtland AFB, New Mexico. (2) A portion of the installation functions of the 485th Electronic Installation Group will transfer from Griffiss AFB, New York. (3) The 68th Intelligence Squadron will relocate from Brooks AFB, Texas

The above actions for Kelly AFB result in a overall increase of 550 full-time military and a decrease of 151 civilian manpower authorizations.

Hill AFB, Utah (Three Actions)

(1) Hill AFB is recommended for realignment. In order to reduce excess depot maintenance capacity, the Air Force will consolidate/relocate 14 commodity workload functions within the Air Logistics Centers (ALC). This action will create or strengthen Technical Repair Centers at the receiving locations in the respective commodities. Minimal workload in each of the

commodities may continue to be performed at the other ALCs as required. A consolidation of: airborne electronic automatic equipment software, sheet metal repair and manufacturing, foundry operations, airborne electronics, and plating commodity workloads is planned at Hill AFB, while composites and plastics, tubing manufacturing, machining manufacturing, electronic manufacturing (printed wire boards), hydraulics, and infection molding commodity workloads will transfer from Hill AFB to other ALCs. All other activities and facilities associated with Hill AFB will remain open.

Realignment actions are tentatively planned to take place by 1998. These actions result in a net increase of 256 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement the entire ALC realignment is $183 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $89 million, with a return on investment expected in 2 years.

(2) Hill AFB is recommended for realignment. The permanent Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) test range activity at the Utah Test and Training Range (UTTR) will be disestablished. Management responsibility for operation of the UTTR and the personnel, equipment, and systems required to support the training range will transfer from AFMC to Air Combat Command. Additional AFMC manpower associated with operation of the range will be eliminated. Some armament/weapons test and evaluation workload will transfer to the Air Force Development Test Center at Eglin AFB, Florida, and the Air Force Flight Test Center at Edwards AFB, California.

Realignment actions are tentatively planned to take place by 1998. These actions result in a net decrease of 35 full-time military and 69 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $3.2 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $12.4 million, with an immediate return on investment.

(3) Cancel the recommendation of the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission regarding the relocation of the 485th Engineering Installation Group (EIG) from Griffiss AFB, New York: Instead, inactivate the 485th EIG, and transfer its functions to Tinker AFB, Oklahoma; Kelly AFB, Texas; and McClellan AFB, California.

The above actions for Hill AFB result in a overall decrease of 35 full-time military and an increase of 187 civilian manpower authorizations.

Redirects to the Recommendations of the 1991 Commission:

Bases identified by the 1991 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission as receiving bases were evaluated by mission category along with all other bases in the United States. As part of this review, the 1991 Commission's realignment recommendations were re-evaluated against recent force structure reductions, as well as, opportunities to operate more efficiently and effectively. The Air Force-recommended changes result from analysis of changing world order, other base closures, the threat and force structure plan, and budgetary reality.

Williams AFB, Arizona

Change the recommendation of the 1991 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission regarding the Armstrong Laboratory Aircrew Training Research Facility relocation as follows: The Armstrong Laboratory Aircrew Training Research Facility will remain at its present location as a stand-alone activity.

The 1991 Commission recommended that the Armstrong Laboratory Aircrew Training Research Facility located at Williams AFB be relocated to Orlando, Florida. This recommendation, was based on assumptions regarding Navy training activities and the availability of facilities. Subsequent to that Commission's report, it was discovered that the facilities were not available at the estimated cost, and the Navy reduced the available pilot resources necessary for this facility's work. The facility's largely civilian operation is well-suited to function in a stand-alone facility, and its proximity to Luke AFB provides a ready source of fighter pilots.

The redirect results in 12 full-time military and 30 civilian manpower authorizations remaining at the Aircrew Training Research Facility. The estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is zero. Annual savings is $0.3 million, with an immediate return on investment.

(a) Orlando, Florida

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the Aircrew Training Research Facility will remain at Mesa, Arizona (formerly Williams AFB Arizona), instead of relocating to Orlando. This action results in 12 full-time military and 30 civilian manpower authorizations remaining at Mesa.

Lowry AFB, Colorado

Change the recommendation of the 1991 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission regarding the cantonment of the 1001st Space Support Squadron as follows: Inactivate the 1001st Space Systems Squadron, now designated Detachment 1, Space Systems Support Group (SSSG). Some Detachment 1 personnel and equipment will relocate to Peterson AFB, Colorado, under the SSSG while the remainder of the positions will be eliminated.

The 1991 Commission recommended that the 1001st Space Systems Squadron remain in a cantonment. This redirect enables the consolidation of space and warning systems software support functions at Peterson AFB, and result in the elimination of some personnel positions and cost savings.

The redirect results in a decrease of 88 full-time military and 11 civilian manpower authorizations. The estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $1.7 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $3.0 million, with a return on investment expected in 1 year.

MacDill AFB, Florida

Change the recommendations of the 1991 and 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commissions regarding the closure and transfer of the airfield to the Department of Commerce as follows: Redirect the retention of the MacDill AFB airfield as part of MacDill AFB. The Air Force will continue to operate the runway and its associated activities. The Department of Commerce will remain as a tenant.

Since the 1993 Commission, the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have validated airfield requirements of the two Unified Commands, and the Air Force has the responsibility to support the requirements. Studies indicate that Tampa International Airport cannot support the Unified Commands' airfield needs, so it is more efficient for the Air Force to operate the airfield from the existing active duty support base. Additional cost savings will be achieved when the KC-135 aircraft and associated personnel are relocated from Malmstrom AFB.

The redirect results in a increase of 684 full-time military and 19 civilian manpower authorizations. The cost and savings data associated with this redirect are reflected in the Malmstrom AFB realignment recommendation.

Redirects to the Recommendations of the 1993 Commission:

Bases identified by the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission as receiving bases were evaluated by mission category along with all other bases in the United States. As part of this review, the 1993 Commission's realignment recommendations were re-evaluated against recent force structure reductions, as well as, opportunities to operate more efficiently and effectively. The Air Force-recommended changes result from analysis of changing world order, other base closures, the threat and force structure plan, and budgetary reality.

Homestead AFB, Florida (Two Actions)

(1) Change the recommendation of the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission regarding Homestead AFB as follows: Redirect the 301st Rescue Squadron (AFR) with its associated aircraft to relocate to Patrick AFB, Florida.

The 301st Rescue Squadron (RQS) is temporarily located at Patrick AFB, pending reconstruction of its facilities at Homestead Air Reserve Station which were destroyed by Hurricane Andrew. As part of the initiative to have Air Reserve Component forces assume a greater role in DoD peacetime missions, the 301st RQS has assumed primary responsibility for Space Shuttle support and range clearing operations at Patrick AFB. Although the 301st RQS could perform this duty from the Homestead Air Reserve Station, doing so would require expensive temporary duty arrangements, scheduling difficulties, and the dislocation of the unit's mission from home station. The redirect will enable the unit to perform its mission more efficiently, with less disruption the mission.

The total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $4.6 million; while the annual savings after implementation are $1.5 million, with a return on investment expected in 4 years.

(a) Patrick AFB, Florida

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the 301st Rescue Squadron (AFR) will remain at Patrick AFB, instead of returning to Homestead Air Reserve Station, Florida. This action results in 472 drill and 164 civilian manpower authorizations remaining at Patrick AFB.

(2) Change the recommendation of the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission regarding the relocation of the 726th Air Control Squadron (ACS) from Homestead AFB to Shaw AFB, South Carolina as follows: Redirect the 726th ACS to Mountain Home AFB, Idaho.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Andrew, the 726th ACS was temporarily moved from Homestead AFB to Shaw AFB, South Carolina. In March 1993, the Secretary of Defense recommended closing Homestead AFB permanently leaving the 726th ACS at Shaw AFB. Since the 1993 Commission agreed with the 726th ACS recommendation, experience has shown that Shaw AFB does not provide adequate radar coverage of training airspace needed to support the training mission.

The total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $7.4 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $0.23 million, with an immediate return on investment.

(a) Shaw AFB, South Carolina

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the 726th Air Control Squadron is tentatively planned to relocate to Mountain Home AFB, Idaho. This action results in a decrease of 258 full-time military and 6 civilian manpower authorizations.

(b) Mountain Home AFB, Idaho

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the 726th Air Control Squadron is tentatively planned to relocate from Shaw AFB, South Carolina. This action results in an increase of 123 full-time military manpower authorizations.

Griffiss AFB, New York (Two Actions)

(1) Change the recommendation of the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission regarding the transfer of the 485th Engineering Installation Group (EIG) as follows: Inactivate the 485th EIG. Transfer the engineering functions to the 38th EIG at Tinker AFB, Oklahoma, and the installation functions to the 838th Electronic Installation Squadron at Kelly AFB, Texas, and the 938th Electronic Installation Squadron at McClellan AFB, California.

Reorganization of the installation and engineering functions will achieve additional personnel overhead savings by inactivating the 485th EIG and redistributing the remaining activities to other units. The originally planned receiver site for the 485th EIG at Hill AFB has proven to require costly renovation. This redirect avoids additional costs and provides a more efficient workload allocation.

The estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $0.5 million; while the annual savings after implementation is $2.9 million, with an immediate return on investment.

(2) Change the recommendation of the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission regarding support of the 10th Infantry (Light) Division (ID) Fort Drum, New York as follows: Close the minimum essential airfield to be maintained by a contractor at Griffiss AFB and provide the mobility/contingency/training support to the 10th ID from the Fort Drum airfield. Mission essential equipment from Griffiss AFB's airfield will transfer to Fort Drum.

Operation of the minimum essential airfield after Griffiss AFB closes has proven to far exceed earlier cost estimates. Support at Ft Drum can be accomplished by improvement of the existing Ft Drum airfield and facilities. This redirect will permit the Air Force to meet the mobility/contingency/training support requirements of the 10th ID at a reduced cost to the Air Force. Having airfield support at its home location will improve 10th ID's response capabilities, and will avoid the necessity of traveling significant distances, sometimes during winter weather, to its mobility support location.

The total estimated one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $51.3 million; while the annual savings after implementation are $12.7 million, with a return on investment expected in 5 years.

(a) Fort Drum, New York

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the 10th Infantry (Light) Division's mobility/contingency/training support is tentatively planned to relocate from Griffiss AFB, New York. This action results in an increase of 150 civilian manpower authorizations.

Installations/Facilities Recommended as Receivers

Edwards AFB, California

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the following functions are tentatively planned to relocate to Edwards AFB: (1) The Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator activity and equipment will transfer from Fort Worth, Texas. (2) The Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor activity and equipment will transfer from Buffalo, New York. These actions result in a net increase of 2 full-time military and 1 civilian manpower authorizations.

March Air Reserve Base, California

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the 148th Combat Communications Squadron and the 210th Weather Flight are tentatively planned to relocate from Ontario International Airport Air Guard Station, California. These actions result in a net increase of 1 full-time military, 151 drill, and 19 civilian manpower authorizations.

Falcon AFB, Colorado

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the following functions are tentatively planned to relocate to Falcon AFB: (1) The 750th Space Group's space tracking functions will relocate from Onizuka Air Station, California. (2) Detachment 2, Space and Missile Systems Center's functions will relocate from Onizuka Air Station. These actions result in a net increase of 287 full-time military and 234 civilian manpower authorizations.

Peterson AFB, Colorado

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the following functions are tentatively planned to relocate to Peterson AFB: (1) Some of the 911th Airlift Wing's (AFR) C-130 aircraft will transfer from Greater Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania. (2) Space Systems Support Group's Detachment 1 personnel and equipment will relocate from Lowry AFB, Colorado. These actions result in a planned net increase of 10 full-time military, 154 drill, and 63 civilian manpower authorizations.

Tyndall AFB, Florida

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence is tentatively planned to relocate from Brooks AFB, Texas. This action results in an increase of 53 full-time military and 314 civilian manpower authorizations.

Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Georgia

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, some of the 911th Airlift Wing's (AFR) C-130 aircraft are tentatively planned to transfer from Greater Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania. This action results in a planned increase of 155 drill and 52 civilian manpower authorizations.

Hanscom AFB, Massachusetts

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the Surveillance, Intelligence & Reconnaissance Software Technology, Advanced C^2 Concepts, and Space Communications activities are tentatively planned to relocate from Rome Laboratory, New York. These actions result in an increase of 5 full-time military and 504 civilian manpower authorizations.

Nellis AFB, Nevada

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, two functions are tentatively planned to relocate to Nellis AFB: (1) The Electromagnetic Test Environment, consisting of eight electronic combat threat simulator systems and two electronic combat pod systems will relocate from Eglin AFB, Florida. (2) The Defense Nuclear Agency's High Explosive Testing will relocate from Kirtland AFB, New Mexico. These actions result in a net increase of 60 full-time military and 50 civilian manpower authorizations.

Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the Photonics, Electromagnetic & Reliability, Computer Systems, Radio Communications and Communications Network activities are tentatively planned to relocate from Rome Laboratory, New York. This action results in an increase of 5 full-time military and 369 civilian manpower authorizations.

Holloman AFB, New Mexico

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the 58th Special Operations Wing and its associated aircraft are tentatively planned to relocate from Kirtland AFB, New Mexico. This action results in an increase of 1,368 full-time military and 198 civilian manpower authorizations.

Stewart International Airport Air Guard Station, New York

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the 213th Electronic Installation Squadron (ANG) and the 274th Combat Communications Group (ANG) are tentatively planned to relocate from Roslyn Air Guard Station, New York. These actions result in an increase of 5 full-time military, 235 drill, and 33 civilian manpower authorizations.

Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, two functions are tentatively planned to relocate to Wright-Patterson AFB: (1) The 178th Fighter Group, and the 251st Combat Communications Group with its 269th Combat Communications Squadron will relocate from Springfield-Beckley Air Guard Station, Ohio. (2) The Human Systems Center, including the School of Aerospace Medicine and Armstrong Laboratory, will relocate from Brooks AFB, Texas. These actions result in a net increase of 1,371 full-time military, 820 drill, and 1,213 civilian manpower authorizations.

Lackland AFB, Texas

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, the following functions are tentatively planned to relocate to Lackland AFB: (1) The Air Force Office of Security Police will relocate from Kirtland AFB, New Mexico. (2) The 710th Intelligence Flight (AFR) and the

hyperbaric chamber operation, including associated personnel, will relocate from Brooks AFB, Texas. These actions result in a net increase of 65 full-time military, 33 drill, and 26 civilian manpower authorizations.

Naval Air Station Fort Worth, Joint Reserve Base, Texas.

As a result of 1995 base closure/realignment recommendations, 10th Air Force, (AFR) is tentatively planned to relocate from Bergstom Air Reserve Base, Texas. This action results in an increase of 78 drill and 94 civilian manpower authorizations.

Office of the Secretary of the Air Force
1670 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330-1670

Office of the Secretary of the Navy
1051 Navy Pentagon
Washington DC 20350-1051

9 July 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SUBJECT: Joint Fixed-Wing Training (Secretary of Defense Memorandum, 15 April 1993) - ACTION MEMORANDUM

This memorandum and the attached plan respond to your 15 April 1993 memorandum directing the Secretary of the Air Force, assisted by the Secretary of the Navy, to consolidate initial fixed-wing aircraft training. The plan also addresses related issues of airlift/tanker/maritime training, and navigator/Naval Flight Officer (NFO) training.

In primary training, the services will begin an instructor exchange in Fiscal Year 1993, and a student exchange in Fiscal Year 1994. The 35th Flying Training Squadron at Reese Air Force Base, Texas, and Training Squadron 3 at Naval Air Station Whiting, Florida, will be the prototype joint training squadrons. They fly the T-37 and T-34 aircraft respectively. Other squadrons will become joint not later than the point at which they convert to the Joint Primary Aircraft Training System (JPATS) aircraft and a common syllabus.

The services will test joint airlift/tanker/maritime training and systems officer training. Pilots in the airlift/tanker/maritime track will complete either Air Force T-1A or Navy T-44 training. Air Force systems officers will attend initial training at Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, and then cross flow into the Navy program at Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida.

Two post-graduate programs will be affected. In Fiscal Year 1995, Navy electronic warfare officers will attend joint training at Randolph Air Force Base. The Army indicates efficiencies may be possible by aligning their fixed-wing transition training with existing Navy programs.

Most cost avoidance has already accrued by closing four training bases. Additional cost avoidance will occur through acquiring a common JPATS. A small recurring cost will grow to approximately $500 thousand annually. The services agree joint training is worth the cost.

Michael B. Donley
Acting Secretary of the Air Force

Frank B. Kelso II
Acting Secretary of the Navy

Attachment:
Joint Fixed-Wing Aircraft Training Plan

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This plan responds to the 15 April 1993 Secretary of Defense memo on the "Roles, Missions, and Functions of the Armed Forces of the US." The plan will consolidate joint fixed-wing aircraft training for Air Force, Navy, Army, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard students. Three distinct areas for training future combat aircrews can be immediately exploited as joint training: fixed-wing primary, advanced airlift/tanker/maritime patrol training, and advanced training for Naval Flight Officers/systems officers/electronic warfare officers.

As the services studied joint training options, several observations were apparent. First, the services, in conjunction with the U.S. Congress have closed several training bases--the cost avoidance associated with these base closure initiatives will account for the preponderance of cost reductions associated with military flying training. One Navy base, Chase, and two Air Force bases, Mather and Williams, have closed in FY93. One other Navy base, Meridian, has been nominated for closure in BRAC Round III. As a result of these closures, DoD will realize an annual recurring savings of $189M per year with only $324M required up front to close all four bases.

Moreover, Secretary Aspin's direction to continue with the acquisition of a common Joint Primary Aircraft Training System (JPATS), will avoid additional costs. More than $575M in redundant development and production costs are avoided by conducting a single aircraft procurement for both services. Additional savings will be realized with one depot overseeing a reduced number of sources for parts and support, and training management staff responsibilities that are jointly shared.

Training capacity and infrastructure were also examined as part of this joint study. Neither the Air Force nor the Navy has the remaining aircraft or base capacity to train all DoD primary students projected for FY99 and beyond. Both services have retired substantial numbers of obsolete training aircraft as projected student loads have been

modified to reflect force structure drawdowns. It was determined that any reduction to post-BRAC III basing structure would preclude expected FY99 mission accomplishment due to the excessive base and airspace loading which would result. Both service training infrastructures are sized appropriately to the force structure supported by existing budgets. Whereas the on-going DoD Bottom-Up Review may produce additional force structure changes that in time further reduce the required numbers of aviation graduates, both services are prepared to respond to these adjustments as they are finalized.

In response to Deputy SECDEF Perry's 28 May 1993 memo on fixed-wing training for helicopter bound student pilots, the helo study group, led by the Secretary of the Navy, will separately address alternatives to the present method of training to include the practice of using fixed-wing training to select and train students enroute to follow-on rotary wing training. Their report will outline the impacts on fixed-wing training force structure associated with these alternatives. Based on their recommendations, fixed-wing training plans could change accordingly. As with the results of the Bottom-Up Review, both services will respond to any policy changes in this regard by resizing the numbers of primary aircraft and instructors, and reevaluating the base infrastructure needed to accommodate modified training loads.

The services will test other joint training programs as well. Prototype airlift/ tanker/maritime patrol advanced pilot training will occur at Reese AFB in the T-1A and at NAS Corpus Christi in the T-44. The Air Force will also train systems officers in the Navy NFO program at NAS Pensacola. Navy electronic warfare officers will attend Air Force electronic warfare training at Randolph AFB after they complete their initial training at NAS Pensacola. While incurring slight additional costs, these initiatives allow us to exploit existing hardware and programs to provide the best training possible to students of all services.

In summary, joint training has enormous potential. Our approach will be to start this year, build the program year by year, learn as we go, and produce the world's best

joint pilot and systems officer training programs. Young aviators will be exposed to the joint service environment, while field grade officers will earn joint duty credit, thus promoting future joint operations. Services will gain from each others' training strengths, resulting in better training overall. Economies of scale will be attainable in every joint training venture, especially with a common aircraft, ground training system, and logistics system. The services are prepared to step smartly into joint training and take full advantage of common training systems like JPATS. The remainder of this report outlines the details of our plan and schedule, and offers a first look at costs and cost avoidance. As we train together, we will continue to improve the quality of our graduates and work toward further efficiencies.

JOINT FIXED WING AIRCRAFT TRAINING ANALYSIS

- **Observations** 5
- **Joint Fixed Wing Primary** 8
- **Joint Airlift/Tanker/Maritime Patrol** 15
- **Joint NFO/Systems Officer/EWO Training** 18
- **Estimated Costs and Savings** 23
- **Summary** 26

OBSERVATIONS

There have been three base closures of military flying training bases as a result of the Base Realignment and Closure process--Mather and Williams Air Force bases, and Chase Naval Air Station. NAS Meridian has been nominated for potential closure in the BRAC Round III (See Figure 1). The remaining infrastructure appears to be sized appropriately for steady state outyear needs.



FIGURE 1

The USN capacity for primary student production at their two locations is 1253 per year. Seventy four excess T-34 aircraft are being retired, resulting in 255 used to meet this requirement. There is no excess capacity when compared to the projected FY99 production of 1253 (See Figure 2).



FIGURE 2

The Air Force possesses 307 T-37 aircraft that have been modified via a service life extension program (SLEP) and are located at their four remaining undergraduate pilot training bases. Maximum student production capacity of these assigned aircraft is 1404 per year. The reduced Air Force requirement due to force downsizing in the steady state by FY99 is 1212. This leaves an excess capability to produce only 212 USN pilots at Air Force bases (See Figure 3).



FIGURE 3

JOINT FIXED-WING PRIMARY

The USAF and USN pilot training programs have evolved over the years into similar training philosophies. Basic military flying skills are taught in the primary training phases, followed by service specific training taught in advanced phases. The USAF pilot training program as shown in Figure 4 is transitioning to Specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training (SUPT), where the advanced track splits into the bomber/fighter track and the airlift/tanker track. Reese AFB is the first USAF base transitioning to SUPT, and will be the first USAF base to host and participate in joint primary training.

USAF PILOT TRAINING



FIGURE 4

The present USN Pilot Training Program consists of a four pipeline system as shown in Figure 5 providing training in four aircraft communities: Strike, Maritime, E-2/C-2, and Helo. [Note: the terms "USN," "Navy," and "Naval" indicate USN, USMC, and USCG students and training.] Each pipeline is divided into three building block levels of training: primary, intermediate, and advanced. The primary phase of all four pipelines is a common syllabus in the T-34 aircraft. Upon completion of primary, student aviators 'pipeline select' and proceed through the pipeline-specific training curriculum. NAS Whiting provides the largest volume of student pilots through the primary phase, and was selected to be the first USN base to host and participate in joint primary training.



FIGURE 5

In compliance with the Secretary of Defense memo, the following describes the plan to move away from the service-specific training programs outlined above and consolidate primary fixed-wing aircraft training for Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and perhaps Army flight students. This will be achieved using JPATS as shown in Figure 6 and a common syllabus that will be jointly developed as the services begin to train jointly in 1993 and expand the program through subsequent years.

JOINT TRAINING PROJECTION - JPATS



FIGURE 6

Near term instructor and student exchanges will gradually build to two prototype squadrons with alternating USAF and USN/USMC commanders by September 1994. Each squadron is expected to have 30 exchange instructor pilots, and train an annual exchange student load of 100 students by 1998. As directed in the Secretary of Defense memo, advanced training will consist of four pipelines: Navy fighter/attack, Air Force fighter/bomber, Joint airlift/tanker/maritime patrol, and Joint helicopter.

Two interim joint training arrangements will allow immediate joint training and enhance a smooth transition to the fully joint JPATS posture illustrated by Figure 6 .

The USAF-hosted interim joint training at Reese AFB is shown in Figure 7. It will use the current 89 hour T-37 primary curriculum, modified to facilitate Naval pipeline selection at 66 hours. At that point, Naval students selected for the fighter/attack and E2/C-2 pipelines will return to Naval training. Naval students selected for the Maritime and Helicopter pipelines continue with their Air Force counterparts to complete the USAF T-37 curriculum, where Air Force student track selection occurs for the advanced pipelines. Upon completion of T-37 training, both Naval and Air Force students proceed to their advanced training aircraft.



FIGURE 7

The USN-hosted interim joint training flow at NAS Whiting Field is shown in Figure 8. It will use the current 66 hour T-34 primary syllabus. Upon completion of primary training, Naval students pipeline select. Student Naval Aviators selected to the Strike and E-2/C-2 pipelines proceed to their respective intermediate training locations and aircraft. Naval students selected to fly Maritime or Helo pipeline and all Air Force students will continue through the current T-34 intermediate syllabus (26 hours). Upon completion of the intermediate syllabus, Naval students will progress to an advanced pipeline training phase. Air Force students track select upon completion of the T-34 intermediate syllabus and then proceed to advanced training.



FIGURE 8

The initial prototype joint training squadrons will be established by September 1994. Joint squadron leadership will alternate between USAF and USN/USMC. The 35th Flying Training Squadron (35 FTS) at Reese AFB and Training Squadron 3 (VT-3) at NAS Whiting Field will be the prototype joint primary flight training sites.

Beginning in September 1993, the first instructor pilot exchange will occur. Six experienced USAF instructors will report to VT-3. Six experienced USN instructors will report to 35 FTS. By March 1994, 4 more instructors will exchange, with a continuous exchange rate of 3 instructors each quarter thereafter until 2 full joint prototype squadrons are manned with 30 exchange instructors.

In September 1994, two exchange students from each service will begin training, with gradual growth until September 1998, when 100 exchange student entries will occur annually in prototype squadrons (Figure 9). Additional joint squadrons will ramp up leading to total joint primary training with JPATS full training capability.

STUDENT FLOW PLAN
(PER SQUADRON)



FIGURE 9

The overall plan for initiating joint fixed-wing training will use a three phase approach. The first phase will be the "foot in the door" stage where the instructor/student

exchange begins (FY93 - 94). The second phase will be the "learning as we go" stage where the primary USN and USAF syllabi are modified to accommodate current hardware (FY95 - 96). Finally the last phase will be "full up operation" where the services transition to a common aircraft and syllabus (FY97 - 98). Then based on lessons learned during the growth period, other squadrons will become joint not later than the point at which the JPATS aircraft arrives.

The services have an opportunity to accelerate joint squadrons by modifying the currently programmed beddown sequence to alternate JPATS deliveries to USAF and USN squadrons as shown in Figure 10. This should not change the current acquisition schedule, but would require some funding shifts in both services since the funding is currently front-loaded for USAF deliveries.

JPATS BEDDOWN OPTIONS



FIGURE 10

JOINT AIRLIFT/TANKER/MARITIME PATROL TRAINING

Undergraduate flight training for airlift/tanker/maritime patrol pilots requires one Navy T-44 squadron and four Air Force T-1A squadrons. SECDEF tasking directs a pipeline for Navy and Air Force airlift/tanker/maritime patrol flight training. Neither service has the capacity to meet the total training requirement. The prototype program will use aircraft and training programs from both the Air Force and Navy in a joint training evaluation. In addition, a review of Army initial fixed-wing transition training requirements was performed. It may be possible to improve quality and cost effectiveness by having the Navy provide fixed-wing multi-engine transition training for Army rotary wing pilots.

Advanced joint fixed-wing training is predicated on turboprop bound students training in T-44 turboprop aircraft and jet bound students training in T-1A jet aircraft. Figures 11 and 12 reflect Air Force and Naval multi-engine tracks. Following a test program in FY94, and assuming that apparent potential for improved turboprop training is realized, Air Force pilots selected for C-130 training could complete advanced undergraduate training at VT-31, NAS Corpus Christi in the T-44 aircraft. Navy pilots selected for E-6 training could complete advanced undergraduate training at 52 FTS, Reese AFB in the T-1A aircraft. Advanced turboprop training, including approximately 50 Air Force C-130 bound students, could be conducted by the Navy. Advanced jet airlift/tanker training, including 25 Navy E-6 bound students, could be conducted by the USAF. Both programs, when fully implemented will also involve a joint instructor force.

USAF C-130/USN E-6 TRACK SELECT



FIGURE 11

USN E-6/USAF C-130 TRACK SELECT



FIGURE 12

The number of exchange instructors within the multi-engine training squadrons will be proportional to the number of exchange students. Three experienced training instructor exchanges will be completed by December 1993. Subsequent instructor exchanges will come from fleet/operational units starting in June 1995.

After the instructor pilot exchanges are in place at 52 FTS and VT-31, syllabi will be evaluated and refined, if necessary, to meet service specific requirements. Further refinement of the syllabi will follow by tracking graduate performance with feedback from follow-on training managers in the C-130 and E-6 prior to full exchange of instructors and students.

Initial student exchanges will start in 1994. As the quality of this initiative is substantiated through graduate evaluation, exchanges will continue until the number of exchange students on board each track/pipeline supports total service requirements in the affected aircraft. The ramp-up of USAF and USN exchange students would be complete by September 1995, barring unforeseen problems.

JOINT NFO/SYSTEMS OFFICER/EWO TRAINING

Like their pilot training counterparts, the USAF and USN navigator training programs mirror the overall pilot training philosophy. Basic military navigation skills are taught in a core or primary phase, followed by service specific training in the intermediate and advanced phases. The current USAF Specialized Undergraduate Navigator Training (SUNT) program is depicted in Figure 13.

USAF NAVIGATOR TRAINING



FIGURE 13

The current USN NFO training program at NAS Pensacola is depicted in Figure 14.



FIGURE 14

The proposed joint Naval Flight Officer (NFO)/systems officer (SO)/electronic warfare officer (EWO) training (Figure 15) would combine undergraduate specialized training to maximize the quality of training and optimize the use of resources. Under the proposal all Air Force SOs and Navy NFOs assigned to strike aircraft could be trained at NAS Pensacola, following a prototype exchange of instructors and students in 1993/4. All USN/USMC navigators and NFOs assigned to transport and land based maritime patrol will continue to train in the Interservice Undergraduate Navigator Training program at Randolph AFB. This joint NFO/SO/EWO training would substantially change USAF SO training. USN NFO training at Pensacola will not significantly change. USN NFO track selection will occur at the same point and advanced NFO graduates will report to their respective Fleet Replacement Squadron (FRS) for aircraft specific training. Refer to Figure 14. Assuming the prototype validates the postulated benefits, the revised program would provide the services with better quality strike and multi-purpose combat navigators for fewer resources expended.

JOINT STRIKE/SO/EWO TRAINING



FIGURE 15

In the joint program USAF SO officers would complete core training and receive basic aviation indoctrination and fundamental navigation training at Randolph. After this 22-week course, track selection occurs to determine the location of the USAF students' advanced training. USAF officers selected for training at Pensacola would receive additional training in the T-37 aircraft at Randolph to hone the aircraft skills required at Pensacola. USAF SO students reporting to Pensacola would enter with USN students in the NFO intermediate phase in the T-39 aircraft. From the intermediate phase until graduation, USAF and USN students would receive the same training. Upon completion of the program, USAF and USN students would be assigned to their specific follow-on combat aircraft training.

An additional opportunity to combine electronic warfare training for all USAF SOs/EWOs and USN NFOs occurs with delivery of the USAF's Simulator for Electronic Combat Training in 1995. USN NFOs requiring EW training would complete training at Randolph after their training at Pensacola. This training would take place enroute to the FRS during time currently spent in the USN EW School at Corry Station. USAF officers destined for EW duty in tactical aircraft would receive this same EW training at Randolph prior to going to Pensacola.

There will be an incremental transition to joint NFO/SO/EWO training. This transition will occur with the implementation of a revised USAF SO/EWO syllabus scheduled to begin in July 1994. Some students commencing training after July 1994 will enter the revised course and complete the joint NFO/SO training program at Pensacola. After the program is validated, a full exchange of students will occur.

Joint instructor exchange will begin in September 1993. Initially, two USN NFO instructors will be assigned to the SUNT program at Randolph and two USAF instructors will be assigned to Pensacola. USAF instructor manning at Pensacola will continue to increase until the final number of nine USAF instructors is reached in December 1994.

All land based Navy NFOs are currently trained at Randolph in the Interservice Undergraduate Navigator Training program. The instructor and student ratios of USAF to USN are sufficient to establish this squadron as a joint squadron in October 1994.

Conducting joint NFO/SO training at Pensacola results in significant benefits for both the USAF and USN. The training uses an in-place, proven training system (T-39/T-2 aircraft) which better replicates operational USAF systems officer avionics suites and more effectively meets USAF training requirements in those radar, visual, and instrument navigation skills needed in strike and multi-purpose combat aircraft.

ESTIMATED COSTS AND SAVINGS

This analysis provides a first look at the cost issues for joint training. Analysis shows clearly that cost savings and cost avoidance will primarily accrue as a result of base closures associated with BRAC, and the JPATS single aircraft procurement program. Both additional costs and savings are associated with the following joint flying training areas: primary fixed-wing, airlift/tanker/maritime patrol, and navigator/NFO. All of the cost data in this document are rough order of magnitude (ROM); if this plan meets with SECDEF approval, all costs will be subjected to a more detailed financial analysis.

Both services are in the process of closing a total of three training bases. The Air Force has closed Mather AFB, CA, and Williams AFB, AZ, and the Navy has closed NAS Chase, TX. In addition, NAS Meridian, MS has been nominated for closure. The up front, non-recurring cost to close these bases will be approximately $322M, and the recurring annual savings will be $189M.

Cost savings associated with the JPATS single aircraft procurement program occur in these areas: development, acquisition, the limiting of support facility requirements to one depot and one source of parts/support, and joint management. A one-time savings in development and acquisition cost avoidance would amount to approximately $577M. Operating only one depot for JPATS could save as much as $500K per year. In addition, there are savings for having one source of parts/support, and for the consolidation of operations and logistics services management responsibilities.

Primary fixed-wing training has a mixture of additional costs and savings. There is an additional cost of approximately $430K per year for PCS costs to send USAF students from USN primary training to USAF advanced training. This PCS cost would only apply to USAF students who attend training at NAS Whiting or NAS Corpus Christi. A flying hour savings of $47K per year accrues for USAF students as a result of flying the T-34

aircraft instead of the T-37. These are the only two areas in primary fixed-wing training where the joint initiatives outlined herein had an impact on cost.

Airlift/tanker/maritime patrol training initiatives will also produce both costs and savings. The TDY cost to send USAF students, selected to fly C-130 aircraft, to NAS Corpus Christi for advanced training in the T-44 would amount to approximately $298K per year. There would be a reduced requirement for T-1A aircraft if the USAF were to send its entire C-130 student pilot flow to NAS Corpus Christi for training in the T-44. This reduced requirement would provide a one-time savings of approximately $20M. Flying hour savings that are a result of the differences between the T-44 and the T-1A training programs and the differential in flying hour costs, amount to approximately $1.2M per year.

In the navigator/NFO training program there were five areas that had an impact on costs and savings: the PCS cost of USAF students to Pensacola to complete their SO training; the additional flying hours for USAF students in the T-37, T-39, and T-2 aircraft; the flying hour savings for not flying the T-43 and T-38; the cost of three additional electronic warfare simulator seats at Randolph AFB; and the TDY cost of USN students to Randolph AFB for EWO training. The PCS cost of USAF SO students to Pensacola would be $139K per year. The flying hour cost for flying the T-37, T-39, and T-2 aircraft would amount to approximately $1.2M per year. The flying hour savings for USAF students not flying the T-43 and T-38 aircraft in the SO track at Randolph AFB, TX would amount to $421K per year. The addition of three simulator seats at Randolph AFB, to accommodate USN EWO students, would cost approximately $3.4M, and the TDY cost of USN students to Randolph AFB for EWO training would be $103K per year.

The possible overall savings/costs for this plan would include a one time cost avoidance of approximately $16.6M, with an annual recurring additional cost of $551K Again, these are "first-look" figures. A more rigorous cost scrub will follow Mr. Aspin's

decision on these initiatives, and could be incorporated in subsequent POM development and budget submissions..

SUMMARY

The foregoing plan responds to Secretary of Defense tasking. It reflects interservice agreement toward meeting training objectives, exploitation of best available training, and an aggressive joint focus.

Our commitment to start immediately, learning as we go, will ensure a seamless and effective transition to joint training. Imbedded in this transition is an equally strong commitment to produce more than just pilots and navigators/NFOs. The services will continue to produce the best combat aircrews in the world. The joint training initiatives described will provide new synergistic combat capability built upon the strengths of each services' training systems. This plan confirms the requirement for JPATS as the avenue to true jointness in initial flying training. This study uncovered no roadblocks as to the course described.

The services agree -- joint training is worth the cost.

EXECUTIVE ROUTING SLIP

ORIGINATED BY: DATE: 2/8

	ACTION REQUIRED	INFORMATION	INITIAL	DATE
STAFF DIRECTOR		✓	copy	
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR				
MILITARY ASSISTANT				
GENERAL COUNSEL				
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS				
DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION		✓	copy	
DIRECTOR OF CONG. AFFAIRS				
DIRECTOR OF INFO. SYSTEMS				
Travel & Advance Coordinator		✓	copy	
DIRECTOR OF REVIEW AND ANALYSIS	✓		copy	
ARMY TEAM LEADER	✓		copy	
NAVY TEAM LEADER	✓		copy	
AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER				
INTERAGENCY TEAM LEADER	✓		copy	
CROSS SERVICE TEAM LEADER	✓		copy	
	PROVIDE ANY SUGGESTIONS NLT NOON 10 FEB			

COMMENTS: TO R&A (INFO AS SHOWN TO OTHERS)
We (AFT) have the lead on the First Hearing for R&A Questions (See pages C-2,3 from R&A Hand Book AZHD). Dave & Merrill have put together what I propose to be the format for gathering questions & consolidating. Please give any comments than we can get David's comments on Q&A. I will get with Shelby on her milestones for the Books input [redacted] Frank

Responsibilities and Suspenses:

- R&A Staff:

  - Recommend subjects for hearings and proposed witnesses to Staff Director no later than mid-January

- Responsible R&A Team:

  - Provide requested information to Travel & Advance for preparation of invitation letters to witnesses
  - Coordinate agenda with Travel & Advance at least five days prior to the hearing
  - Consolidate proposed questions prepared by each R&A Team and provide 16, three-hole punched copies to Travel & Advance by COB three days before the hearing
  - Respond to Commissioners' questions and requests for information
  - Attend hearings
  - Prepare thank you letters with follow-up questions for appropriate witnesses and give to Executive Secretariat for dispatch no later than two days after hearing

- Military Assistant:

  - Provide notice to the *Federal Register* at least one month prior to the hearing, but in no event later than 10 days before the hearing

- Travel & Advance:

  - Dispatch letters inviting witnesses at least two weeks prior to the hearing
  - Arrange for stenographer no later than seven days prior to the hearing
  - Draft hearing agenda in coordination with responsible R&A Team no later than five days prior to the hearing
  - Arrange Commissioners' travel no later than five days prior to the hearing
  - Make luncheon arrangements for Commissioners and appropriate staff no later than five days prior to the hearing
  - Provide hearing schedule to Commissioners' secretaries no later than three days prior to the hearing
  - Inform the Chairman and Staff Director of Commissioner attendance no later than three days prior to the hearing
  - Prepare 21 read-ahead books by COB two days before each hearing and distribute them as follows: one copy to each Commissioner, the Staff Director, the Executive Director, the General Counsel, the Director of Communications, and the Director of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs; six copies to Review & Analysis; and two copies to the Executive Secretariat
  - Send read-ahead books to Commissioners by over-night mail at least two days before each hearing
  - Provide record copy of read-ahead book to Executive Secretariat

- Travel & Advance (Continued):

  - Take all necessary materials to hearing room
  - Set-up and clean-up hearing room
  - Prepare and submit travel vouchers for Commissioners as soon as possible after the hearing
  - Finalize and mail thank you letters

- Liaison Office:

  - Schedule hearing room
  - Notify "Super 20"

- Communications:

  - Prepare appropriate press releases no later than five days prior to hearing
  - Prepare opening remarks for the Chairman no later than two days prior to the hearing
  - Obtain copies of prepared statements of witness as soon as they are available

Attachments:

1. Sample of Proposed Questions

8 Feb 95

MEMORANDUM FOR R&A TEAM CHIEFS

SUBJECT: Questions for SECDEF and CJCS Investigative Hearing, 1 Mar 95

1. We need your help developing questions for the SECDEF and CJCS hearing on 1 Mar 95. Generally, the questions for this hearing should focus above the Service level--although they may reflect Service or Agency concerns--and should address issues in the following suggested categories (Add more if you want):

SECDEF
Selection Process
Selection Criteria
Force Structure
Military Value
Return On Investment
Economic Impact
Environmental Impact
Cross Service Groups (Depots, UPT, Etc.)

CJCS
Selection Process
Selection Criteria
Force Structure
Military Value
Cross Service Groups

2. Please indicate the category for each question and number your questions as follows so we can track the originator of each question during the development process.

Army	A1 through An
Navy	N1 throuigh Nn
Air Force	F1 through Fn
Interagency	I1 through In
Cross Service	C1 through Cn

3. Format questions as follows:

Use 1 inch margins all around.
Number questions sequentially and indicate category in parenthesis at the end of the question.
Print entire question using 12 pt Times New Roman Bold. Do not indent.
Double space after question.

If background information is required to provide context for the commissioners, print "Background:" using 12 pt Times New Roman Bold. Do not indent.
Continue on same line with background information using 12 pt Times New Roman (not Bold).

Example:

F1. How did you balance the Services' operational training needs against environmental restrictions, and did environmental restrictions influence the selection of a particular base for closure? (SECDEF Environmental Impact)

Background: Many environmental protection statutes, regulations, and associated permit requirements influence the Services' ability to conduct military training, particularly at range complexes. Commanders are faced with maintaining and enhancing warfighting capabilities within environmental guidelines enacted by Congress, federal regulatory agencies, the states, and local authorities.

F2. What instructions were the Services given to investigate joint use of installations, and what steps were taken to ensure DoD guidance was followed throughout the process? (SECDEF Selection Process)

F3. What methodology and measures of effectiveness were used to ensure costs were accurately calculated for depot closure and realignment recommendations? (SECDEF Selection Process)

Background: The Services use individual cost accounting systems which capture different sets of costs. These may provide an inadequate basis for cost comparisons between services unless appropriate adjustments are included.

4. Mail questions as a Word Atch to Steve Ackerman NLT COB 13 Feb 95. We will consolidate inputs into a final draft (Encl 1) for your review on 14 Feb 95. If you have questions, please contact Dave Olson or Merrill Beyer.

2 Encl

Thanks
Frank

SECDEF HEARING - 1 MARCH 1995

SELECTION PROCESS

1. What methodology and measures of effectiveness were used to ensure costs were accurately calculated for depot closure and realignment recommendations?

Background: The Services use individual cost accounting systems which capture different sets of costs. These may provide an inadequate basis for cost comparisons between services unless appropriate adjustments are included.

2. What instructions were the Services given to investigate joint use of installations, and what steps were taken to ensure DoD guidance was followed throughout the process?

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

3. How did you balance the Services' operational training needs against environmental restrictions, and did environmental restrictions influence the selection of a particular base for closure? (SECDEF Environmental Impact)

Background: Many environmental protection statutes, regulations, and associated permit requirements influence the Services' ability to conduct military training, particularly at range complexes. Commanders are faced with maintaining and enhancing warfighting capabilities within environmental guidelines enacted by Congress, federal regulatory agencies, the states, and local authorities.

DRAFT TO BE TLS CeCe

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

COMMISSION PROCESS AND COMMUNITY HINTS

COMMISSION RESPONSIBILITIES

- ENSURE FAIRNESS:
  - "IN CONSIDERING INSTALLATIONS FOR CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT, THE SECRETARY SHALL CONSIDER ALL MILITARY INSTALLATIONS INSIDE THE UNITED STATES EQUALLY WITHOUT REGARD TO WHETHER THE INSTALLATION HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED OR PROPOSED FOR CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT."
    [Section 2903(c)(3), Public Law 101-510]
- ENSURE OPENNESS:
  - "EACH MEETING OF THE COMMISSION, OTHER THAN MEETINGS IN WHICH CLASSIFIED INFORMATION IS TO BE DISCUSSED, SHALL BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC."
    [Section 2902(e)(2)(A), Public Law 101-510]

COMMISSION POLICIES

- EVERY MAJOR BASE UNDER CONSIDERATION VISITED BY AT LEAST ONE COMMISSIONER
- REGIONAL HEARINGS GIVE COMMUNITIES A CHANCE TO TESTIFY
- ALL DOCUMENTATION USED IN DELIBERATIONS AVAILABLE TO ANYONE
- ALL COMMISSION ACTIVITIES OPEN TO THE PRESS AND THE PUBLIC
- EVERY AFFECTED COMMUNITY HAS A SEAT AT THE TABLE
- NO SECRETS
- NO SPECIAL ACCESS NEEDED

OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNITY INTERACTION

- KNOW THE PROCESS
- ORIENTATION MEETINGS WITH COMMISSION STAFF
- REVIEW COMMISSION LIBRARY
- REGIONAL HEARINGS -- KEY ON MILITARY VALUE
- FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS WITH STAFF AND COMMISSIONERS PRIOR TO FINAL DELIBERATIONS -- NEW INFORMATION ONLY
- SOLID, WELL-DEVELOPED COMMUNITY PITCH IS KEY
- CONSIDER POTENTIAL CLOSURE SCENARIOS
- PROVIDE TWO COPIES OF ANY INFORMATION SUBMITTED TO THE COMMISSION

MILITARY VALUE--MILITARY VALUE--MILITARY VALUE

Cirillo, Francis A.

From: Carman, Cece
To: Almand, Bond; Bailey, Steve; Beyer, Merrill; Bivins, Bob; Borden, Ben; Brown, Edward A.; Cirillo, Francis A.; Cook, Robert (Bob); Creedon, Madelyn; Dicamillo, Rick; Earnhardt, John; Eckles, Kent; Farrington, Les; Gertler, JJ; Hall, Craig; Hegarty, Paul; Helmer, Dick; Kennedy, Mike; Kress, Rob; Landrith, Jim; Lyles, David; Miller, Bob; Nelson, Wade; Owsley, James L.; Petersen, Mark; Purser, Wayne; Brown, Rick; Reese, Ann; Schufreider, Jim; Smith, Charles; Thompson, Sylvia; Varallo, Joe; Walgren, Chip; Yellin, S. Alexander
Subject: Monday's Meetings
Date: Friday, February 03, 1995 4:41PM

This is the beginning of a rough week in terms of many, many meetings. I'm afraid it only gets worse from here...

Monday 2/6

12:00 -- Rep. Saxby Chambliss and staff. He represents Robins AFB, Moody AFB and the Marine Corps Logistics Base in Albany. process brief required. David will give the brief.

3:00 -- Bay County Chamber of Commerce re: Tyndall AFB. they have been in several times. no process brief required. Frank will be the lead.

Cirillo, Francis A.

From: Bivins, Bob
To: Bailey, Steve; Beyer, Merrill; Borden, Ben; Brown, Edward A.; Cirillo, Francis A.; Cook, Robert (Bob); Dicamillo, Rick; Farrington, Les; Helmer, Dick; Kennedy, Mike; Miller, Bob; Owsley, James L.; Reese, Ann; Yellin, S. Alexander
Cc: Campbell, Jeff; Carman, Cece; Cornella, Alton; Forkin, Antonia; Fuchs, David; Goode, Chris; Kress, Rob; Lyles, David; Phillips, James K.; Varallo, Joe; Smith, Walton
Subject: COBRA Schedule
Date: Thursday, February 02, 1995 3:46PM

I've just been informed that there is a new version of COBRA out. We are now up to Version 5.08. R&K, Inc. had to correct a problem in calculating Packing costs.

Also, we have set up COBRA training for all R&A senior analysts on 16 &17 Feb and for the executive staff and associate analysts on 22 Feb. We will also train people on the 23rd of Feb. if necessary. The team leads can fill in on the "light" days if they want the training. R&K, Inc. will be conducting the training on 16 & 17 Feb in the Navy team area and in the Interagency area on 22 & 23 Feb. The training will last from approximately 0830 until 1600 each day. I will start a sign-up list around sometime next week when more of our people are in place. Please sign up with a firm commitment to attend one of the days of training. (Training slots and computer availability will be limited so please attend on the day you sign up for.)

Signed

The COBRA-meister

SUPER 25 LIST

SENATE

Senator Bob Dole
Majority Leader
S-230, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-6521
(202) 228-4569 (fax)

Staff Contact: Dan Stanley

Senator Tom Daschle
Minority Leader
S-221, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-2321
(202) 224-2047 (fax)

Staff Contact: Brad Van Dam

Senator Strom Thurmond
Chairman
Committee on Armed Services
SR-228
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-3871
(202) 228-3781 (fax)

Staff Contact: George Lauffer

Senator Sam Nunn
Ranking Member
Committee on Armed Services
SR-228
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-3871
(202) 228-3780 (fax)

Staff Contact: Arnold Punaro

Senator John McCain
Chairman
Subcommittee on Readiness
Armed Services Committee
SR-241
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-2235
(202) 228-2862 (fax)

Staff Contact: Ann Sauer

Senator John Glenn
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Readiness
Armed Services Committee
SH-503
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-7987
(202) 224-7983 (fax)

Staff Contact: Suzanne McKenna

Senator Mark O. Hatfield
Chairman
Committee on Appropriations
S-128, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20510-6025

(202) 224-7271
(202) 224-4344 (fax)

Staff Contact: Jim Morhard

Senator Robert C. Byrd
Ranking Member
Committee on Appropriations
SD-135
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-7200
(202) 224-3001 (fax)

Staff Contact: Dick D'Amato

Senator Ted Stevens
Chairman
Subcommittee on Defense
Committee on Appropriations
SD-119
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-3471
(202) 224-3001 (fax)

Staff Contact: Steve Cortese

Senator Daniel Inouye
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Defense
Committee on Appropriations
SD-117
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-7296
(202) 224-3001 (fax)

Staff Contact: Charlie Houy

Senator Conrad Burns
Chairman
Subcommittee on Military Construction
Committee on Appropriations
SD-131
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-7271
(202) 224-4344 (fax)

Staff Contact: Jim Morhard

Senator Harry Reid
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Military Construction
Committee on Appropriations
SD-157
Washington, DC 20510

(202) 224-7276
(202) 224-3001 (fax)

Staff Contact: Dick D'Amato

HOUSE

Rep. Newt Gingrich
Speaker of the House
H-232, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20515

(202) 225-0529
(202) 225-4656 (fax)

Staff Contact: Krister Holladay

Rep. Dick Armey
Majority Leader
H-329, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20515

(202) 225-7772
(202) 225-7614 (fax)

Staff Contact: Valerie Shank

Rep. Dick Gephardt
Minority Leader
H-204, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20515

(202) 225-0100
(202) 226-0938 (fax)

Staff Contact: Brett O'Brien

Rep. Floyd Spence
Chairman
National Security Committee
2120 RHOB
Washington, DC 20515

(202) 225-7120
(202) 225-0789 (fax)

Staff Contact: Phil Grone
Larry Shockley

Rep. Ron Dellums
Ranking Member
National Security Committee
2340 RHOB
Washington, DC 20515

(202) 225-7120
(202) 225-0789 (fax)

Staff Contact: Phil Grone
Larry Shockley

Rep. Joel Hefley
Chairman
Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities
National Sercurity Committee
2120 RHOB
Washington, DC 20515

(202) 225-7120
(202) 225-0789 (fax)

Staff Contact: Phil Grone
Larry Shockley

Rep. Solomon Ortiz
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities
National Security Committee
2120 RHOB
Washington, DC 20515

(202) 225-7742
(202) 226-1134 (fax)

Staff Contact: Sheila McCready

Rep. Bob Livingston
Chairman
Committee on Appropriations
H-218, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20515-6015

(202) 225-2771
(202) 225-

Staff Contact: James Dyer

Rep. David Obey
Ranking Member
Committee on Appropriations
1016 Longworth HOB
Washington, DC 20515-6015

(202) 225-3841
(202) 225-9476 (fax)

Staff Contact: James Lilly

Rep. Bill Young
Chairman
Subcommittee on National Security
Committee on Appropriations
H-144, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20515-6018

(202) 225-2847
(202) 225-2822 (fax)

Staff Contact: Kevin Roper

Rep. John Murtha
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on National Security
Committee on Appropriations
1016 Longworth HOB
Washington, DC 20515

(202) 225-3481
(202) 225-9476 (fax)

Staff Contact: Carmen Scalabba
Greg Dahlberg

Rep. Barbara Vucanovich
Chairman
Subcommittee on Military Construction
Committee on Appropriations
B-300 RHOB
Washington, DC 20515-6026

(202) 225-6155
(202) 225-2319 (fax)

Staff Contact: Dennis Parobek

Rep. Bill Hefner
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Military Construction
Committee on Appropriations
B-300 RHOB
Washington, DC 20515

(202) 225-3715
(202) 225-4036 (fax)

Staff Contact: Irene Schecter

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
Alabama								
Army								
Ft McClellan		Close	259	122	45	316	(6,095)	(2,441)
Navy								
NRC Huntsville		Close	0	(3)	1	7	(11)	(8)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							229	3,380
Total Alabama Personnel Impact							(5,877)	931
Alaska								
Army								
Ft Greely		Realign	23	(45)	19	225	(438)	(286)
Navy								
NAF Adak		Close	9	(108)	26	255	(340)	(1,128)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							103	36
Total Alaska Personnel Impact							[illegible]	(386)
Arizona								
Air Force								
Williams AFB		Redirect	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							[illegible]	34
Total Arizona Personnel Impact							[illegible]	134
Arkansas								
Army								
Ft Chaffee		Close	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(207)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							[illegible]	[illegible]
Total Arkansas Personnel Impact							(40)	(207)
California								
Army								
Branch US Disciplinary Barracks		Close	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Ft Baker		Close	0	1	2	15	(47)	(50)
Ft Hunter-Liggett		Realign	6	(12)	5	64	(393)	(85)
Rio Vista Army Reserve Center		Close	0	(1)	0	2	0	0
Sierra Army Depot		Realign	14	(55)	29	333	(53)	(539)
Navy								
MCAS El Toro/Tustin		Redirect	90	(293)	7	347	0	0
NAS Alameda		Redirect	Costs/Savings included in NAS Meridian closure				0	0
Naval Health Research Ctr San Diego		Disestablish	6	2	1	11	(17)	(137)
NAVPERS R&D Ctr San Diego		Disestablish	8	4	2	15	(17)	(202)
NISE West San Diego		Disestablish	2	(19)	4	60	0	(58)
NRC Pomona		Close	0	(2)	0	5	(7)	(3)
NRC Santa Anna (Irvine)		Close	0	(3)	1	8	(12)	(2)
NRC Stockton		Close	0	(2)	0	5	(7)	0
NSY Long Beach		Close	75	(726)	131	1,949	(263)	(3,766)
Recruiting District San Diego		Redirect	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPSHIP Long Beach		Disestablish	0	(1)	0	3	(11)	(8)
Air Force								
Moffett Federal Airport AGS		Close	15	(4)	5	50	(88)	(230)
North Highlands Air Guard Station		Close	1	1	0	2	0	0
Onizuka AS		Realign	124	126	30	182	(673)	(1,202)
Ontario IAP AGS		Close	1	0	0	1	0	0

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Civ
Sacramento ALC (McClellan AFB)		Realign	Costs/Savings included in AF ALC Realignments (See San An				0	0
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Contract Management District West		Redirect	10	(11)	4	51	0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							2,190	2,294
Total California Personnel Impact							602	(3,988)
Colorado								
Army								
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center		Close	142	39	34	299	(1,291)	(1,612)
Air Force								
Lowry AFB		Redirect	2	(11)	3	39	(78)	(11)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							528	303
Total Colorado Personnel Impact							(841)	(1,320)
Connecticut								
Army								
Stratford Army Engine Plant		Close	2	(24)	6	80	(2)	0
Navy								
NUWC Det New London		Disestablish	23	(14)	8	91	(5)	(622)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							20	13
Total Connecticut Personnel Impact							13	(609)
District of Columbia								
Navy								
[illegible]		[illegible]						
[illegible]		[illegible]						
[illegible]							[illegible]	
[illegible]							[illegible]	
Florida								
Army								
[illegible]		[illegible]						
Navy								
NADEP Pensacola		Redirect	[illegible]	(2)	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	0
NAS Cecil Field		Redirect	[illegible]	(335)	12	435	0	0
NAS Key West		Realign	[illegible]	(0)	1	2	(19)	(1)
NRL Underwater Sound Det Orlando		Disestablish	8	(4)	3	30	0	(109)
NTC Orlando/San Diego		Redirect	4	(25)	0	24	0	0
Nuclear Power Propulsion Trng Ctr, Orlando		Redirect	145	(20)	5	71	0	0
Air Force								
Eglin AFB		Realign	2	(6)	3	31	420	299
Homestead AFB (301 ARS)		Redirect	5	(2)	2	15	(61)	(153)
Homestead AFB (726 ACS)		Redirect	7	(2)	0	5	0	0
MacDill AFB		Redirect	Costs/Savings included in Malmstrom AFB action				0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							3,414	643
Total Florida Personnel Impact							3,754	679
Georgia								
Air Force								
Warner-Robins ALC (Robins AFB)		Realign	Costs/Savings included in AF ALC Realignments (See San Antonio ALC				(8)	(526)

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

3RAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Contract Management District South		Disestablish	1	(18)	6	76	(5)	(164)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							804	77
Total Georgia Personnel Impact							791	(613)
Guam								
Navy								
FISC Guam		Disestablish	18	(143)	31	437	(73)	(340)
NAS Agana		Redirect	44	(214)	22	418	(1,272)	0
Naval Activities Guam		Realign	93	(66)	43	474	(737)	(1,684)
SRF Guam		Close	8	(172)	38	529	(22)	(641)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Guam Personnel Impact							(2,104)	(2,665)
Hawaii								
Navy								
[illegible]		Redirect	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							495	775
Total Hawaii Personnel Impact							495	775
Idaho								
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							122	0
Total Idaho Personnel Impact							122	0
Illinois								
Army								
[illegible] Support Center		Close	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(22)	(200)
Savanna Army Depot Activity		Close	32	[illegible]	10	[illegible]	(57)	(395)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							10	0
Total Illinois Personnel Impact							(72)	(595)
Indiana								
Navy								
NAWC-AD Indianapolis		Close	180	27	68	640	(36)	(2,805)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							13	1,778
Total Indiana Personnel Impact							(23)	(1,027)
Kansas								
Navy								
NARC Olathe		Close	0	(4)	1	11	(10)	(4)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Kansas Personnel Impact							(10)	(4)

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
Kentucky								
Navy								
NSWC Louisville		Close	Costs/Savings included in NAWC Indianapolis action				(15)	(1,449)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,416	54
Total Kentucky Personnel Impact							1,401	(1,395)
Louisiana								
Navy								
Naval Bio Dynamics Lab New Orleans		Close	1	(14)	3	42	(15)	(39)
NR Readiness Cmd 10 New Orleans		Close	1	(6)	2	24	(24)	(23)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	2
Total Louisiana Personnel Impact							(39)	(60)
Maine								
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							215	5
Total Maine Personnel Impact							215	5
Maryland								
Army								
Army Bio-Medical Research Lab, Ft Detrick		Redirect	0	(4)	0	4	0	0
Army Publications Distribution Center		Relocate	6	(3)	0	35	(2)	(129)
Concepts Analysis Agency		Relocate	4	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	0
Ft Meade (Kimbrough Hospital)		Realign	2	(16)	4	50	(55)	(74)
Ft Ritchie		Close	[illegible]	(22)	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Navy								
[illegible]		Close					[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]				[illegible]				[illegible]
Defense Investigative Service								
DLSC Ft Holabird		[illegible]						
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							[illegible]	
Total Maryland Personnel Impact							[illegible]	[illegible]
Massachusetts								
Navy								
NAS South Weymouth		Close	17	(51)	27	315	(637)	(299)
Army								
Hingham Cohasset		Close	0	(1)	0	2	0	0
Sudbury Training Annex		Close	1	0	0	1	0	(13)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							9	765
Total Massachusetts Personnel Impact							(628)	453
Michigan								
Army								
Detroit Arsenal		Realign	1	(8)	3	38	0	0
Selfridge Army Garrison		Close	5	(47)	10	140	(54)	(555)
Navy								
NAF Detroit		Redirect	0	(9)	0	9	0	0
NRC Cadillac		Close	0	(2)	0	5	(8)	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							62	275
Total Michigan Personnel Impact							0	(280)

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

3RAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
Mississippi								
Navy								
NAS Meridian		Close	33	(159)	33	471	(1,643)	(947)
NTTC Meridian		Close	Costs/Savings included in NAS Meridian action					
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							115	237
Total Mississippi Personnel Impact							(1,519)	(710)
Missouri								
Army								
Aviation-Troop Command		Disestablish	146	(9)	46	453	(247)	(4,484)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,411	282
Total Missouri Personnel Impact							1,164	(4,102)
Montana								
Army								
Ft Missoula		Close	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Air Force								
Malmstrom AFB		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							[illegible]	[illegible]
Total Montana Personnel							[illegible]	[illegible]
Nevada								
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							[illegible]	[illegible]
Total Nevada Personnel Impact							[illegible]	[illegible]
New Jersey								
Army								
Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal		Close	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Camp Kilmer		Close	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Camp Pedricktown		Close	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Raven Point Army Reserve Center		Close	Costs/Savings included in Ft Hamilton action				[illegible]	[illegible]
Ft Dix		Realign	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(429)
Navy								
NAWC Lakehurst		Close	97	5	37	359	(380)	(1,383)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							35	1,213
Total New Jersey Personnel Impact							(758)	(1,866)
New Mexico								
Air Force								
Kirtland AFB		Realign	278	159	62	465	(4,556)	(2,294)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,368	344
Total New Mexico Personnel Impact							(3,188)	(1,950)
New York								
Army								
Bellmore Logistics Activity		Close	0	(2)	0	5	0	0
Ft Hamilton		Realign	2	(3)	7	74	0	(52)
Ft Totten		Close	4	0	2	17	(11)	(32)

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
Seneca Army Depot		Close	15	(34)	21	242	(9)	(316)
Navy								
NRC Staten Island		Close	0	(4)	1	10	(12)	(2)
Air Force								
Griffiss AFB (485th EIG)		Redirect	1	(27)	3	54	0	0
Griffiss AFB (Airfield Support)		Redirect	51	13	12	111	0	(150)
REDCAP Activity, Buffalo		Disestablish	2	(2)	1	11	(2)	(1)
Rome Laboratories		Close	53	15	12	98	(10)	(1,057)
Rostyn AGS		Close	2	(1)	1	8	(8)	(36)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							8	231
Total New York Personnel Impact							(41)	(1,415)
North Carolina								
Army								
Recreation Center # 2 Fayetteville		Close	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							703	0
Total North Carolina Personnel Impact							703	0
North Dakota								
Air Force								
Grand Forks AFB		Realign	12	(112)	35	447	(1,506)	(119)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total North Dakota Personnel Impact							(1,506)	(119)
Ohio								
Air Force								
[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]							[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]							[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]							[illegible]	[illegible]
Oklahoma								
Air Force								
Oklahoma City ALC (Tinker AFB)		Realign	Costs/Savings included in AF ALC Realignments (See San Antonio ALC)				127	(831)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,743	452
Total Oklahoma Personnel Impact							1,870	(379)
Pennsylvania								
Army								
Ft Indiantown Gap		Close	13	(67)	23	285	(136)	(385)
Kelly Support Center, PA		Realign	36	22	5	28	0	(121)
Letterkenny Army Depot		Realign	50	(207)	78	952	(35)	(2,055)
Navy								
NAESU Philadelphia		Close	3	(6)	3	30	(10)	(80)
NATSF Philadelphia		Close	6	(1)	2	23	(4)	(223)
NAWC-AD Open Water Test Facility Orlando		Close	0	0	0	0	0	0
NAWC-AD Warminster		Close	8	(33)	8	105	(16)	(332)
NCCOSC R&D Det Warminster		Close	Costs/Savings included in NAWC-AD Warminster action				0	0

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
NSY Philadelphia-Norfolk Det		Realignment	0	(52)	9	135	0	0
Air Force								
Greater Pittsburgh IAP ARS		Close	22	(36)	13	161	0	(387)
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny		Disestablish	45	21	12	102	(4)	(374)
Defense Industrial Supply Center, PA		Disestablish	17	(59)	18	237	(16)	(369)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	947
Total Pennsylvania Personnel Impact							(221)	(3,379)
Puerto Rico								
Army								
Ft Buchanan		Realign	74	50	10	45	(59)	(123)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Puerto Rico Personnel Impact							(59)	(123)
Rhode Island								
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							[illegible]	[illegible]
Total Rhode Island Personnel Impact							[illegible]	[illegible]
South Carolina								
Navy								
PSC Charleston		Close	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
NR Redcliffe Ctr Charleston		Close		[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							[illegible]	[illegible]
Total South Carolina Personnel Impact							[illegible]	[illegible]
Tennessee								
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Distribution Depot Memphis		Close	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(1,259)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							[illegible]	[illegible]
Total Tennessee Personnel Impact							[illegible]	(996)
Texas								
Army								
Red River Army Depot		Close	60	(313)	123	1,497	(14)	(2,887)
Navy								
NAS Corpus Christi		Realign	Costs/Savings included in NAS Meridian closure				252	(394)
NRF Laredo		Close	0	(1)	0	4	(6)	0
Air Force								
AF Electronic Warfare Simulator Activity, Ft. Worth		Disestablish	6	3	1	6	(4)	(1)
Bergstrom Air Reserve Base		Close	13	(93)	21	291	0	(585)
Brooks AFB		Close	186	139	27	142	(1,820)	(1,939)
Reese AFB		Close	37	(52)	22	257	(900)	(1,183)
San Antonio ALC (Kelly AFB)		Realign	183	(139)	89	991	364	(143)
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Distribution Depot Red River		Disestablish	59	1	19	186	(1)	(820)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,754	1,346
Total Texas Personnel Impact							(375)	(6,606)

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
	Utah							
Army								
Dugway Proving Ground		Realign	25	(61)	26	307	(165)	(931)
Air Force								
Ogden ALC (Hill AFB)		Realign	Costs/Savings included in AF ALC Realignments (See San Antonio ALC)				0	0
Hill AFB (Including Utah Test and Training Range)		Realign	3	(62)	12	180	0	147
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Distribution Depot Ogden		Close	111	28	21	181	(8)	(1,105)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Utah Personnel Impact							(173)	(1,889)
	Virginia							
Army								
Ft Lee (Kenner Hospital)		Realign	2	(16)	4	51	(99)	(106)
Ft Pickett		Close	25	(41)	21	241	(9)	(245)
Information Systems Software Command		Relocate	6	2	1	8	0	0
Navy								
Info Systems Mgt Ctr Arlington		Relocate	0	0	0	2	0	0
Naval Mgt Systems Spt Office Chesapeake		Disestablish	2	(9)	3	35	(6)	(15)
NAVSEA Crystal City		Redirect	160	(48)	9	144	0	0
NISE Det Norfolk		Close	5	0	2	20	0	0
Office of Naval Research Arlington		Redirect	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPAWAR Arlington		Redirect	24	(120)	25	360	(201)	(932)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							4,669	787
Total Virginia Personnel Impact							4,354	(511)
	Washington							
Army								
[illegible]								
Navy								
[illegible]		[illegible]						[illegible]
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							[illegible]	[illegible]
Total Washington Personnel Impact							[illegible]	[illegible]
	West Virginia							
Army								
Valley Grove Area Maintenance Spt Activity, WV		Close	Costs/Savings included in Kelly Support Center action				0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total West Virginia Personnel Impact							0	(7)
	Wisconsin							
Navy								
NRC Sheboygan		Close	0	(1)	0	4	(6)	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Wisconsin Personnel Impact							(6)	0

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State / Installation	Action	Out Mil	Out Civ	In Mil	In Civ	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Net Gain/(Loss) Civ
ALABAMA							
ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	RECEIVE	0	0	28	473	28	473
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT ANNISTON	RECEIVE	0	0	0	539	0	539
FORT MCCLELLAN	CLOSE	(6,095)	(2,441)	0	0	(6,095)	(2,441)
NRC HUNTSVILLE	CLOSE	(11)	(8)	0	0	(11)	(8)
REDSTONE ARSENAL	RECEIVE	0	0	201	2,368	201	2,368
	Total	(6,106)	(2,449)	229	3,380	(5,877)	931
ALASKA							
FORT GREELY	REALIGN	(438)	(286)	0	0	(438)	(286)
FORT WAINWRIGHT	RECEIVE	0	0	205	56	205	56
NAF ADAK	CLOSE	(540)	(138)	0	0	(540)	(138)
	Total	(978)	(424)	205	56	(773)	(368)
ARIZONA							
FORT HUACHUCA	RECEIVE	0	0	108	166	108	166
YUMA PROVING GROUND	RECEIVE	0	0	39	18	39	18
	Total	0	0	147	184	147	184
ARKANSAS							
FORT CHAFFEE	CLOSE	(40)	(207)			(40)	(207)
	Total	(40)	(207)			(40)	(207)
CALIFORNIA							
NSC PORT HUENEME	RECEIVE						[illegible]
DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT DISTRICT WEST	RECEIVE						[illegible]
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT LONG BEACH	RECEIVE				[illegible]		[illegible]
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION REGION WEST	REDIRECT			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
EAST ST BAKER	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
EDWARDS AFB	RECEIVE						[illegible]
FISC SAN DIEGO	RECEIVE				[illegible]		[illegible]
FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	REALIGN	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
MCCLELLAN AFB	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRPORT NAS	CLOSE		[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
NADEP NORTH ISLAND	RECEIVE						[illegible]
NAS NORTH ISLAND	RECEIVE		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NAVAL HEALTH RESEARCH CENTER SAN DIEGO	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
NAVAL PERSONNEL R&D CENTER SAN DIEGO	DISESTABLISH		[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
NAVAL STATION SAN DIEGO	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION SEAL BEACH	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NAVMEDCEN SAN DIEGO	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NAWC CHINA LAKE	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NCCOSC RDT&E SAN DIEGO	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NISE WEST SAN DIEGO	DISESTABLISH		[illegible]				[illegible]
NORTH HIGHLANDS AIR GUARD STATION	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]
NRC POMONA	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
NRC SANTA ANA (IRVINE	CLOSE	(12)	(2)	[illegible]		(12)	(2)
NRC STOCKTON	CLOSE	(7)	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(7)	0
NSWC PORT HUENEME	RECEIVE	0	0	0	107	0	107
NSY LONG BEACH	CLOSE	(263)	(3,766)	0	0	(263)	(3,766)
ONIZUKA AS	REALIGN	(673)	(1,202)	0	0	(673)	(1,202)
SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	REALIGN	(53)	(539)	0	0	(53)	(539)
SUPSHIP LONG BEACH	DISESTABLISH	(11)	(8)	0	0	(11)	(8)
TRAVIS AFB	RECEIVE	0	0	14	1	14	1
	Total	(1,588)	(6,283)	2,190	2,295	602	(3,988)
COLORADO						0	0
FALCON AFB	RECEIVE	0	0	287	234	287	234
FITZSIMONS ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	CLOSE	(1,291)	(1,612)	0	0	(1,291)	(1,612)
FORT CARSON	RECEIVE	0	0	231	0	231	0
LOWRY AFB	REDIRECT	(78)	(11)	0	0	(78)	(11)
PETERSON AFB	RECEIVE	0	0	10	69	10	69
	Total	(1,369)	(1,623)	528	303	(841)	(1,320)

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Out Mil	Out Civ	In Mil	In Civ	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Net Gain/(Loss) Civ
CONNECTICUT							
NUWC DET NEW LONDON	DISESTABLISH	(5)	(622)	0	0	(5)	(622)
STRATFORD ARMY ENGINE PLANT	CLOSE	(2)	0	0	0	(2)	0
SUBASE NEW LONDON	RECEIVE	0	0	20	13	20	13
	Total	(7)	(622)	20	13	13	(609)
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA							
NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY	RECEIVE	0	0	32	0	32	0
WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	RECEIVE	0	0	193	0	193	0
	Total	0	0	225	0	225	0
FLORIDA							
EGLIN AFB	RECEIVE	(27)	(25)	447	324	420	299
HOMESTEAD AFB	REDIRECT	(61)	(153)	0	0	(61)	(153)
MACDILL AFB	RECEIVE	0	0	687	57	687	57
NADEP JACKSONVILLE	RECEIVE	0	0	0	40	0	40
NAS JACKSONVILLE	RECEIVE	0	0	1,901	27	1,901	27
NAS KEY WEST	REALIGN	(19)	(1)	0	0	(19)	(1)
NAS PENSACOLA	RECEIVE	0	0	399	94	399	94
NAS WHITING FIELD	RECEIVE	0	0	327	5	327	5
NAWC TRNG SYS DIV ORLANDO	RECEIVE	0	0	5	48	5	48
NRL UNDERWATER SOUND DET ORLANDO	DISESTABLISH	0	(109)	0	0	0	(109)
NSWC PANAMA CITY	RECEIVE	0	0	42	28	42	28
TYNDALL AFB	RECEIVE	0	0	53	344	53	344
	Total	(107)	(288)	3,861	967	3,754	679
GEORGIA							
DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT DISTRICT SOUTH	DISESTABLISH	(5)	(164)	0	0	(5)	(164)
DOBBINS ARB	RECEIVE	0	0	0	59	0	59
FORT GORDON	RECEIVE	0	0	94	0	94	0
NAS ATLANTA	RECEIVE	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NAVSCSCOL ATHENS	RECEIVE	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
WARNER-ROBINS ALC [illegible]	REALIGN		[illegible]				[illegible]
	Total	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]							
[illegible]						[illegible]	
[illegible]							
[illegible]		[illegible]				[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
HAWAII							
[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]		[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]		[illegible]	
[illegible]	[illegible]					[illegible]	[illegible]
NAVSTA PEARL HARBOR	RECEIVE			297	507	297	507
	Total		[illegible]	991	[illegible]	991	[illegible]
IDAHO							
MOUNTAIN HOME AFB	RECEIVE	0	0	120	0	120	0
	Total	0	0	120	0	120	0
ILLINOIS							
NTC GREAT LAKES	RECEIVE	0	0	10	5	10	5
PRICE SUPPORT CENTER, IL	CLOSE	(25)	(200)	0	0	(25)	(200)
SAVANNA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY	CLOSE	(57)	(393)	0	0	(57)	(393)
	Total	(82)	(593)	10	5	(72)	(588)
INDIANA							
NAWC-AD INDIANAPOLIS	CLOSE	(36)	(2,805)	0	0	(36)	(2,805)
NSWC CRANE	RECEIVE	0	0	13	1,778	13	1,778
	Total	(36)	(2,805)	13	1,778	(23)	(1,027)
KANSAS							
NARC OLATHE	CLOSE	(10)	(4)	0	0	(10)	(4)
	Total	(10)	(4)		0	(10)	(4)

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State / Installation	Action	Out Mil	Out Civ	In Mil	In Civ	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Net Gain/(Loss) Civ
KENTUCKY							
FORT KNOX	RECEIVE	0	0	1,416	54	1,416	54
NSWC LOUISVILLE	CLOSE	(15)	(1,449)	0	0	(15)	(1,449)
	Total	(15)	(1,449)	1,416	54	1,401	(1,395)
LOUISIANNA							
NAS NEW ORLEANS	RECEIVE	0	0	0	2	0	2
NAVAL BIO DYNAMICS LAB NEW ORLEANS	CLOSE	(15)	(39)	0	0	(15)	(39)
NR READINESS CMD 10 NEW ORLEANS	CLOSE	(24)	(23)	0	0	(24)	(23)
	Total	(39)	(62)	0	2	(39)	(60)
MAINE							
NAS BRUNSWICK	RECEIVE	0	0	215	5	215	5
	Total	0	0	215	5	215	5
MARYLAND							
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	RECEIVE	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	108
ARMY PUBLICATIONS DISTRIBUTION CENTER	RELOCATE	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
FORT DETRICK	RECEIVE	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
FORT MEADE (KIMBROUGH HOSPITAL)	REALIGN	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
FORT RITCHIE	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH INST BETHESDA	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
NAWC-AD PATUXENT RIVER	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NSWC CARDEROCK	RECEIVE						
NSWC DET ANNAPOLIS	CLOSE		[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
NSWC DET WHITE OAK	CLOSE		[illegible]				[illegible]
	Total	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
MASSACHUSSETTS							
DEFENSE CONTRACT MGT. DISTRICT NORTHEAST	RECEIVE	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]		[illegible]
HANSCOM AFB	RECEIVE	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NAS SOUTH WEYMOUTH	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	299
NATICK RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]
	Total	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
MICHIGAN							
DEFENSE REUTILIZATION AND MARKETING SERVICE HQ	RECEIVE	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
DETROIT ARSENAL	RECEIVE		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
DETROIT ARSENAL TANK PLANT	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
NRC CADILLAC	CLOSE	(8)	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	(8)	[illegible]
SELFRIDGE AGB	RECEIVE	[illegible]	[illegible]	54	[illegible]	54	[illegible]
SELFRIDGE ARMY GARRISON	CLOSE	(54)	(555)	[illegible]	[illegible]	(54)	(555)
	Total	(62)	(555)	62	275	[illegible]	(280)
MISSISSIPPI							
COLUMBUS AFB	RECEIVE	0	0	115	201	115	201
NAS MERIDIAN	CLOSE	(1,634)	(947)	0	0	(1,634)	(947)
NAVOCEANO	RECEIVE	0	0	0	36	0	36
	Total	(1,634)	(947)	115	237	(1,519)	(710)
MISSOURI							
AVIATION-TROOP COMMAND	DISESTABLISH	(247)	(4,484)	0	0	(247)	(4,484)
FORT LEONARD WOOD	RECEIVE	(4,139)	(90)	5,548	432	1,409	342
ST LOUIS PUBS	RECEIVE	0	0	2	40	2	40
	Total	(4,386)	(4,574)	5,550	472	1,164	(4,102)
MONTANA							
MALMSTROM AFB	REALIGN	(719)	(60)	0	0	(719)	(60)
	Total	(719)	(60)	0	0	(719)	(60)
NEVADA							
NELLIS AFB	RECEIVE	0	0	87	85	87	85
	Total	0	0	87	85	87	85
NEW JERSEY							
BAYONNE MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL	CLOSE	(100)	(1,257)	0	0	(100)	(1,257)
CAVEN POINT RESERVE CENTER	CLOSE	(3)	0	0	0	(3)	0
FORT DIX	REALIGN	[illegible]	429	0	[illegible]	[illegible]	(429)

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State / Installation	Action	Out Mil	Out Civ	In Mil	In Civ	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Net Gain/(Loss) Civ
FORT MONMOUTH	RECEIVE	0	0	35	1,186	35	1,186
NAVY WPNSTA EARLE	RECEIVE	0	0	0	25	0	25
NAWC LAKEHURST	CLOSE	(380)	(1,383)	0	0	(380)	(1,383)
	Total	(793)	(3,079)	35	1,213	(758)	(1,866)
NEW MEXICO							
HOLLOMAN AFB	RECEIVE	0	0	1,368	344	1,368	344
KIRTLAND AFB	REALIGN	(4,556)	(2,964)	0	670	(4,556)	(2,294)
	Total	(4,556)	(2,964)	1,368	1,014	(3,188)	(1,950)
NEW YORK							
FORT DRUM	RECEIVE	0	0	0	180	0	180
FORT HAMILTON RESERVE CENTER	REALIGN	0	(52)	3	0	3	(52)
FORT TOTTEN	CLOSE	(11)	(32)	0	0	(11)	(32)
GRIFFISS AIR GUARD	REDIRECT	0	(150)	0	0	0	(150)
NRC STATEN ISLAND	CLOSE	(12)	(2)	0	0	(12)	(2)
REDCAP ACTIVITY, BUFFALO	DISESTABLISH	(2)	(1)	0	0	(2)	(1)
ROME LABORATORIES	CLOSE	(10)	(1,057)	0	0	(10)	(1,057)
ROSLYN AGS	CLOSE	(8)	(36)	0	0	(8)	(36)
SENECA ARMY DEPOT	CLOSE	(9)	(316)	0	0	(9)	(316)
STEWART IAP AGS	RECEIVE	0	0	8	36	8	36
WATERVLIET ARSENAL	RECEIVE	0	0	0	15	0	15
	Total	(52)	(1,646)	11	231	(41)	(1,415)
NORTH CAROLINA							
MCAS NEW RIVER	RECEIVE	0	0	703	0	703	0
	Total	0	0	703	0	703	0
NORTH DAKOTA							
GRAND FORKS AFB	REALIGN	(1,506)	(119)	0	0	(1,506)	(119)
	Total	(1,506)	(119)	0		(1,506)	(119)
OHIO							
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT COLUMBUS	REALIGN		[illegible]				[illegible]
SPRINGFIELD BECKLEY MAP	CLOSE						
[illegible]	[illegible]						
	[illegible]		[illegible]				
[illegible]							
[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]			
[illegible]	[illegible]						
[illegible]	REDIRECT					[illegible]	[illegible]
	Total		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
PENNSYLVANIA							
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT LETTERKENNY	DISESTABLISH		[illegible]				[illegible]
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT SUSQUEHANNA	RECEIVE		[illegible]		[illegible]		[illegible]
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION REGION EAST	RECEIVE	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	0	85
DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY CENTER	REALIGN	(16)	(369)	0	0	(16)	(369)
FORT INDIANTOWN GAP	CLOSE	(130)	(385)	0	0	(130)	(385)
GREATER PITTSBURGH IAP ARS	CLOSE	0	(397)	0	0	0	(397)
KELLY SUPPORT CENTER	REALIGN	0	(128)	0	7	0	(121)
LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	REALIGN	(35)	(2,055)	0	0	(35)	(2,055)
NAESU PHILADELPHIA	CLOSE	(10)	(80)	0	0	(10)	(80)
NATSF PHILADELPHIA	CLOSE	(4)	(223)	0	0	(4)	(223)
NAWC-AD & NCCOSC DET WARMINSTER WARMINSTER	CLOSE	(16)	(332)	0	0	(16)	(332)
NAWC-AD OPEN WATER TEST FACILITY OREFIELD	CLOSE	0	0	0	0	0	0
NSWC PHILADELPHIA	RECEIVE	0	0	0	261	0	261
NSY PHILADELPHIA-NORFOLK DET	REDIRECT	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	RECEIVE	0	0	0	301	0	301
	Total	(221)	(4,033)	0	954	(221)	(3,079)
PUERTO RICO							
FORT BUCHANAN	REALIGN	(59)	(123)	0	0	(59)	(123)
	Total	(59)	(123)	0	0	(59)	(123)

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State / Installation	Action	Out Mil	Out Civ	In Mil	In Civ	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Net Gain/(Loss) Civ
RHODE ISLAND							
NETC NEWPORT	RECEIVE	0	0	522	10	522	10
NUWC NEWPORT	RECEIVE	0	0	0	562	0	562
	Total	0	0	522	572	522	572
SOUTH CAROLINA							
FISC CHARLESTON	CLOSE	(2)	(6)	0	0	(2)	(6)
FORT JACKSON	RECEIVE	0	0	1,404	51	1,404	51
MCAS BEAUFORT	RECEIVE	0	0	540	5	540	5
NAVAL READINESS CMD 7 CHARLESTON	CLOSE	(30)	(16)	0	0	(30)	(16)
NAVY WPNSTA CHARLESTON	RECEIVE	0	0	2,780	0	2,780	0
SHAW AFB (726 ACS, HOMESTEAD AFB)	REDIRECT	(123)	(3)	0	0	(123)	(3)
	Total	(155)	(25)	4,724	56	4,569	31
TENNESSEE							
BUREAU OF PERSONNEL (IN)	RECEIVE	0	0	293	293	293	293
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT MEMPHIS	DISESTABLISH	111	(1,289)	0	0	(111)	(1,289)
	Total	111	(1,289)	293	293	182	(996)
TEXAS							
AF ELEC. WARFARE SIMULATOR ACT FT WORTH	DISESTABLISH	41	[illegible]			41	[illegible]
BERGSTROM AIR RESERVE BASE	CLOSE	[illegible]	(385)	[illegible]		[illegible]	(385)
BROOKS AFB	CLOSE	600	(1,309)	[illegible]		(600)	(1,309)
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT RED RIVER	DISESTABLISH	[illegible]	(322)				(322)
FORT BLISS	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
FORT SAM HOUSTON	RECEIVE			[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]
NAS FT WORTH	RECEIVE						
BOLLING AFB (INCL [illegible])	REALIGN	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
LACKLAND AFB	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
LAUGHLIN AFB	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
LONE STAR ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	RECEIVE			[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]
NAS CORPUS CHRISTI	REALIGN	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]
NAS KINGSVILLE	RECEIVE			[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]
NAS LAREDO	CLOSE					[illegible]	[illegible]
RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
REESE AFB	CLOSE	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
SHEPPARD AFB	RECEIVE			[illegible]		[illegible]	[illegible]
	Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
UTAH							
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT OGDEN	DISESTABLISH		[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
DUGWAY PROVING GROUND	REALIGN	[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
HILL AFB (INCL UTAH TEST AND TRNG RANGE)	RECEIVE		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		[illegible]
	Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
VIRGINIA							
DG MCCDC QUANTICO	RECEIVE			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT COMMAND	RECEIVE	0	0	11	41	11	41
DEFENSE GENERAL SUPPLY CENTER	RECEIVE	0	0	12	347	12	347
FORT LEE (KENNER HOSPITAL)	REALIGN	(99)	(106)	0	0	(99)	(106)
FORT PICKETT	CLOSE	(9)	(245)	0	0	(9)	(245)
NAS NORFOLK	REALIGN	(551)	0	0	0	(551)	0
NAS OCEANA	RECEIVE	0	0	5,185	145	5,185	145
NAVAL MGT SYSTEMS SPT OFFICE CHESAPEAKE	DISESTABLISH	(6)	(15)	0	0	(6)	(15)
NSWC DAHLGREN	RECEIVE	0	0	0	24	0	24
NSY NORFOLK	RECEIVE	0	0	0	230	0	230
SPAWAR ARLINGTON	REDIRECT	(201)	(932)	0	0	(201)	(932)
	Total	(866)	(1,298)	5,220	787	4,354	(511)
WASHINGTON							
FORT LEWIS	RECEIVE	0	0	137	0	137	0
NAS WHIDBEY ISLAND	RECEIVE	0	0	510	0	510	0
NSY PUGET SOUND	RECEIVE	0	0	41	28	41	28
NUWC KEYPORT	RECEIVE	0	(28)	92	0	92	(28)
	Total	0	(28)	780	28	780	0

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State / Installation	Action	Out Mil	Out Civ	In Mil	In Civ	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Net Gain/(Loss) Civ
WEST VIRGINIA							
VALLEY GROVE AREA MAINT SUP ACT (AMSA)	CLOSE	0	(7)	0	0	0	(7)
	Total	0	(7)	0	0	0	(7)
WISCONSIN							
NRC SHEBOYGAN	CLOSE	(6)	0	0	0	(6)	0
	Total	(6)	0	0	0	(6)	0

NOTE: This table excludes relocations "out" for BRAC 95 recommendations to change prior BRAC decisions that have not yet been implemented.

Selected Recommended Changes to Prior Round BRAC Decisions

(Personnel that have not yet relocated.)

A Prior BRAC Decision Requires Personnel To Relocate:		A BRAC 95 Recommendation Would Change the Destination To:		
			Personnel In	
From	To	New Location	Military	Civilian
NAS Alameda, CA	NAS North Island, CA	NAS Corpus Christi, TX	423	0
NAS Cecil Field, FL	MCAS Cherry Point, NC	NAS Oceana, VA	3,288	111
		MCAS Beaufort, SC	540	5
	MCAS Beaufort, SC	NAS Atlanta, GA	319	7
	NAS Oceana, VA	NAS Jacksonville, FL	1,389	22
NAF Detroit, MI	Marine Corps Res. Ctr., Twin Cities, MN	Selfridge AGB, MI	54	3
MCAS El Toro and MCAS Tustin, CA	NAS Lemoore, CA	NAS Oceana, VA	1,397	34
		NAS North Island, CA	[illegible]	[illegible]
		NAS Jacksonville, FL	[illegible]	[illegible]
MCAS El Toro and MCAS Tustin, CA	NAS Miramar, CA	MCAS New River, NC	[illegible]	[illegible]
		MCAS Kaneohe Bay, HI	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NTC Orlando & NTC San Diego, CA	NAS Pensacola, FL	Lackland AFB, TX	[illegible]	
	NTC Great Lakes, IL	NWC Newport, RI	[illegible]	
		NTC San Diego, CA	[illegible]	[illegible]
Naval Recruiting Command, Washington, DC	NTC Great Lakes, IL	Bureau of Personnel, Washington, DC	[illegible]	35
Naval Security Group Command Headquarters, Potomac, MD	[illegible]	Naval Research Laboratory	[illegible]	
Williams AFB, AZ	[illegible]	Williams AFB, AZ	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible] AFB, IL	[illegible] AFB, IL	[illegible]		
485th Engineering Installation Group				

Read File

March 1995

EVENT CALENDAR (as of 2/15/95)

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
February S M T W T F S 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		April S M T W T F S 1 8 2 3 4 5 6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	1 9:30 AM HRG.(Sec. Perry), SD-106 1:30 PM HRG.(Gotbaum), SD-106	2	3	4
5	6 9:00 AM HRG.(Navy), Cannon 345 1:30 PM HRG.(Air Force), Cannon 345	7 9:00 AM HRG.(Army), SD-106 1:30 PM HRG.(Def. Agencies), SD-106	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16 9:00 AM HRG.(Re-use), SH-216 1:30 PM HRG.(Re-use), SD-106	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

April 1995

EVENT CALENDAR (as of 2/15/95)

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20 9:30 AM HRG.(GAO) 1:30 PM HRG.(Re-use)	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

March

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

May

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

May 1995

EVENT CALENDAR (as of 2/15/95)

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8 A Long Day	9 DELIBERATIONS (ADDS)	10 DELIBERATIONS (ADDS)	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

April

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

June

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

June 1995

EVENT CALENDAR (as of 2/15/95)



May						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			



July						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12 HEARINGS (Cong.)	13 HEARINGS (Cong.)	14 HEARINGS (Cong.)	15 HEARINGS	16	17
18	19	20	21 DELIBERATIONS	22 DELIBERATIONS	23 DELIBERATIONS	24 DELIBERATIONS
25	26 DELIBERATIONS	27 COMMISSIONER REVIEW	28	29	30	

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING SYSTEM (ECTS) # 950228-5

FROM: PERRY, WILLIAM	TO: GENERAL
TITLE: SEC OF DEF	TITLE:
ORGANIZATION: DEPT OF DEF	ORGANIZATION: DBCRC
INSTALLATION (s) DISCUSSED:	

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN	FYI	ACTION	INIT	COMMISSION MEMBERS	FYI	ACTION	INIT
CHAIRMAN DIXON				COMMISSIONER			
STAFF DIRECTOR	✓			COMMISSIONER			
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	✓			COMMISSIONER			
GENERAL COUNSEL	✓			COMMISSIONER			
MILITARY EXECUTIVE				COMMISSIONER			
				COMMISSIONER			
DIR./CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON	✓			COMMISSIONER			
DIR./COMMUNICATIONS				REVIEW AND ANALYSIS			
				DIRECTOR OF R & A	✓		
EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT				ARMY TEAM LEADER	✓		
				NAVY TEAM LEADER	✓		
DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION				AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER	✓		
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER				INTERAGENCY TEAM LEADER	✓		
DIRECTOR OF TRAVEL				CROSS SERVICE TEAM LEADER	✓		
DIR./INFORMATION SERVICES							

TYPE OF ACTION REQUIRED

	Prepare Reply for Chairman's Signature		Prepare Reply for Commissioner's Signature
	Prepare Reply for Staff Director's Signature		Prepare Direct Response
	ACTION: Offer Comments and/or Suggestions	✓	FYI

Subject/Remarks:

1995 DEPT OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE PRESS RELEASE

Due Date:	Routing Date: 950228	Date Originated: 950228	Mail Date:

NEWS RELEASE

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301
PLEASE NOTE DATE

Please refer to this number when responding 950228-5

No. 095-95
(703)695-0192(media)
(703)697-3189(copies)
(703)697-5737(public/industry)

IMMEDIATE RELEASE February 28, 1995

SECRETARY PERRY RECOMMENDS CLOSING, REALIGNING 146 BASES

Secretary of Defense William Perry today announced the Department's recommendations to close or realign 146 military installations in the United States. The recommendations are being forwarded to the independent Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

"These recommendations, though painful, are necessary to achieve the levels of readiness and modernization we need within the budget we have," said Secretary Perry. "Our armed forces and our budget have been cut by one-third or more, but our infrastructure only about half that. Today's recommendations will save the taxpayers and the Department some $18 billion over the next two decades."

The Secretary's recommendations were developed by each of the military services in accordance with the strict procedures laid down by the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Each base was evaluated using a set of published criteria, giving priority first to the military value of the facility, and then to the savings and the economic and other effects that the closure would have. The evaluation data is certified for accuracy by each Service, and then reviewed by both the Base Closure and Realignment Commission and the General Accounting Office.

During a press conference at the Pentagon, Perry said that both he and General John Shalikashvili, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had approved the recommendations made by the military departments without exception. "These actions are necessary so that we can carefully shape our armed forces to support the National Military Strategy and the Bottom Up Review," the Secretary explained.

The BRAC 95 recommendations will cost less than the BRAC 95 round ($3.8 billion vs. $6.9 billion) and will generate savings more quickly. Over the six-year implementation period prescribed by law, the closures and realignments are expected to generate net savings of approximately $4 billion. Recurring savings thereafter are expected to reach $1.8 billion per year. Total savings over 20 years, discounted to present value, are estimated to be $18 billion.

-MORE-

INTERNET AVAILABILITY: This document is available on DefenseLINK, a World Wide Web Server on the Internet, at: http://www.dtic.dla.mil/defenselink/

Perry also announced that he will recommend that the current BRAC authority be extended to permit another base closure round in three or four years. "We need time to absorb the closure of over a hundred major bases," the Secretary said, "but we are continuing to refine our force structure and our mission. Each service has told me that, ultimately, they can do more."

While some of these actions will have significant economic impact upon local communities, Perry said that he did not remove any Service recommendations for this reason. However, he pledged to continue and expand the Department's efforts to encourage recovery and reuse. Department of Defense assistance programs include personnel transition and job training assistance, local reuse planning grants, on-site transition coordinators, accelerated property disposal, and faster environmental cleanup that supports reuse needs.

"These installations offer an opportunity for communities to diversify and reshape their economic futures. We have already seen impressive redevelopment successes in such diverse communities as Sacramento, Calif.; Alexandria, La.; and Rantoul, Ill. They prove that new jobs can be created to replace those that are lost. There is no doubt that it takes strong local leadership and a lot of hard work., but the President has committed us to help, and we will," Secretary Perry said.

Attached are summaries of the impacts of each BRAC action, listed by state.

-END-

1995 List of Military Installations Inside the United States for Closure or Realignment

Part I: Major Base Closures

Army

Fort McClellan, Alabama
Fort Chaffee, Arkansas
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado
Price Support Center, Illinois
Savanna Army Depot Activity, Illinois
Fort Ritchie, Maryland
Selfridge Army Garrison, Michigan
Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey
Seneca Army Depot, New York
Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania
Red River Army Depot, Texas
Fort Pickett, Virginia

Navy

Naval Air Facility, Adak, Alaska
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California
Ship Repair Facility, Guam
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis, Indiana
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division Detachment, Louisville, Kentucky
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division Detachment, White Oak, Maryland
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts
Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Lakehurst, New Jersey
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Warminster, Pennsylvania

Air Force

North Highlands Air Guard Station, California
Ontario IAP Air Guard Station, California
Rome Laboratory, Rome, New York
Roslyn Air Guard Station, New York
Springfield-Beckley MAP, Air Guard Station, Ohio
Greater Pittsburgh IAP Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania
Bergstrom Air Reserve Base, Texas
Brooks Air Force Base, Texas
Reese Air Force Base, Texas

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

Army

Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, California
East Fort Baker, California
Rio Vista Army Reserve Center, California
Stratford Army Engine Plant, Connecticut
Big Coppett Key, Florida
Concepts Analysis Agency, Maryland
Publications Distribution Center Baltimore, Maryland
Hingham Cohasset, Massachusetts
Sudbury Training Annex, Massachusetts
Aviation-Troop Command (ATCOM), Missouri
Fort Missoula, Montana
Camp Kilmer, New Jersey
Caven Point Reserve Center, New Jersey
Camp Pedricktown, New Jersey
Bellmore Logistics Activity, New York
Fort Totten, New York
Recreation Center #2, Fayettville, North Carolina
Information Systems Software Command (ISSC), Virginia
Camp Bonneville, Washington
Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA), West Virginia

Navy

Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering West Coast Division, San Diego, California
Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, California
Naval Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California
Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN, Long Beach, California
Naval Undersea Warfare Center-Newport Division, New London Detachment, New London, Connecticut
Naval Research Laboratory, Underwater Sound Reference Detachment, Orlando, Florida
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Guam
Naval Biodynamics Laboratory, New Orleans, Louisiana
Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Detachment, Annapolis, Maryland
Naval Technical Training Center, Meridian, Mississippi
Naval Aviation Engineering Support Unit, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Open Water Test Facility, Oreland, Pennsylvania

Naval Reserve Readiness Commands at:

New Orleans, Louisiana (Region 10)
Charleston, South Carolina (Region 7)

Air Force

Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, California
Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor Activity, Buffalo, New York
Air Force Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator Activity, Fort Worth, Texas

Defense Logistics Agency

Defense Contract Management District South, Marietta, Georgia
Defense Contract Management Command International, Dayton, Ohio
Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, Ohio
Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny, Pennsylvania
Defense Industrial Supply Center Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Defense Distribution Depot Red River, Texas

Defense Investigative Service

Investigations Control and Automation Directorate, Fort Holabird, Maryland

Part IV: Changes to Previously Approved BRAC Recommendations

Army

Army Bio-Medical Research Laboratory, Fort Detrick, Maryland

Navy

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California
Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California
Naval Air Station Alameda, California
Naval Recruiting District, San Diego, California
Naval Training Center, San Diego, California
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida
Naval Aviation Depot, Pensacola, Florida
Navy Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center, Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida
Naval Training Center Orlando, Florida
Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii

Naval Air Facility, Detroit, Michigan
Naval Shipyard, Norfolk Detachment, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia
Office of Naval Research, Arlington, Virginia
Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia
Naval Recruiting Command, Washington, D.C.
Naval Security Group Command Detachment Potomac, Washington, D.C.

Air Force

Williams AFB, Arizona
Lowry AFB, Colorado
Homestead AFB, Florida (301st Rescue Squadron)
Homestead AFB, Florida (726th Air Control Squadron)
MacDill AFB, Florida
Griffiss AFB, New York (Airfield Support for 10th Infantry (Light) Division)
Griffiss AFB, New York (485th Engineering Installation Group)

Defense Logistics Agency

Defense Contract Management District West, El Segundo, California

Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, RDT&E Division Detachment, Warminster, Pennsylvania
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina
Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering East Coast Detachment, Norfolk, Virginia
Naval Information Systems Management Center, Arlington, Virginia
Naval Management Systems Support Office, Chesapeake, Virginia

Navy/Marine Reserve Activities

Naval Reserve Centers at:

Huntsville, Alabama
Stockton, California
Santa Ana, Irvine, California
Pomona, California
Cadillac, Michigan
Staten Island, New York
Laredo, Texas
Sheboygan, Wisconsin

Naval Air Reserve Center at:

Olathe, Kansas

Defense Logistics Agency

Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, Tennessee
Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Utah

Part II: Major Base Realignments

Army

Fort Greely, Alaska
Fort Hunter Liggett, California
Sierra Army Depot, California
Fort Meade, Maryland
Detroit Arsenal, Michigan
Fort Dix, New Jersey
Fort Hamilton, New York
Charles E. Kelly Support Center, Pennsylvania
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania
Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah
Fort Lee, Virginia

Navy

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida
Naval Activities, Guam
Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas
Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Keyport, Washington

Air Force

McClellan Air Force Base, California
Onizuka Air Station, California
Eglin Air Force Base, Florida
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas
Hill Air Force Base, Utah

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
Alabama								
Army								
Ft McClellan		Close	269	122	45	316	(6,595)	(2,441)
Navy								
NRC Huntsville		Close	0	(3)	1	7	(11)	(8)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							229	3,380
Total Alabama Personnel Impact							(6,377)	931
Alaska								
Army								
Ft Greely		Realign	23	(43)	19	225	(438)	(284)
Navy								
NAF Adak		Close	9	(108)	26	355	(840)	(138)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							205	86
Total Alaska Personnel Impact							(773)	(348)
Arizona								
Air Force								
Williams AFB		Redirect	0	(18)	0	21	0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							147	184
Total Arizona Personnel Impact							147	184
Arkansas								
Army								
Ft Chaffee		Close	10	(39)	13	167	(40)	(207)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Arkansas Personnel Impact							(40)	(207)
California								
Army								
Branch US Disciplinary Barracks		Close	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Ft Baker		Close	8	1	2	16	(47)	(80)
Ft Hunter-Liggett		Realign	4	(12)	5	44	(393)	(86)
Rio Vista Army Reserve Center		Close	0	(1)	0	2	0	0
Sierra Army Depot		Realign	14	(55)	29	333	(83)	(539)
Navy								
MCAS El Toro/Tustin		Redirect	90	(293)	3	347	0	0
NAS Alameda		Redirect	Costs/Savings Included in NAS Meridian closure				0	0
Naval Health Research Ctr San Diego		Disestablish	4	2	1	11	(17)	(137)
NAVPERS R&D Ctr San Diego		Disestablish	8	4	2	16	(17)	(202)
NISE West San Diego		Disestablish	2	(19)	4	40	0	(58)
NRC Pomona		Close	0	(2)	0	5	(7)	(3)
NRC Santa Anna (Irvine)		Close	0	(3)	1	8	(12)	(2)
NRC Stockton		Close	0	(2)	0	5	(7)	0
NSY Long Beach		Close	75	(724)	131	1,949	(343)	(3,746)
Recruiting District San Diego		Redirect	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUPSHIP Long Beach		Disestablish	0	(1)	0	3	(11)	(8)
Air Force								
Moffett Federal Airport AGS		Close	15	(4)	5	60	(58)	(230)
North Highlands Air Guard Station		Close	1	1	0	2	0	0
Ontario AS		Realign	134	126	30	182	(673)	(1,202)
Ontario IAP AGS		Close	1	0	0	1	0	0

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

($FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Contract Management District South		Disestablish	4	(18)	6	76	(5)	(164)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							804	77
Total Georgia Personnel Impact							791	(613)
Guam								
Navy								
FSC Guam		Disestablish	18	(143)	31	437	(73)	(340)
NAS Agana		Redirect	44	(214)	22	416	(1,272)	0
Naval Activities Guam		Realign	93	(66)	43	474	(737)	(1,484)
SRF Guam		Close	8	(172)	36	629	(22)	(641)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Guam Personnel Impact							(2,104)	(2,465)
Hawaii								
Navy								
NAS Barbers Point		Redirect	0	(18)	8	16	0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							996	773
Total Hawaii Personnel Impact							996	773
Idaho								
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							123	3
Total Idaho Personnel Impact							123	3
Illinois								
Army								
Price Support Center, IL		Close	4	(35)	9	116	(25)	(200)
Savanna Army Depot Activity		Close	38	12	13	112	(57)	(393)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							10	5
Total Illinois Personnel Impact							(72)	(588)
Indiana								
Navy								
NAWC-AD Indianapolis		Close	180	37	68	640	(36)	(2,805)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							13	1,778
Total Indiana Personnel Impact							(23)	(1,027)
Kansas								
Navy								
NARC Olathe		Close	0	(4)	1	11	(10)	(4)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Kansas Personnel Impact							(10)	(4)

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.78%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

FY 96 ($Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FYP6-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
Mississippi								
Navy								
NAS Meridian		Close	83	(169)	33	471	(1,643)	(947)
NTTC Meridian		Close	Costs/Savings Included in NAS Meridian action					
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							116	237
Total Mississippi Personnel Impact							(1,519)	(710)
Missouri								
Army								
Aviation-Troop Command		Disestablish	146	(9)	46	463	(247)	(4,484)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,411	382
Total Missouri Personnel Impact							1,164	(4,102)
Montana								
Army								
Ft Missoula		Close	0	(1)	0	2	0	0
Air Force								
Malmstrom AFB		Realign	17	(5)	5	84	(719)	(60)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Montana Personnel							(719)	(60)
Nevada								
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							87	85
Total Nevada Personnel Impact							87	85
New Jersey								
Army								
Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal		Close	44	8	10	90	(100)	(1,267)
Camp Kilmer		Close	0	(1)	0	2	0	0
Camp Pedricktown		Close	0	(2)	0	6	0	0
Coven Point Army Reserve Center		Close	Cost/Savings Included in Ft Hamilton action				(3)	0
Ft Dix		Realign	19	(112)	36	478	(310)	(429)
Navy								
NAWC Lakehurst		Close	97	6	37	369	(380)	(1,383)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							36	1,213
Total New Jersey Personnel Impact							(758)	(1,866)
New Mexico								
Air Force								
Kirtland AFB		Realign	376	169	42	466	(4,554)	(2,294)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,368	344
Total New Mexico Personnel Impact							(3,186)	(1,950)
New York								
Army								
Bellmore Logistics Activity		Close	0	(2)	0	6	0	0
Ft Hamilton		Realign	2	(3)	7	74	3	(82)
Ft Totten		Close	4	0	2	17	(11)	(20)

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.78%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

FY 96 (Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Civ
NSY Philadelphia-Norfolk Det		Redirect	0	(52)	9	136	0	0
Air Force								
Greater Pittsburgh IAP ARS		Close	22	(36)	13	141	0	(387)
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny		Disestablish	45	21	12	102	(4)	(374)
Defense Industrial Supply Center, PA		Disestablish	17	(99)	18	237	(16)	(349)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	947
Total Pennsylvania Personnel Impact							(221)	(3,379)
Puerto Rico								
Army								
Ft Buchanan		Realign	74	60	10	46	(59)	(123)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Puerto Rico Personnel Impact							(59)	(123)
Rhode Island								
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							822	572
Total Rhode Island Personnel Impact							822	572
South Carolina								
Navy								
FISC Charleston		Close	2	(2)	1	11	(2)	(6)
NR Readiness Cmd 7 Charleston		Close	1	(14)	3	40	(30)	(16)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							4,601	53
Total South Carolina Personnel Impact							4,549	31
Tennessee								
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Distribution Depot Memphis		Close	86	(15)	24	244	(11)	(1,389)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							233	393
Total Tennessee Personnel Impact							222	(996)
Texas								
Army								
Red River Army Depot		Close	60	(313)	123	1,497	(14)	(2,887)
Navy								
NAS Corpus Christi		Realign	Costs/Savings included in NAS Meridian closure				352	(394)
NRF Laredo		Close	0	(1)	0	4	(4)	0
Air Force								
AF Electronic Warfare Simulator Activity, Ft. Worth		Disestablish	4	3	1	4	(4)	(1)
Bergstrom Air Reserve Base		Close	13	(93)	21	291	0	(586)
Brooks AFB		Close	164	139	27	142	(1,820)	(1,939)
Reese AFB		Close	37	(82)	22	267	(900)	(1,183)
San Antonio ALC (Kelly AFB)		Realign	183	(139)	89	991	364	(143)
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Distribution Depot Red River		Disestablish	89	1	19	184	(1)	(820)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,764	1,346
Total Texas Personnel Impact							(378)	(6,606)

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Civ
ALABAMA			
ANNISTON ARMY DEPOT	RECEIVE	28	473
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT ANNISTON	RECEIVE	0	839
FORT MCCLELLAN	CLOSE	(6,085)	(2,441)
NRC HUNTSVILLE	CLOSE	(11)	(8)
REDSTONE ARSENAL	RECEIVE	201	2,368
	Total	(5,877)	831
ALASKA			
FORT GREELY	REALIGN	(438)	(286)
FORT WAINWRIGHT	RECEIVE	205	86
NAF ADAK	CLOSE	(540)	(136)
	Total	(773)	(336)
ARIZONA			
FORT HUACHUCA	RECEIVE	108	166
YUMA PROVING GROUND	RECEIVE	39	18
	Total	147	184
ARKANSAS			
FORT CHAFFEE	CLOSE	(40)	(207)
	Total	(40)	(207)
CALIFORNIA			
CBC PORT HUENEME	RECEIVE	0	2
DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT DISTRICT WEST	RECEIVE	2	20
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT SAN JOAQUIN	RECEIVE	0	213
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION REGION WEST	REDIRECT	2	289
EAST FT BAKER	CLOSE	(47)	(50)
EDWARDS AFB	RECEIVE	3	0
FISC SAN DIEGO	RECEIVE	0	18
FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	REALIGN	(393)	(85)
MCCLELLAN AFB	RECEIVE	134	245
MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRPORT AGS	CLOSE	(86)	(230)
NADEP NORTH ISLAND	RECEIVE	6	213
NAS NORTH ISLAND	RECEIVE	1,829	54
NAVAL HEALTH RESEARCH CENTER, SAN DIEGO	CLOSE	(17)	(137)
NAVAL PERSONNEL R&D CENTER, SAN DIEGO	DISESTABLISH	(17)	(203)
NAVAL STATION SAN DIEGO	RECEIVE	175	22
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION SEAL BEACH	RECEIVE	51	126
NAVMEDCEN SAN DIEGO	RECEIVE	102	36
NAWC CHINA LAKE	RECEIVE	18	284
NCCOSC RDT&E SAN DIEGO	RECEIVE	154	986
NISE WEST SAN DIEGO	DISESTABLISH	0	(56)
NORTH HIGHLANDS AIR GUARD STATION	CLOSE	0	0
NRC POMONA	CLOSE	(7)	(3)
NRC SANTA ANA (IRVINE)	CLOSE	(12)	(2)
NRC STOCKTON	CLOSE	(7)	0
NSWC PORT HUENEME	RECEIVE	0	107
NSY LONG BEACH	CLOSE	(283)	(3,796)
ONIZUKA AS	REALIGN	(873)	(1,202)
SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	REALIGN	(53)	(538)
SUPSHIP LONG BEACH	DISESTABLISH	(11)	(8)
TRAVIS AFB	RECEIVE	14	1
	Total	802	(3,966)

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Civ
IDAHO			
MOUNTAIN HOME AFB	RECEIVE	123	3
	Total	123	3
ILLINOIS			
NTC GREAT LAKES	RECEIVE	10	5
PRICE SUPPORT CENTER, IL	CLOSE	(25)	(200)
SAVANNA ARMY DEPOT ACTIVITY	CLOSE	(57)	(393)
	Total	(72)	(588)
INDIANA			
NAWC-AD INDIANAPOLIS	CLOSE	(36)	(2,805)
NSWC CRANE	RECEIVE	13	1,778
	Total	(23)	(1,027)
KANSAS			
NARC OLATHE	CLOSE	(10)	(4)
	Total	(10)	(4)
KENTUCKY			
FORT KNOX	RECEIVE	1,416	54
NSWC LOUISVILLE	CLOSE	(15)	(1,449)
	Total	1,401	(1,395)
LOUISIANNA			
NAS NEW ORLEANS	RECEIVE	0	2
NAVAL BIO DYNAMICS LAB NEW ORLEANS	CLOSE	(15)	(39)
NR READINESS CMD 10 NEW ORLEANS	CLOSE	(24)	(23)
	Total	(39)	(60)
MAINE			
NAS BRUNSWICK	RECEIVE	215	5
	Total	215	5
MARYLAND			
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	RECEIVE	11	108
ARMY PUBLICATIONS DISTRIBUTION CENTER	RELOCATE	(2)	(129)
FORT DETRICK	RECEIVE	602	325
FORT MEADE (KIMBROUGH HOSPITAL)	REALIGN	(55)	(74)
FORT RITCHIE	CLOSE	(1,011)	(1,333)
NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH INST. BETHESDA	CLOSE	(91)	(35)
NAWC-AD PATUXENT RIVER	RECEIVE	67	649
NSWC CARDEROCK	RECEIVE	1	19
NSWC DET ANNAPOLIS	CLOSE	(2)	(520)
NSWC DET WHITE OAK	CLOSE	(1)	(201)
	Total	(481)	(1,211)
MASSACHUSSETTS			
DEFENSE CONTRACT MGT. DISTRICT NORTHEAST	RECEIVE	1	20
HANSCOM AFB	RECEIVE	6	585
NAS SOUTH WEYMOUTH	CLOSE	(537)	(299)
NATICK RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER	RECEIVE	2	160
SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	CLOSE	0	(13)
	Total	(528)	453
MICHIGAN			
DEFENSE REUTILIZATION AND MARKETING SERVICE (HQ)	RECEIVE	0	97
DETROIT ARSENAL	RECEIVE	8	178

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Civ
NORTH DAKOTA			
GRAND FORKS AFB	REALIGN	(1,506)	(118)
	Total	(1,506)	(118)
OHIO			
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT COLUMBUS	REALIGN	(2)	(721)
SPRINGFIELD BECKLEY MAP AGS	CLOSE	0	0
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB	RECEIVE	1,315	1,233
	Total	1,313	512
OKLAHOMA			
FORT SILL	RECEIVE	1,575	32
MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	RECEIVE	53	219
TINKER AFB (INCL. OKLAHOMA CITY ALC)	REALIGN	127	(831)
VANCE AFB	RECEIVE	115	201
	Total	1,870	(379)
PENNSYLVANIA			
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT LETTERKENNY	DISESTABLISH	(4)	(374)
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT SUSQUEHANNA	RECEIVE	0	297
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION REGION EAST	RECEIVE	0	89
DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY CENTER	REALIGN	(16)	(369)
FORT INDIANTOWN GAP	CLOSE	(136)	(385)
GREATER PITTSBURGH IAP ARS	CLOSE	0	(367)
KELLY SUPPORT CENTER	REALIGN	0	(121)
LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT	REALIGN	(35)	(2,055)
NAESU PHILADELPHIA	CLOSE	(10)	(80)
NATBF PHILADELPHIA	CLOSE	(4)	(223)
NAWC-AD & NCCOSC DET WARMINSTER WARMINSTER	CLOSE	(16)	(332)
NAWC-AD OPEN WATER TEST FACILITY ORELAND	CLOSE	0	0
NSWC PHILADELPHIA	RECEIVE	0	281
NSY PHILADELPHIA-NORFOLK DET	REDIRECT	0	0
TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT	RECEIVE	0	300
	Total	(221)	(3,379)
PUERTO RICO			
FORT BUCHANAN	REALIGN	(59)	(123)
	Total	(59)	(123)
RHODE ISLAND			
NETC NEWPORT	RECEIVE	522	10
NUWC NEWPORT	RECEIVE	0	562
	Total	522	572
SOUTH CAROLINA			
FISC CHARLESTON	CLOSE	(2)	(8)
FORT JACKSON	RECEIVE	1,404	51
MCAS BEAUFORT	RECEIVE	640	5
NAVAL READINESS CMD 7 CHARLESTON	CLOSE	(30)	(16)
NAVY WPNSTA CHARLESTON	RECEIVE	2,780	0
SHAW AFB (726 ACS, HOMESTEAD AFB)	REDIRECT	(123)	(3)
	Total	4,669	31
TENNESSEE			
BUREAU OF PERSONNEL (IN)	RECEIVE	233	283
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT MEMPHIS	DISESTABLISH	(11)	(1,289)
	Total	222	(996)

Selected Recommended Changes to Prior Round BRAC Decisions

(Personnel that have not yet relocated.)

A Prior BRAC Decision Requires Personnel To Relocate:		A BRAC 95 Recommendation Would Change the Destination To:		
			Personnel In	
From	To	New Location	Military	Civilian
NAS Alameda, CA	NAS North Island, CA	NAS Corpus Christi, TX	423	0
NAS Cecil Field, FL	MCAS Cherry Point, NC	NAS Oceana, VA	3,298	111
		MCAS Beaufort, SC	540	5
	MCAS Beaufort, SC	NAS Atlanta, GA	319	7
	NAS Oceana, VA	NAS Jacksonville, FL	1,889	22
NAF Detroit, MI	Marine Corps Res. Ctr., Twin Cities, MN	Selfridge ANGB, MI	84	0
MCAS El Toro and MCAS Tustin, CA	NAS Lemoore, CA	NAS Oceana, VA	1,897	34
		NAS North Island, CA	1,271	54
		NAS Jacksonville, FL	12	5
MCAS El Toro and MCAS Tustin, CA	NAS Miramar, CA	MCAS New River, NC	703	0
		MCAS Kaneohe Bay, HI	126	0
Naval Nuclear Training, Orlando, FL	SUBASE New London, CT	Weapons Station Charleston, SC	2,780	0
NTC Orlando & NTC San Diego, CA	NAS Pensacola, FL	Lackland AFB, TX	193	0
	NTC Great Lakes, MI	NUWC Keyport, WA	82	0
		FTC San Diego, CA	127	0
Naval Recruiting Command, Washington, DC	NTC Great Lakes, MI	Bureau of Personnel, Memphis, TN	216	135
Naval Security Group Command Detachment Potomac, MD	Fort Meade, MD	Naval Research Laboratory, MD	32	0
Williams Air Force Base, AZ	Orlando, FL	Williams Air Force Base, AZ	0	36
Griffiss AFB, NY 485th Engineering Installation Group	Hill AFB, UT	Unit Inactivates		

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Civ
TEXAS			
AF ELEC. WARFARE SIMULATOR ACT., FT. WORTH	DISESTABLISH	(4)	(1)
BERGSTROM AIR RESERVE BASE	CLOSE	0	(585)
BROOKS AFB	CLOSE	(1,820)	(1,939)
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT RED RIVER	DISESTABLISH	(1)	(820)
FORT BLISS	RECEIVE	470	62
FORT SAM HOUSTON	RECEIVE	414	27
JRB FT WORTH	RECEIVE	2	5
KELLY AFB (INCL. SAN ANTONIO ALC)	REALIGN	364	(143)
LACKLAND AFB	RECEIVE	240	26
LAUGHLIN AFB	RECEIVE	129	523
LONE STAR ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT	RECEIVE	0	510
NAS CORPUS CHRISTI	REALIGN	252	(384)
NAS KINGSVILLE	RECEIVE	416	50
NRF LAREDO	CLOSE	(6)	0
RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	CLOSE	(14)	(2,667)
REESE AFB	CLOSE	(900)	(1,183)
SHEPPARD AFB	RECEIVE	81	143
	Total	(375)	(6,606)
UTAH			
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT OGDEN	DISESTABLISH	(8)	(1,105)
DUGWAY PROVING GROUND	REALIGN	(165)	(831)
HILL AFB (INCL. UTAH TEST AND TRNG RANGE)	RECEIVE	0	147
	Total	(173)	(1,889)
VIRGINIA			
CG MCCDC QUANTICO	RECEIVE	12	0
DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT COMMAND	RECEIVE	11	41
DEFENSE GENERAL SUPPLY CENTER	RECEIVE	12	347
FORT LEE (KENNER HOSPITAL)	REALIGN	(88)	(106)
FORT PICKETT	CLOSE	(9)	(245)
NAS NORFOLK	REALIGN	(551)	0
NAS OCEANA	RECEIVE	5,185	145
NAVAL MGT SYSTEMS SPT OFFICE CHESAPEAKE	DISESTABLISH	(8)	(15)
NSWC DAHLGREN	RECEIVE	0	24
NSY NORFOLK	RECEIVE	0	230
SPAWAR ARLINGTON	REDIRECT	(201)	(832)
	Total	4,354	(511)
WASHINGTON			
FORT LEWIS	RECEIVE	137	0
NAS WHIDBEY ISLAND	RECEIVE	610	0
NSY PUGET SOUND	RECEIVE	41	28
NUWC KEYPORT	RECEIVE	92	(28)
	Total	780	0
WEST VIRGINIA			
VALLEY GROVE AREA MAINT SUP ACT (AMSA)	CLOSE	0	(7)
	Total	0	(7)
WISCONSIN			
NRC SHEBOYGAN	CLOSE	(8)	0
	Total	(8)	0

NOTE: This table excludes relocations "out" for BRAC 95 recommendations to change prior BRAC decisions that have not yet been implemented.

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military Includes average student load civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Civ
DETROIT ARSENAL TANK PLANT	CLOSE	0	0
NRC CADILLAC	CLOSE	(8)	0
SELFRIDGE AGB	RECEIVE	54	0
SELFRIDGE ARMY GARRISON	CLOSE	(54)	(555)
	Total	0	(280)
MISSISSIPPI			
COLUMBUS AFB	RECEIVE	115	201
NAS MERIDIAN	CLOSE	(1,634)	(947)
NAVOCEANO	RECEIVE	0	36
	Total	(1,519)	(710)
MISSOURI			
AVIATION-TROOP COMMAND	DISESTABLISH	(247)	(4,484)
FORT LEONARD WOOD	RECEIVE	1,409	342
ST LOUIS PUBS	RECEIVE	2	40
	Total	1,164	(4,102)
MONTANA			
MALMSTROM AFB	REALIGN	(719)	(80)
	Total	(719)	(80)
NEVADA			
NELLIS AFB	RECEIVE	87	85
	Total	87	85
NEW JERSEY			
BAYONE MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL	CLOSE	(100)	(1,267)
CAVEN POINT RESERVE CENTER	CLOSE	(3)	0
FORT DIX	REALIGN	(310)	(429)
FORT MONMOUTH	RECEIVE	35	1,186
NAVY WPNSTA EARLE	RECEIVE	0	25
NAWC LAKEHURST	CLOSE	(380)	(1,363)
	Total	(758)	(1,866)
NEW MEXICO			
HOLLOMAN AFB	RECEIVE	1,368	344
KIRTLAND AFB	REALIGN	(4,553)	(2,294)
	Total	(3,185)	(1,950)
NEW YORK			
FORT DRUM	RECEIVE	0	180
FORT HAMILTON RESERVE CENTER	REALIGN	3	(82)
FORT TOTTEN	CLOSE	(11)	(32)
GRIFFISS AIR GUARD	REDIRECT	0	(150)
NRC STATEN ISLAND	CLOSE	(12)	(2)
REDCAP ACTIVITY, BUFFALO	DISESTABLISH	(2)	(1)
ROME LABORATORIES	CLOSE	(10)	(1,057)
ROSLYN AGS	CLOSE	(8)	(36)
SENECA ARMY DEPOT	CLOSE	(9)	(315)
STEWART IAP AGS	RECEIVE	8	36
WATERVLIET ARSENAL	RECEIVE	0	15
	Total	(41)	(1,415)
NORTH CAROLINA			
MCAS NEW RIVER	RECEIVE	703	0
	Total	703	0

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Civ
Sacramento ALC (McClellan AFB)		Realign	Costs/Savings included in AF ALC Realignments (See San Antonio ALC)				0	0
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Contract Management District West		Realract	10	(11)	4	61	0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							2,190	2,294
Total California Personnel Impact							602	(3,968)
Colorado								
Army								
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center		Close	142	39	34	299	(1,291)	(1,612)
Air Force								
Lowry AFB		Realract	2	(11)	3	39	(78)	(11)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							828	303
Total Colorado Personnel Impact							(541)	(1,320)
Connecticut								
Army								
Stratford Army Engine Plant		Close	2	(24)	4	80	(2)	0
Navy								
NUWC Det New London		Disestablish	23	(14)	8	91	(5)	(622)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							20	13
Total Connecticut Personnel Impact							13	(609)
District of Columbia								
Navy								
Recruiting Command Wash. D.C.		Realract	7	(1)	0	1	0	0
Security Group Det Potomac		Realract	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							325	0
Total District of Columbia Personnel Impact							325	0
Florida								
Army								
Big Coppitt Key		Close	0	0	0	0	0	0
Navy								
NADEP Pensacola		Realract	2	(2)	0	4	0	0
NAS Cecil Field		Realract	67	(336)	12	436	0	0
NAS Key West		Realign	0	(5)	2	26	(19)	(1)
NRL Underwater Sound Det Orlando		Disestablish	8	(4)	3	20	0	(109)
NTC Orlando/San Diego		Realract	6	(26)	0	26	0	0
Nuclear Power Propulsion Trng Ctr, Orlando		Realract	148	(20)	6	71	0	0
Air Force								
Eglin AFB		Realign	2	(6)	3	31	430	299
Homestead AFB (301 ARS)		Realract	6	(2)	2	16	(61)	(163)
Homestead AFB (726 ACS)		Realract	7	(2)	0	6	0	0
MacDill AFB		Realract	Costs/Savings included in Mahmstrom AFB action				0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							3,414	643
Total Florida Personnel Impact							3,764	679
Georgia								
Air Force								
Warner-Robins ALC (Robins AFB)		Realign	Costs/Savings included in AF ALC Realignments (See San Antonio ALC)				(8)	(534)

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.78%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
Kentucky								
Navy								
NSWC Louisville		Close	Costs/Savings included in NAWC Indianapolis action				(15)	(1,449)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,416	54
Total Kentucky Personnel Impact							1,401	(1,395)
Louisiana								
Navy								
Naval Biodynamics Lab New Orleans		Close	1	(14)	3	42	(15)	(39)
Mil Personnel Cmd 10 New Orleans		Close	1	(6)	2	24	(24)	(23)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	2
Total Louisiana Personnel Impact							(39)	(60)
Maine								
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							215	6
Total Maine Personnel Impact							215	6
Maryland								
Army								
Army Biomedical Research Lab, Ft Detrick		Redirect	0	(4)	0	4	0	0
Army Publications Distribution Center		Relocate	6	(3)	3	35	(2)	(129)
Concepts Analysis Agency		Relocate	4	0	1	7	0	0
Ft Meade (Kimbrough Hospital)		Realign	2	(16)	4	50	(56)	(74)
Ft Ritchie		Close	93	(83)	46	712	(1,011)	(1,333)
Navy								
Naval Medical Research Inst Bethesda		Close	3	(19)	10	111	(91)	(56)
NSWC Det Annapolis		Close	25	(37)	15	176	(2)	(520)
NSWC Det White Oak		Close	3	(29)	4	86	(1)	(201)
Defense Investigative Service								
ICSAD, Ft Holabird		Relocate	11	1	0	4	0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							661	1,101
Total Maryland Personnel Impact							(461)	(1,211)
Massachusetts								
Navy								
NAS South Weymouth		Close	17	(51)	27	315	(637)	(297)
Army								
Hingham Cohasset		Close	0	(1)	0	2	0	0
Sudbury Training Annex		Close	1	0	0	1	0	(13)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							9	766
Total Massachusetts Personnel Impact							(628)	453
Michigan								
Army								
Detroit Arsenal		Realign	1	(8)	3	38	0	0
Selfridge Army Garrison		Close	5	(47)	10	140	(54)	(555)
Navy								
NAF Detroit		Redirect	0	(9)	0	9	0	0
NRC Cadillac		Close	0	(2)	0	5	(5)	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							62	275
Total Michigan Personnel Impact							0	(280)

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment Recommendation Costs and Savings

($Y 96 ($Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Action	Closure Cost	FY96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Civ
Seneca Army Depot		Close	15	(34)	21	242	(9)	(316)
Navy								
NRC Staten Island		Close	0	(4)	1	10	(12)	(2)
Air Force								
Griffiss AFB (485th EIG)		Redirect	1	(27)	3	64	0	0
Griffiss AFB (Airfield Support)		Redirect	61	13	12	111	0	(160)
REDCAP Activity, Buffalo		Disestablish	2	(2)	1	11	(2)	(1)
Rome Laboratories		Close	53	16	12	98	(10)	(1,067)
Roslyn AGS		Close	2	(1)	1	8	(8)	(36)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							8	231
Total New York Personnel Impact							(41)	(1,415)
North Carolina								
Army								
Recreation Center # 2 Fayetteville		Close	0	0	0	0	0	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							703	0
Total North Carolina Personnel Impact							703	0
North Dakota								
Air Force								
Grand Forks AFB		Realign	12	(112)	36	447	(1,506)	(119)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total North Dakota Personnel Impact							(1,506)	(119)
Ohio								
Air Force								
Springfield-Beckley MAP AGS		Close	23	6	4	35	0	0
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Contract Mgmt Command International		Realign	3	(9)	3	39	0	0
Defense Distribution Depot Columbus		Realign	8	(51)	12	161	(2)	(721)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,316	1,233
Total Ohio Personnel Impact							1,313	512
Oklahoma								
Air Force								
Oklahoma City ALC (Tinker AFB)		Realign	Costs/Savings included in AF ALC Realignments (See San Antonio ALC)				127	(831)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							1,743	452
Total Oklahoma Personnel Impact							1,870	(379)
Pennsylvania								
Army								
Ft Indiantown Gap		Close	13	(67)	23	285	(126)	(368)
Kelly Support Center, PA		Realign	36	22	5	35	8	(121)
Letterkenny Army Depot		Realign	80	(807)	78	962	(36)	(2,055)
Navy								
NAESU Philadelphia		Close	3	(6)	3	30	(10)	(80)
NATSF Philadelphia		Close	6	(1)	2	23	(4)	(223)
NAWC-AD Open Water Test Facility Oreland		Close	0	0	0	0	0	0
NAWC-AD Warminster		Close	8	(33)	8	106	(16)	(332)
NCCOSC R&D Det Warminster		Close	Costs/Savings included in NAWC-AD Warminster action				0	0

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.75%

BRAC 95 Closure and Realignment

(FY 96 $Millions)

Service/Agency Installation	State	Act	Cost	FY 96-01 Net Cost (Savings)	Annual Savings	Total Savings *	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Mil	Net Personnel Gains and (Losses) Civ
Utah								
Army								
Dugway Proving Ground		Realign	25	(61)	26	307	(165)	(931)
Air Force								
Ogden ALC (Hill AFB)		Realign	Costs/Savings included in AF ALC Realignments (see San Antonio ALC)				0	0
Hill AFB (Including Utah Test and Training Range)		Realign	3	(62)	12	180	0	147
Defense Logistics Agency								
Defense Distribution Depot Ogden		Close	111	28	21	181	(8)	(1,105)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Utah Personnel Impact							(173)	(1,889)
Virginia								
Army								
Ft Lee (Kenner Hospital)		Realign	2	(16)	4	51	(99)	(106)
Ft Pickett		Close	26	(41)	21	241	(9)	(245)
Information Systems Software Command		Relocate	6	2	1	8	0	0
Navy								
Info Systems Mgt Ctr Arlington		Relocate	0	0	0	2	0	0
Naval Mgt Systems Spt Office Chesapeake		Disestablish	2	(9)	3	36	(6)	(16)
NAVSEA Crystal City		Redirect	160	(48)	9	144	0	0
NISE Det Norfolk		Close	5	0	2	20	0	0
Office of Naval Research Arlington		Redirect	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPAWAR Arlington		Redirect	24	(120)	25	340	(201)	(932)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							4,669	787
Total Virginia Personnel Impact							4,364	(511)
Washington								
Army								
Camp Bonneville		Close	0	(1)	0	2	0	0
Navy								
NUWC Keyport		Realign	2	(10)	2	30	0	(28)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							780	28
Total Washington Personnel Impact							780	0
West Virginia								
Army								
Valley Grove Area Maintenance Spt Activity, WV		Close	Costs/Savings included in Kelly Support Center action				0	(7)
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total West Virginia Personnel Impact							0	(7)
Wisconsin								
Navy								
NRC Sheboygan		Close	0	(1)	0	4	(6)	0
Personnel Increases at Other Bases							0	0
Total Wisconsin Personnel Impact							(6)	0

* Twenty Year Net Present Value at 2.78%

Department of Defense Recommended BRAC 95 Job Changes by State

(Military includes average student load, civilian includes on-base contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Civ
COLORADO		0	0
FALCON AFB	RECEIVE	287	234
FITZSIMONS ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	CLOSE	(1,291)	(1,612)
FORT CARSON	RECEIVE	231	0
LOWRY AFB	REDIRECT	(78)	(11)
PETERSON AFB	RECEIVE	10	69
	Total	(841)	(1,320)
CONNECTICUT			
NUWC DET NEW LONDON	DISESTABLISH	(5)	(622)
STRATFORD ARMY ENGINE PLANT	CLOSE	(2)	0
SUBASE NEW LONDON	RECEIVE	20	13
	Total	13	(609)
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY	RECEIVE	32	0
WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	RECEIVE	193	0
	Total	225	0
FLORIDA			
EGLIN AFB	RECEIVE	420	299
HOMESTEAD AFB	REDIRECT	(61)	(153)
MACDILL AFB	RECEIVE	867	57
NADEP JACKSONVILLE	RECEIVE	0	40
NAS JACKSONVILLE	RECEIVE	1,901	27
NAS KEY WEST	REALIGN	(19)	(1)
NAS PENSACOLA	RECEIVE	300	84
NAS WHITING FIELD	RECEIVE	327	5
NAWC TRNG SYS DIV ORLANDO	RECEIVE	5	48
NRL UNDERWATER SOUND DET ORLANDO	DISESTABLISH	0	(109)
NSWC PANAMA CITY	RECEIVE	42	28
TYNDALL AFB	RECEIVE	83	344
	Total	3,764	679
GEORGIA			
DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT DISTRICT SOUTH	DISESTABLISH	(5)	(184)
DOBBINS ARB	RECEIVE	0	88
FORT GORDON	RECEIVE	94	0
NAS ATLANTA	RECEIVE	319	7
NAVSCSCOL ATHENS	RECEIVE	391	12
WARNER-ROBINS ALC (ROBINS AFB)	REALIGN	(8)	(626)
	Total	791	(813)
GUAM			
FISC GUAM	DISESTABLISH	(73)	(340)
NAS AGANA	REDIRECT	(1,272)	0
NAVAL ACTIVITIES GUAM	REALIGN	(737)	(1,884)
SRF GUAM	CLOSE	(22)	(841)
	Total	(2,104)	(2,865)
HAWAII			
FORT SHAFTER	RECEIVE	102	0
MCB KANEOHE BAY	RECEIVE	546	0
NAVMAG LUALUALEI	RECEIVE	80	246
NAVSTA PEARL HARBOR	RECEIVE	267	527
	Total	995	773

State	Installation Name	Military I	Civilian/Contractor Indi	Military (Training) In
Alabama	BIRMINGHAM MAP AGS	0.41	0.55	0.16
Alabama	MAXWELL AFB & GUNTER AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
Alaska	ELMENDORF AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
Alaska	EIELSON AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Arizona	TUCSON IAP AGS	0.41	0.55	0.16
Arizona	ARMSTRONG LAB - MESA	0.5	1.89579729506153	0.21
Arizona	DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
Arizona	LUKE AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Arizona	WILLIAMS AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Arizona	GILA BEND AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Arkansas	IRA EAKER (BLYTHEVILLE) AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Arkansas	LITTLE ROCK AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
California	LOS ANGELES AFB	0.5	2.41653811361553	0.21
California	MATHER AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
California	MCCLELLAN AFB	0.5	1.69193882139779	0.21
California	VANDENBERG AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
California	FRESNO AIR TERMINAL AGS	0.41	0.55	0.16
California	MARCH AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
California	NORTON AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
California	ONIZUKA AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
California	TRAVIS AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
California	ONTARIO AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
California	BEALE AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
California	MOFFETT FIELD AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
California	GEORGE AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
California	CASTLE AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
California	NORTH HIGHLANDS AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
California	EDWARDS AFB	0.41	1.36473316061443	0.16
Colorado	LOWRY AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Colorado	BUCKLEY AGB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Colorado	ARPC	0.5	0.63	0.21
Colorado	US AIR FORCE ACADEMY	0.41	0.55	0.16
Colorado	PETERSON AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
Colorado	FALCON AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
Colorado	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	0.41	0.55	0.16
Delaware	DOVER AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
District of Columbi	BOLLING AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Florida	DUKE FIELD	0.29	0.43	0.13
Florida	HURLBURT FIELD	0.29	0.43	0.13
Florida	CAPE CANAVERAL AFS	0.41	0.55	0.16
Florida	HOMESTEAD ARS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Florida	EGLIN AFB	0.29	1.00905151114805	0.13
Florida	PATRICK AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16

To AF-Team

These are the Bases on the IA Team Economic Model from DoD - the multipliers represent the "indirect" JOB factors for each location

State	Installation Name	Military I	Civilian/Contractor Indi	Military (Training) In
Florida	MACDILL AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Florida	TYNDALL AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Georgia	ROBINS AFB	0.35	1.20034704663609	0.15
Georgia	MOODY AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Georgia	DOBBINS ARB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Guam	ANDERSON AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Hawaii	WHEELER AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
Hawaii	HICKAM AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
Idaho	BOISE AIR TERMINAL AGS	0.35	0.44	0.15
Idaho	MOUNTAIN HOME AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Illinois	SCOTT AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Illinois	O'HARE IAP ARS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Illinois	GREATER ROCKFORD AIRPORT (OR OTHER LOCATION)	0.35	0.44	0.15
Illinois	CHANUTE AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
Indiana	GRISSOM AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
Kansas	MCCONNELL AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
Louisiana	ENGLAND AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Louisiana	BARKSDALE AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
Maine	LORING AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Maryland	MARTIN STATE AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Maryland	ANDREWS AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Massachussetts	WESTOVER ARB	0.41	0.55	0.16
Massachussetts	HANSCOM AFB	0.5	2.10592400509525	0.21
Massachussetts	OTIS AGB	0.35	0.44	0.15
Michigan	K. I. SAWYER AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Michigan	WURTSMITH AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Michigan	BATTLE CREEK FED CT	0.29	0.43	0.13
Michigan	SELFRIDGE AGB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Minnesota	MINNEAPOLIS/ST PAUL IAP ARS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Mississippi	KEESLER AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
Mississippi	COLUMBUS AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Missouri	RICHARDS-GEBAUR ARS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Missouri	WHITEMAN AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Missouri	LAMBERT ST LOUIS IAP AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Montana	GREAT FALLS IAP AGS	0.29	0.43	0.13
Montana	MALMSTROM AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Montana	GREAT FALLS AGS	0.29	0.43	0.13
Nebraska	OFFUTT AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
Nebraska	LINCOLN MUNICIPAL AIRPORT AGS	0.35	0.44	0.15
Nevada	NELLIS AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
New Hampshire	PEASE AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
New Jersey	MCGUIRE AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
New Mexico	CANNON AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13

State	Installation Name	Military I	Civilian/Contractor Indi	Military (Training) In
New Mexico	KIRTLAND AFB	0.41	1.39638181069616	0.16
New Mexico	HOLLOMAN AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
New York	GRIFFISS AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
New York	NIAGARA FALLS IAP ARS	0.35	0.44	0.15
New York	ROME LABS	0.35	1.20531420575822	0.15
New York	ROSLYN AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
New York	PLATTSBURGH AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
New York	STEWART IAP AGS	0.35	0.44	0.15
New York	BUFFALO-REDCAP	0.41	1.57071692585948	0.16
New York	HANCOCK FIELD AGS	0.41	0.55	0.16
New York	GRIFFISS RESERVE AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
New York	SUFFOLK COUNTY AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
North Carolina	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
North Carolina	POPE AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
North Dakota	MINOT AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
North Dakota	GRAND FORKS AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Ohio	YOUNGSTOWN MAP ARS	0.41	0.55	0.16
Ohio	GENTILE AFS	0.41	0.55	0.16
Ohio	RICKENBACKER AGB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Ohio	WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB	0.41	1.57157060888671	0.16
Ohio	SPRINGFIELD BECKLEY MAP AGS	0.41	0.55	0.16
Ohio	NEWARK AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Oklahoma	ALTUS AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Oklahoma	VANCE AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Oklahoma	TINKER AFB	0.5	1.59363560522665	0.21
Oregon	PORTLAND IAP AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Oregon	KLAMATH, OREGON AIR GUARD STATE	0.29	0.43	0.13
Pennsylvania	GREATER PITTSBURGH IAP AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Pennsylvania	WILLOW GROVE ARS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Pennsylvania	GREATER PITTSBURGH RESERVE BASE	0.5	0.63	0.21
South Carolina	SHAW AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
South Carolina	MYRTLE BEACH AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
South Carolina	CHARLESTON AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
South Carolina	MCENTIRE AGB	0.41	0.55	0.16
South Dakota	ELLSWORTH AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Tennessee	ARNOLD AFB	0.29	0.71764179811052	0.13
Texas	CARSWELL AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Texas	BERGSTROM AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Texas	LAUGHLIN AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Texas	GOODFELLOW AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Texas	PLANT 4	0.5	1.74897545767805	0.21
Texas	SHEPPARD AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Texas	BROOKS AFB	0.5	1.70036355263363	0.21

State	Installation Name	Military I	Civilian/Contractor Indi	Military (Training) In
Texas	REESE AFB	0.35	0.44	0.15
Texas	ELLINGTON FIELD AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Texas	RANDOLPH AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Texas	LACKLAND AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Texas	KELLY AFB	0.5	1.70036355263363	0.21
Texas	DYESS AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13
Utah	OGDEN AIR LOGISTICS CENTER	0.5	1.65649893041714	0.21
Utah	HILL AFB	0.5	1.65649893041714	0.21
Utah	UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE	0.29	0.61365446088264	0.13
Utah	SALT LAKE CITY IAP AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Virginia	LANGLEY AFB	0.5	0.63	0.21
Washington	MCCHORD AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
Washington	FAIRCHILD AFB	0.41	0.55	0.16
Wisconsin	GEN BILLY MITCHELL FIELD AGS	0.5	0.63	0.21
Wyoming	FRANCIS E. WARREN AFB	0.29	0.43	0.13

February 28, 1995

Memo To The File -- Lewis

Air Force Recommendations -- Medical Impacts

Closures:

Brooks AFB -- Close Aeromedical School, clinic with base
Reese AFB -- close "hospital" (actually clinic) with base

Realignments:

Kirtland AFB -- terminate medical activities at VA hospital
(MDMIS lists a 25 bed hospital at Kirtland)
Onizuka AFB -- close clinic
Grand Forks AFB -- keep 15 bed hospital open
Hill AFB -- no mention of 25 bed hospital
Eglin AFB -- no mention of 85 bed hospital
Robins AFB -- no mention of 15 bed hospital

NAAG

Steve
Copy to each TC, Ben, Dave, Charlie
& in Daily Reading

PRESIDENT
Charles W. Burson
Attorney General of Tennessee

PRESIDENT-ELECT
Tom Udall
Attorney General of New Mexico

VICE PRESIDENT
Scott Harshbarger
Attorney General of Massachusetts

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT
Hubert H. Humphrey III
Attorney General of Minnesota

MILITARY BASE CLOSURE BULLETIN

FEBRUARY 1995

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE SAYS NUMBER OF BASES CLOSED IN 1995 WILL BE SMALLER THAN NUMBER OF BASES CLOSED IN 1993

Secretary of Defense William J. Perry announced, at a national meeting of mayors in Washington, DC, that the number of bases closed during the 1995 round of closings will not be as great as the number closed during the 1993 round. One hundred thirty bases, including 31 major bases, were scheduled for closure during the 1993 round. It had been anticipated that the 1995 round of closures would be larger than the three previous rounds of closures.

Although Secretary Perry gave no reason for the change, the Pentagon has recently begun focusing more resources on the readiness of the services. While saving money over the long-term, the upfront costs of closing bases have been higher than anticipated and receipts from the sales of real property at the closing bases have been lower than anticipated. One of the upfront costs of closing bases, which has received attention lately, is the cost of meeting the cleanup and other standards set in federal and state environmental laws. According to Secretary Perry, the cost of closing the 70 major bases already scheduled for closure will be $15 billion.

Secretary Perry, under the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (PL 101-510), is required to submit his recommendations on which bases to close during this year's round of closures to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission on or before March 1, 1995.

PRESIDENT CLINTON NOMINATES SIX TO SERVE ON THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

President Clinton has nominated six persons to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission; the Commission currently has seven open positions. The Committee on Armed Services held a confirmation hearing for all the nominees on February 14, 1995, and the nominees are expected to be confirmed by the end of February. A nominee for the last open position is expected to be named shortly. The persons nominated by the President are as follows:

- **Al Cornella** is President of Cornella Refrigeration, Inc., in Rapid City, SD, and a U.S. Navy veteran with service in Vietnam. He has been involved in military issues for more than a decade and currently serves on the boards of the South Dakota Air and Space Foundation and the Rapid City Economic Development Loan Fund.

- **Rebecca G. Cox** is currently a Vice-President of Continental Airlines, Inc., and has served as an assistant to President Reagan and as Director of the Office of Public Liaison. She also served on the 1993 commission.

- **General J.B. Davis**, U.S. Air Force (retired), served in the U.S. Air Force for 35 years as a combat fighter pilot, commander, strategic planner and programmer, including service as a commander of a combat fighter wing, of the U.S. Air Force's military Personnel Center, Pacific Air Forces, and United States Forces Japan.

- **S. Lee Kling** is Chairman of the Board of Kling Rechter & Company, a merchant banking company, and serves as a Special Advisor and Managing Director of Willis Corroon Corp.

- **Benjamin F. Montoya** is President and Chief Executive Officer of Public Service Company of New Mexico, a public utility providing gas, electricity, and water service throughout New Mexico. He also served in the U.S. Navy for 31 years and retired with the rank of Rear Admiral.

- **Wendi L. Steele** served as the liaison for the Senate with the Commission in 1991 and has worked in the legislative affairs offices of both the Office of Management and Budget and the White House. She is currently a writer.

The chair of the Commission, Alan Dixon, former U.S. Senator from Illinois, was nominated by President Clinton and confirmed by the Senate before it adjourned in October 1994. Mr. Dixon served two terms as Senator and was on the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Small Business, and the Committee on Armed Services Committee. He also chaired the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness. Mr. Dixon is currently a senior partner in the St. Louis law firm of Bryan Cave.

Under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (PL 101-510), the Commission will hold hearings and review the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense as to which U.S. military bases should be closed or realigned and prepare a final list of bases for approval by President Clinton. Assuming the President approves the list, Congress will have 45 legislative days to disapprove the entire list or the recommendations will become final and the bases closed or realigned.

PRESIDENT CLINTON SENDS BUDGET FOR THE 1996 FISCAL YEAR TO CONGRESS

President Clinton sent his proposed budget for the 1996 fiscal year to Congress on February 6, 1995. The proposed budget includes reductions in the level of funding for the Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA), the account used to fund cleanups at operating military bases and bases scheduled for closure this year, and increased funding for the Base Realignment and Closure Accounts (BRAC accounts), the accounts used to fund all closure activities, including environmental restoration activities, at closing military bases.

The proposed budget includes $1.622 billion for the DERA account, a reduction of $159 million in funding from last year's appropriation. (The amount appropriated for the DERA account last year was $400 million less than what President Clinton requested in his proposed budget for the 1995 fiscal year.) The proposed budget also includes an additional $965 million for the 1991 BRAC account and $2.15 billion for the 1993 BRAC account and initial funding for the 1995 BRAC account of $785 million. Unlike previous years, no minimum amount of funds in the BRAC accounts would be set aside for environmental restoration activities. *See, Cost of Complying with Environmental Laws at Federal Facilities Expected to be Issue in Budget and Superfund Debates, January 1995, for a description of the budget process and a list of the members of the Senate's and House of Representative's Committees on Appropriations.* The proposed budget also calls for appropriating funds for the 1997 fiscal year as part of this year's appropriations. Under the proposed budget, $127 million for the 1991 BRAC account, $809 million for the 1993 account, and $824 million for the 1995 BRAC account would be appropriated for the 1997 fiscal year.

ANSWERS TO FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

Q: What is the timetable for the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to review the Secretary of Defense's recommendations on which bases to close and realign and prepare and transmit its own recommendations to the President?

Date	Action
March 1, 1995	Last day for the Secretary of Defense to transmit a list of bases that he recommends for closure or realignment to the Commission and Congress
March 1 through June 30, 1995	Period of review, site visits by individual members of the Commission and the full Commission, and public hearings
Not less than 45 days before transmitting the Commission's report to the President	Last day for Commission to publish notice in the Federal Register that bases other than those listed by the Secretary will be **considered** for closure or realignment
July 1, 1995	Last day for the Commission to transmit its report and recommendations to the President
July 15, 1995	Last day for the President to approve or disapprove entire list
Forty-five legislative days after the President approves the Commission's recommendations and transmits his approval and the Commission's recommendations to Congress or adjournment of Congress *sine die*	Last day for Congress to enact a joint resolution "disapproving" the entire list

If the President disapproves the Commission's recommendations, the President will transmit his reasons for disapproving the recommendations to the Commission and Congress and the Commission will have until August 15, 1995, to submit a revised list of recommendations to the President. If the President does not approve any list of bases for closure or realignment by September 1, 1995, no bases will be closed or realigned this year.

Q: What standard will be used by the Commission in reviewing the Secretary's proposed list of base closures and realignments?

A: Under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended, the Secretary of Defense must prepare a force-structure plan for the Armed Forces based on an assessment of the probable threats to the national security during the next six years and the anticipated levels of funding that will be available for national defense during that same period. An unclassified

version of the force-structure plan should be available in March. In addition, the Secretary was also required to publish the criteria to be used in selecting bases for closure and realignment. The final selection criteria were published in the December 9, 1994, edition of the *Federal Register* and include the military value of the facility, the return on investment from closing or realigning the base, and the impacts, including environmental effects, of the closure or realignment on the existing and receiving communities. The Commission can make changes to the Secretary's recommendations only if it determines that the Secretary "deviated substantially" from the current force-structure plan and the eight final selection criteria in making his recommendations.

Q: Who can help me to schedule a visit with the Commission?

A: A visit can be scheduled with the Commission by contacting CeCe Carman, Director of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs. Ms. Carman's mailing address is Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, 1700 North Moore Street, Suite 1425, Arlington, VA 22209, and her telephone number is (703) 696-0504.

REPORTS AVAILABLE FROM THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

ollution Prevention: Status of DOD's Efforts (GAO/NSIAD-95-13). In this report, the GAO reports n (1) the efforts of the Department of Defense to collect and report on its inventories and releases of toxic substances, (2) what progress DOD has made in reducing hazardous substances, (3) what problems DOD faces in reducing the use of toxic chemicals, and (4) what DOD has done to incorporate pollution prevention in procurement and inventory processes. GAO concludes, while some progress has been made, DOD has much more to do to meet the requirements of Executive Order 12856

Environment Cleanup: Case Studies of Six High Priority DOD Installations (GAO/NSIAD-95-8). In April 1994, DOD was criticized by GAO in a report for spending too much money on studies and not enough on "moving dirt." This report follows up on the earlier report and studies six high priority sites: Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Fort Wainwright, McChord Air Force Base, McClellen Air Force Base, Pearl Harbor Naval Complex, and Schofield Barracks. The GAO discusses the status, cost, and other aspects of the restoration programs at these facilities.

A copy of any of these reports may be obtained free of charge by writing to the GAO at P.O. Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015 or faxing a request to (301) 358-4066 or by calling (202) 516-6000.

Printed on paper containing 50% recycled paper.

Copyright 1995 by the National Association of Attorneys General. (No copyright claimed for government works.)

Y BASE CLOSURE BULLETIN is published 10 times per year by the Environment Project of the National Association of Attorneys General. orth Capitol Street, Suite 339, Washington, D.C. 20001. MBCB is edited by Brian J. Zwit, Environment Counsel. Subscription rate: $75.00 per For subscription services, call (202) 434-8030.

ublication of MBCB is funded, in part, by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under cooperative agreement number CR-823591-01. The its of this bulletin do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency nor of the National Association rneys General, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
INSTALLATIONS LOGISTICS AND ENVIRONMENT
110 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0110

February 15, 1995

Please refer to this number when commenting: 950302-7

MEMORANDUM FOR PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE (INSTALLATIONS)

SUBJECT: Transfer of Land and Buildings to Department of the Army - Brooks Air Force Base, Texas

The U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) Command has an interest in a portion of the subject property should it become excess to the Air Force requirements. It would satisfy facilities requirements for USAR units in the San Antonio area.

Transfer of Air Force property would allow the Army Reserve to eliminate a costly lease, reduce the need for new programmed construction, and provide facilities necessary to enhance unit readiness at a significant savings to the Department of Defense. The Army Reserve would be able to cancel a lease with an annual cost savings of $218,655 and an FY 99 MILCON project with an estimated cost savings of $11,400,000.

The attached site plan of Brooks AFB has been annotated to indicate the land and buildings to be considered for transfer, including thirteen permanent buildings of 211,300 square feet and approximately 57 acres. These buildings satisfy Army Reserve space requirements of approximately 200,000 square feet.

Steve
We have
insure in file

Printed on Recycled Paper

If transfer of the property is supported, we will direct preparation and execution of the Form DD 1354 to effect the conveyance.

Paul W. Johnson
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Installations and Housing)
OASA(I,L&E)

Attachment

CF: Assistant Secretary of Defense for
Economic Security, ATTN: ASD(ES)
Director of the Army Staff,
ATTN: DAS-TAB (Col Jones)
Chief, Army Reserve,
ATTN: DAAR-EN (Mr. Porter)
Commander, Army Reserve Command
ATTN: AFRC-DCS-EN (LTC Ard),
AFRC-COE (Mr. Smith)

PARTIAL SITE PLAN, BROOKS AFB
SAN ANTONIO, TX
NOT TO SCALE



02-14-1995 09:45AM FROM TO 17036965371 P.02

SUBJECT: Transfer of Land and Buildings to Department of the Army - Brooks Air Force Base, Texas

The following language is recommended in the Air Force/DoD submittal to the Base Realignment and Closure Committee for BRAC 95;

> "The Air Force shall transfer the land and buildings to be vacated at Brooks AFB, San Antonio, Texas, to the Army for an Army Reserve Enclave."

See the attached memorandum from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (I&H) with related site plan for justification.

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

EXECUTIVE CORRESPONDENCE TRACKING SYSTEM (ECTS) # 950306-1

FROM: DEPTULA, DAVE	TO: GENERAL
TITLE: ISSUE TEAM LEADER	TITLE:
ORGANIZATION: CRMAF	ORGANIZATION: OBCRC
INSTALLATION (s) DISCUSSED:	

OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN	FYI	ACTION	INIT	COMMISSION MEMBERS	FYI	ACTION	INIT
CHAIRMAN DIXON							
STAFF DIRECTOR	✓						
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	✓						
GENERAL COUNSEL	✓						
MILITARY EXECUTIVE							
				COMMISSIONER			
DIR./CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON				COMMISSIONER			
DIR./COMMUNICATIONS				REVIEW AND ANALYSIS			
				DIRECTOR OF R & A	✓		
EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT				ARMY TEAM LEADER	✓		
				NAVY TEAM LEADER	✓		
DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION				AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER	✓		
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER				INTERAGENCY TEAM LEADER	✓		
DIRECTOR OF TRAVEL				CROSS SERVICE TEAM LEADER	✓		
DIR./INFORMATION SERVICES							

Frank f
go see Jeff
seems like the
wrong
commission?

TYPE OF ACTION REQUIRED

	Prepare Reply for Chairman's Signature		Prepare Reply for Commissioner's Signature
	Prepare Reply for Staff Director's Signature		Prepare Direct Response
	ACTION: Offer Comments and/or Suggestions	✓	FYI

Subject/Remarks:

CORRECTIONS TO DEEP ATTACK/PRECISION CONVENTIONAL STRIKE DRAFT ISSUE PAPER. SENT OVER MARCH 3.

Due Date:	Routing Date: 950306	Date Originated: 950305	Mail Date:

Please refer to this number when responding 950306-

Commission on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces
1100 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1200F
Arlington, Virginia 22209
(703) 696-4250/4229

MEMORANDUM FOR THE COMMISSIONERS 05 Mar 95

SUBJECT: Deep Attack/Precision Conventional Strike Draft Issue Paper

FROM: Colonel Dave Deptula, Issue Team Leader

1. An arithmetic error in one of the evaluation summary tables was discovered after this issue paper was sent you on 3 Mar 95. Please remove page 22 (first line reads, "c. Evaluation summary: Deep Attack/Precision Conventional Strike Systems..."), and replace with new page provided. Replace appendix B, pages 28-31, with new pages 28-30, and renumber following pages accordingly.

2. I apologize for this inconvenience.

cc: Mr. Michael Leonard

DRAFT

c. Evaluation summary: Deep Attack/Precision Conventional Strike Systems. The results of the subjective assessment of the options relative to the applicable criteria is presented in the following paragraphs. All assessments are relative to the baseline option (current plans and programs).

CRITERIA / OPTION	Cost (95$B) FYDP / 18YRS	Resp-onsive-ness	Robust-ness	Innov-ation	Comp-etition	Coop-eration	Effici-ency
Baseline	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fund PGMs	+1 to +5 / ?	+	++	++	0	+	++
Optimize Systems Considering RMA	-2 to -7 / -5 to -36	++	+	++	+	+	++
Cut Redundant Systems	-12 to -23 / -48 to -97	0	—	0	+	+	++
Perform Deep Attack COEA	?	0	0	+	+	0	0

NOTE: For this matrix Option 1=Baseline, Option 2=Fund PGMs, Option 3=Optimize Systems Considering RMA, Option 4=Cut Redundant Systems, Option 5=Perform Deep Attack COEA

1) Responsiveness: Option 2 and 3—provides more diverse precision capabilities, increases probability of current military strategy mission accomplishment. PGMs married with long-range, quick response platforms produce a formidable quick reaction force to address the early stages of contingencies both large and small without the need for proximate basing. Option 3—Increases reliability and capability in a range of mission areas—means increased speed of response and improved mission executability (i.e. ensure you will accomplish what you say you will with minimum casualties). Enable smaller, mobile highly effective fighting units. Allows rapid shift of force between/among theaters.

2) Robustness: Option 2—increased deployment to other tactical units, which includes Navy and USMC fighter units could provide broader and better capabilities. Vast decrease in the number of personnel exposed to enemy threat. Option 3—high marks because you add capabilities and

DRAFT

APPENDIX B: COSTING OF ILLUSTRATIVE OPTION ALTERNATIVES

The work of the aviation force structure group is currently on-going and not complete with respect to the Congressional taskings. The mix of force structure alternatives in the current paper were chosen for the purpose of illustrating potential of the higher order option. Other alternative mixes exist that would provide different, but most likely comparable, results.

The range of costs displayed in cases involving more than one system or choice associated with a particular alternative (carrier battle groups, B-2s, B-1s, F/A-18E/F) reflect the spread of sub-alternatives within that particular alternative from least costly to most costly. The intent is to identify the spectrum of costs associated with the spread of force structure adjustments that might accompany selection of a particular alternative. All costs are 1995 dollars rounded to nearest billion displayed as FYDP:18YR cost differentials.

Summary:

Example for Option B3—Optimize Systems Considering RMA:

Alternative	Low Sub-alternative*		High sub-alternative**	
Carrier/CVBG Reduction	-1 CV/CVW	**-4:-12**	-3 CVBG	**-14:-55**
B-2 Plus Up	+20 B-2s	**+10:22**	+55 B-2s	**+22:69**
F/A-18E/F	F/A-18C	**-8:-15**	Cancel	**-15:50**
FYDP Spread		**-2**		**-7**
18YR Spread		**-5**		**-36**

Example for Option B4—Cut Potentially Redundant Systems:

Alternative	Low Sub-alternative*		High sub-alternative**	
USMC F/A-18 Reduction	-10 SQDs	**-1:-15**	-10 SQDs	**-1:-15**
Terminate B-1B	Upgrade	**-2:-3**	Retire All	**-7:-26**
Cancel ATACMS Future Variants		**-1:-3**		**-1:-3**
Retire Carriers Excess to BUR War Rqmts	- 1 CV/CVW	**-4:-12**	-2 CVBG	**-10:-38**

Retire 144 A/OA-10s	-4:-15	-4:-15
FYDP Spread	**-6**	**-23**
18YR Spread	**-15**	**-97**

COSTING DATA: All costs were computed by IDA using the FACS model.

1. Removing Carriers from the Active Force

Reduce to a total of 11 carriers:

*Case A. –1 CV + Air Wing, Do not postpone CVN 77
FYDP 96–01 **–4**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–12**

Case B. –1 CV + Air Wing + BG + Postpone CVN77
FYDP 96–01 **–6**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–22**

Reduce to a total of 10 carriers:

Case C. –2 Cvs + Air Wings, Do not postpone CVN77
FYDP 96–01 **–7**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–23**

Case D. –2 Cvs + Air Wings + BGs + Postpone CVN77
FYDP 96–01 **–10**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–38**

Reduce to a total of 9 carriers:

Case E. –3 CVNs + Air Wings, Do not postpone CVN77
FYDP 96–01 **–10**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–36**

**Case F. –3 CVNs + Air Wings + BGs + Postpone CVN77
FYDP 96–01 **–14**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–55**

Air Wing include:			Battle Group (BG) Consists of two each:
	(14)	F–14D/F–18C	DD 963 Spruance Class
	(36)	F–18C/F–18F	DDG 51 Arleigh Burke Class
	(4)	E–2C	SSN 688 Los Angeles Class
	(8)	S–3B	CG 47 Ticonderoga Class
	(6)	SH–60/HH60	

DRAFT

2. Buy More B–2s	+20	+55
FYDP 96–01	+10*	+22
18 Yr. 96–13	+22	+69**

Note: FACS could not accommodate some of the unique costs associated with the B-2 program. Other costing techniques that incorporate all these costs are being used for B-2 estimates.

---

3. Cancel F–18E/F Buy (530 Aircraft)

**Case A. Cancel Program.
FYDP 96–01 **–15**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–50**

*Case B. Cancel program, but maintain force structure by buying F–18C/D one–for–one.

FYDP 96–01 **–8**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–15**

---

4. Remove (10) squadrons of Marine active and reserve F–18s. No replacement.

FYDP 96–01 **–1**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–15**

---

5. Cancel the B–1B Conventional Mission Upgrade Program (CMUP) or Retire all B–1Bs.

*Case A. Cancel the Conventional Mission Upgrade Program (CMUP).

FYDP 96–01 **–2**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–3**

**Case B. Retire the B–1B fleet.

FYDP 96–01 **–7**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–26**

---

6. Cancel Future Variants of ATACMS

FYDP 96–01 **–1**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–3**

---

7. Reduce 144 Air Force A–10/OA–10s

FYDP 96–01 **–4**
18 Yr. 96–13 **–15**

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 15, 1995

TO: Team Leads/Associate Analysts

FROM: Ty Trippet

RE: Matching the Cobra numbers to the Economic Impact Database (the Dave Henry database) numbers.

We need to make sure the "jobs lost/realigned" numbers from the Cobra runs for each installation match the appropriate numbers on the Economic Impact Database. I've attached a printout of the Economic Impact Database report for your team's installations. Please divide the Economic Impact Database sheets among your team members and have the appropriate analyst check the numbers on his/her installations. I have attached more specific instructions and a sample for your guidance.

If you or your team members have questions, contact me (Ext. 157), Dave Henry (Ext. 159), or Bob Bivins (Ext. 155). Please complete this by **COB Friday (Mar 17).**

Attachment

How to Match Numbers between Cobra and Economic Impact Database

Step 1

Make sure you have an Economic Impact Database datasheet for each of your installations.

Step 2

On the Economic Impact Database datasheet, add the numbers *across* from 1996 through 2001 for the following rows (DO NOT add the years 1994 & 1995):

Mil. Personnel Relocated (OUT)

Mil. Personnel Disestablished (OUT)

Civ. Pers. Relocated (OUT)

Civ. Pers. Disestablished (OUT)

Mil. Training Status (OUT)

See the attached sample.

Step 3

Compare the above totals with the first page of the Cobra run (titled "Cobra Realignment Summary"). The numbers on the Cobra sheet that you are looking for are under the "Positions eliminated" and the "Positions realigned" sections. ***See the attached sample.***

Step 4

If your numbers match, send an e-mail to Bob Bivins confirming that the numbers for your specific installations match.

If you have number problems, send an e-mail to Bob Bivins telling him the specific numbers and problems. Most of the problems you find will have a reasonable explanation.

COBRA REALIGNMENT SUMMARY (COBRA v5.08) - Page 1/2
Data As Of 09:31 09/29/1994, Report Created 15:07 03/11/1995

Department : ARMY
Option Package : MT3-2
Scenario File : C:\COBRA95\ARMY\MT3-2.CBR
Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA95\ARMY\SF7DEC.SFF

Starting Year : 1996
Final Year : 1998
ROI Year : 1999 (1 Year)

NPV in 2015($K): -477,856
1-Time Cost($K): 19,432

Fort Dix
New Jersey

COBRA Run Sheet

Net Costs ($K) Constant Dollars

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Total	Beyond
MilCon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Person	0	0	0	0	0	0	-56,056	-16,438
Overhd	1,676	1,257	-6,743	-16,438	-16,438	-16,438	-62,766	-21,832
Moving	0	0	-202	-21,832	-21,832	-21,832	5,802	0
Missio	0	0	5,802	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	854	0
TOTAL	1,676	1,257	-289	-38,270	-38,270	-38,270	-112,166	-38,270

POSITIONS ELIMINATED	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Total
Officers	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Enlisted	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Civ	0	0	383	0	0	0	383
TOT	0	0	390	0	0	0	390

POSITIONS REALIGNED							
Off	0	0	62	0	0	0	62
Enl	0	0	241	0	0	0	241
Stu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civ	0	0	46	0	0	0	46
TOT	0	0	349	0	0	0	349

1, 6 } =(B)
383 → =(D)
390

62, 241 } → =(A)
0 → =(F)
46 → =(C)
349

Summary:

Close Ft. Dix, N.J.
Move all Army organizations to Base X.
RIF civilians in Garrison not required to remain to support Army Reserve Garrison.
ENCLAVE ALL Tenant organizations.
ENCLAVE RC Bldg, land, ranges and organizations.

Match the COBRA letters with the E.I.D. letters

As of: 19:15 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

FORT DIX
New Jersey
MT3-2
ARMY
REALIGN - RELOCATE TO BASE -X

300	817	1509	5303	22
REALIGNING				

1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	
0	0	0	0	-303	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	-7	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	-46	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	-383	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Totals
-303 (A)
-7 (B)
-46 (C)
-383 (D)
0 (E) → Ignore Contractors
0 (F)

Ignore (INS)

Ignore '94 + '95

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 15, 1995

TO: Team Leads/Associate Analysts

FROM: Ty Trippet

RE: Matching the Cobra numbers to the Economic Impact Database (the Dave Henry database) numbers.

We need to make sure the "jobs lost/realigned" numbers from the Cobra runs for each installation match the appropriate numbers on the Economic Impact Database. I've attached a printout of the Economic Impact Database report for your team's installations. Please divide the Economic Impact Database sheets among your team members and have the appropriate analyst check the numbers on his/her installations. I have attached more specific instructions and a sample for your guidance.

If you or your team members have questions, contact me (Ext. 157), Dave Henry (Ext. 159), or Bob Bivins (Ext. 155). Please complete this by **COB Friday (Mar 17).**

Attachment

How to Match Numbers between Cobra and Economic Impact Database

Step 1

Make sure you have an Economic Impact Database datasheet for each of your installations.

Step 2

On the Economic Impact Database datasheet, add the numbers *across* from 1996 through 2001 for the following rows (DO NOT add the years 1994 & 1995):

Mil. Personnel Relocated (OUT)

Mil. Personnel Disestablished (OUT)

Civ. Pers. Relocated (OUT)

Civ. Pers. Disestablished (OUT)

Mil. Training Status (OUT)

See the attached sample.

Step 3

Compare the above totals with the first page of the Cobra run (titled "Cobra Realignment Summary"). The numbers on the Cobra sheet that you are looking for are under the "Positions eliminated" and the "Positions realigned" sections. ***See the attached sample.***

Step 4

If your numbers match, send an e-mail to Bob Bivins confirming that the numbers for your specific installations match.

If you have number problems, send an e-mail to Bob Bivins telling him the specific numbers and problems. Most of the problems you find will have a reasonable explanation.

COBRA REALIGNMENT SUMMARY (COBRA v5.08) - Page 1/2
Data As Of 09:31 09/29/1994, Report Created 15:07 03/11/1995

Department : ARMY
Option Package : MT3-2
Scenario File : C:\COBRA95\ARMY\MT3-2.CBR
Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA95\ARMY\SF7DEC.SFF

Starting Year : 1996
Final Year : 1998
ROI Year : 1999 (1 Year)

NPV in 2015($K): -477,856
1-Time Cost($K): 19,432

Fort Dix
New Jersey

COBRA Run Sheet

Net Costs ($K) Constant Dollars

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Total	Beyond
MilCon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Person	0	0	-6,743	-16,438	-16,438	-16,438	-56,056	-16,438
Overhd	1,676	1,257	-202	-21,832	-21,832	-21,832	-62,766	-21,832
Moving	0	0	5,802	0	0	0	5,802	0
Missio	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	854	0	0	0	854	0
TOTAL	1,676	1,257	-289	-38,270	-38,270	-38,270	-112,166	-38,270

POSITIONS ELIMINATED	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Total
Officers	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Enlisted	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Civ	0	0	383	0	0	0	383
TOT	0	0	390	0	0	0	390

POSITIONS REALIGNED							
Off	0	0	62	0	0	0	62
Enl	0	0	241	0	0	0	241
Stu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civ	0	0	46	0	0	0	46
TOT	0	0	349	0	0	0	349

1, 6 } → =(B)
383 → =(D)
390

62, 241 } → =(A)
0 → =(F)
46 → =(C)
349

Summary:

Close Ft. Dix, N.J.
Move all Army organizations to Base X.
RIF civilians in Garrison not required to remain to support Army Reserve Garrison.
ENCLAVE ALL Tenant organizations.
ENCLAVE RC Bldg, land, ranges and organizations.

Match the COBRA letters with the E.I.D. letters

of 19:15 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

FORT DIX
NEW JERSEY
MT3-2
ARMY
REALIGN - RELOCATE TO BASE -X
300 | 817 | 1509 | 5303 | 22
REALIGNING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
	0	0	0	0	-303	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	-7	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	-46	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	-383	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Totals
-303 (A)
-7 (B)
-46 (C)
-383 (D)
0 (E) → Ignore Contractors
0 (F)

Ignore (INS)

Ignore '94 + '95

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: March 15, 1995

TO: Team Leads/Associate Analysts

FROM: Ty Trippet

RE: Matching the Cobra numbers to the Economic Impact Database (the Dave Henry database) numbers.

We need to make sure the "jobs lost/realigned" numbers from the Cobra runs for each installation match the appropriate numbers on the Economic Impact Database. I've attached a printout of the Economic Impact Database report for your team's installations. Please divide the Economic Impact Database sheets among your team members and have the appropriate analyst check the numbers on his/her installations. I have attached more specific instructions and a sample for your guidance.

If you or your team members have questions, contact me (Ext. 157), Dave Henry (Ext. 159), or Bob Bivins (Ext. 155). Please complete this by **COB Friday (Mar 17).**

Attachment

How to Match Numbers between Cobra and Economic Impact Database

Step 1

Make sure you have an Economic Impact Database datasheet for each of your installations.

Step 2

On the Economic Impact Database datasheet, add the numbers *across* from 1996 through 2001 for the following rows (DO NOT add the years 1994 & 1995):

Mil. Personnel Relocated (OUT)

Mil. Personnel Disestablished (OUT)

Civ. Pers. Relocated (OUT)

Civ. Pers. Disestablished (OUT)

Mil. Training Status (OUT)

See the attached sample.

Step 3

Compare the above totals with the first page of the Cobra run (titled "Cobra Realignment Summary"). The numbers on the Cobra sheet that you are looking for are under the "Positions eliminated" and the "Positions realigned" sections. ***See the attached sample.***

Step 4

If your numbers match, send an e-mail to Bob Bivins confirming that the numbers for your specific installations match.

If you have number problems, send an e-mail to Bob Bivins telling him the specific numbers and problems. Most of the problems you find will have a reasonable explanation.

COBRA REALIGNMENT SUMMARY (COBRA v5.08) - Page 1/2
Data As Of 09:31 09/29/1994, Report Created 15:07 03/11/1995

Department : ARMY
Option Package : MT3-2
Scenario File : C:\COBRA95\ARMY\MT3-2.CBR
Std Fctrs File : C:\COBRA95\ARMY\SF7DEC.SFF

Starting Year : 1996
Final Year : 1998
ROI Year : 1999 (1 Year)

NPV in 2015($K): -477,856
1-Time Cost($K): 19,432

Fort Dix
New Jersey

COBRA Run Sheet

Net Costs ($K) Constant Dollars

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Total	Beyond
MilCon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Person	0	0	-6,743	-16,438	-16,438	-16,438	-56,056	-16,438
Overhd	1,676	1,257	-202	-21,832	-21,832	-21,832	-62,766	-21,832
Moving	0	0	5,802	0	0	0	5,802	0
Missio	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	854	0	0	0	854	0
TOTAL	1,676	1,257	-289	-38,270	-38,270	-38,270	-112,166	-38,270

POSITIONS ELIMINATED	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Total
Officers	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Enlisted	0	0	6	0	0	0	6
Civ	0	0	383	0	0	0	383
TOT	0	0	390	0	0	0	390

POSITIONS REALIGNED							
Off	0	0	62	0	0	0	62
Enl	0	0	241	0	0	0	241
Stu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civ	0	0	46	0	0	0	46
TOT	0	0	349	0	0	0	349

1 } =(B)
6
383 → =(D)

62 } → (A)
241
0 → =(F)
46 → =(C)
349

Summary:

Close Ft. Dix, N.J.
Move all Army organizations to Base X.
RIF civilians in Garrison not required to remain to support Army Reserve Garrison.
ENCLAVE ALL Tenant organizations.
ENCLAVE RC Bldg, land, ranges and organizations.

Match the COBRA letters with the E.I.D. letters

As of: 19:15 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: FORT DIX
State: New Jersey
Service: ARMY
Option Name: MT3-2
Comment: REALIGN - RELOCATE TO BASE -X
Action: REALIGNING
300 | 817 | 1509 | 5303 | 22

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	Totals	
	0	0	0	0	-303	0	0	0	-303	(A)
	0	0	0	0	-7	0	0	0	-7	(B)
	0	0	0	0	-46	0	0	0	-46	(C)
	0	0	0	0	-383	0	0	0	-383	(D)
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(E) → Ignore Contractors
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(F)
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Ignore (INS)

Ignore '94 + '95

As of: 07:56 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: NELLIS AFB

tate: Nevada Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Comment: IN FROM EGLIN AND KIRTLAND

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED Mil: 0 Civ: 0 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 783 Enl: 5418 Civ: 1093 Contr: 958 Train: 0

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	87	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	75	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 19:37 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: MOUNTAIN HOME AFB

State: Idaho Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Comment: INS FROM SHAW

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: 91

Action: REALIGNING Mil: 0 Civ: 0 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 368 Enl: 2903 Civ: 429 Contr: 293 Train: 0

Action:

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	123	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 19:36 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: MOUNTAIN HOME AFB

tate: Idaho Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Comment: INS FROM SHAW

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: 91

Action: REALIGNING Mil: 0 Civ: 0 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 368 Enl: 2903 Civ: 429 Contr: 293 Train: 0

Action:

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	123	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 19:35 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: MCCLELLAN AFB

tate: California | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: INS FROM MOFFETT AND GRIFFISS REDIRECT and Depot Actions

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: 93

Action: UNAFFECTED | Mil: 8 | Civ: 421 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 462 | Enl: 2245 | Civ: 9578 | Contr: 480 | Train: 0

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	134	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	244	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 19:30 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: LAUGHLIN AFB

tate: Texas | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: INS FROM REESE

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 188 | Enl: 527 | Civ: 1267 | Contr: 315 | Train: 162

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	69	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	137	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	386	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	60	0	0	0	0

As of: 19:29 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: LACKLAND AFB

tate: Texas | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: SCHOOLS FROM NAS PENSACOLA; INS FROM KIRTLAND

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: 93

Action: REALIGNING | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 1780 | Enl: 4554 | Civ: 2678 | Contr: 1282 | Train: 7991

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	3	47	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	190	0	0	0	0	0

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: KELLY AFB

tate: Texas Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Comment: DEPOT PLUS INS FROM KIRTLAND AFB PLUS INS FROM GRIFFISS

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: REALIGNING Mil: 0 Civ: 0 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 763 Enl: 3860 Civ: 12613 Contr: 815 Train: 0

Action: REALIGNING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	-44	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	-486	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	-25	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	408	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	308	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	60	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 19:27 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: HOLLOMAN AFB

tate: New Mexico Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Comment: IN FROM KIRTLAND

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED Mil: 0 Civ: 0 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 485 Enl: 3990 Civ: 1037 Contr: 984 Train: 0

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	1368	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	198	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	146	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 19:27 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: HILL AFB

tate: Utah Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Includes Redirects Comment: Ins from Depot Actions; Redirect of EIG Griffiss

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: REALIGNING Mil: 255 Civ: 332 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 613 Enl: 4196 Civ: 8510 Contr: 1358 Train: 0

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	-254	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	-333	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	237	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 19:26 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: HANSCOM AFB

tate: Massachussetts | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: INS FROM ROME LABS

Previous BRAC Actions: | Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 760 | Enl: 941 | Civ: 2206 | Contr: 2904 | Train: 0

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	506	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	79	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 19:08 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: DOBBINS ARB

tate: Georgia | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment:

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 1098 | Enl: 4444 | Civ: 1464 | Contr: 46 | Train: 0

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	52	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 18:59 14 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: COLUMBUS AFB

tate: Mississippi Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Comment:

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED Mil: 0 Civ: 0 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 226 Enl: 540 Civ: 234 Contr: 816 Train: 152

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	86	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	189	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:57 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: CARSWELL AFB

tate: Texas | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment:

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: 91

Action: REALIGNING | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 3 | Enl: 8 | Civ: 566 | Contr: 22 | Train: 0

Action:

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	94	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: ANDERSON AFB

tate: Guam | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: NAVY UNITS BEING MOVED OFF ISLAND TO MCD HAWAII, NORTH

Previous BRAC Actions: | Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 288 | Enl: 2297 | Civ: 516 | Contr: 12 | Train: 0

Action: REALIGNING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	-768	-418	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	-86	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 09:08 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE

tate: Utah Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Comment:

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED Mil: 0 Civ: 0 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 32 Enl: 42 Civ: 145 Contr: 0 Train: 0

Action: REALIGNING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	-35	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	-69	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:25 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: TYNDALL AFB

State: Florida | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: RECEIVE FROM BROOKS

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 688 | Enl: 3672 | Civ: 1038 | Contr: 473 | Train: 69

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	53	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	314	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:25 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: TRAVIS AFB

State: California | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: INS FROM KIRTLAND

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: 93

Action: REALIGNING | Mil: 1259 | Civ: 9 | Contr: 0 | Train: 21

BRAC95 Inputs:

Current Base Pers.: ff: 1278 | Enl: 7035 | Civ: 2043 | Contr: 474 | Train: 0

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 09:07 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: TINKER AFB

tate: Oklahoma | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: AIR FORCE DEPOT ACTIONS PLUS REDIRECT FROM GRIFFISS EIG

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: REALIGNING | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 1508 | Enl: 6913 | Civ: 12669 | Contr: 865 | Train: 0

Action: REALIGNING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	-19	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	-133	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	-980	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	-48	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	146	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	330	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:27 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: VANCE AFB

tate: Oklahoma Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Comment: INS FROM REESE

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED Mil: 0 Civ: 0 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 169 Enl: 383 Civ: 109 Contr: 1392 Train: 150

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	86	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	189	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:18 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: SHEPPARD AFB

tate: Texas | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: RECEIVE FROM REESE

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: 93

Action: UNAFFECTED | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 684 | Enl: 2817 | Civ: 1515 | Contr: 1370 | Train: 5476

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	60	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	135	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:18 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: SHAW AFB

State: South Carolina | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: OUT TO MOUNTAIN HOME

Previous BRAC Actions: | Year: 93

Action: REALIGNING | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 712 | Enl: 4458 | Civ: 584 | Contr: 149 | Train: 0

Action:

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	-123	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	-3	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:15 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: ROBINS AFB

State: Georgia Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Comment: AIR FORCE DEPOT ACTIONS

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: REALIGNING Mil: 0 Civ: 0 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

Current Base Pers: Mil: 725 Enl: 3086 Civ: 10901 Contr: 892 Train: 0

Action: REALIGNING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	-8	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	-118	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	-368	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	-40	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:12 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: PATRICK AFB

State: Florida | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: RETAINS PERSONNEL THAT SHOW AS OUTS AT HOMESTEAD

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: 93

Action: UNAFFECTED | Mil: 61 | Civ: 153 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

Current Base Pers.: Off: 402 | Enl: 1655 | Civ: 1118 | Contr: 1088 | Train: 0

Action: UNAFFECTED

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:11 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: OGDEN AIR LOGISTICS CENTER

tate: Utah | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment:

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: 93

Action: REALIGNING | Mil: 0 | Civ: 102 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 0 | Enl: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

Action:

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:30 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB

State: Ohio Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: Comment: INS FROM NBIODYNLAB

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: 93

Action: REALIGNING Mil: 9 Civ: 44 Contr: 0 Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

Current Base Pers.: Off: 3170 Enl: 3062 Civ: 13156 Contr: 2845 Train: 0

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	2	1013	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	980	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	253	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	300	0	0	0	0

As of: 08:21 15 March 1995

ECONOMIC IMPACT DATABASE

Installation: STEWART IAP AGS

tate: New York | Service: AIR FORCE

Report Note: | Comment: FROM ROSLYN, PER L.S., 2/15

Previous BRAC Actions: Year: N/A

Action: UNAFFECTED | Mil: 0 | Civ: 0 | Contr: 0 | Train: 0

BRAC95 Inputs:

urrent Base Pers.: ff: 205 | Enl: 210 | Civ: 405 | Contr: 85 | Train: 0

Action: RECEIVING

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Military Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Relocated (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian Pers. Disestablished (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (OUT)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0
Civilian Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	36	0	0	0	0
Contractor Personnel (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Training Status (IN)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

BASE VISIT SCHEDULE ANNOUNCED BY COMMISSION

54 Bases To Be Visited

Washington, DC, March 20, 1995 -- The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission announced its schedule for visits to bases being considered for realignment and closure.

Fifty-four major installations proposed for closure or realignment are currently scheduled to receive a base visit by one or more Commissioners. Base visits provide an opportunity for Commissioners to view a base directly and to investigate first-hand many of the issues related to that base. The Base Public Affairs Officer should be contacted for visit specifics.

All dates are subject to change. Interested persons should contact the Commission prior to visits for confirmation of dates and Commissioners attending the visit.

Scheduled visits as of today:

March 22 -- Fort McClellan, AL
March 23 -- Robins AFB, GA
March 24 -- Defense Distribution Depot, TN
MacDill AFB, FL
Ft. Ritchie, MD
Letterkenny, PA
March 27 -- Fort Leonard Wood, MO
NSWC Annapolis, MD
NSWC White Oak, MD
March 28 -- Guam Installations
ATCOM, MO
Fort Pickett, VA
Price Support Center, IL
March 29 -- Guam Installations
March 30 -- Minot AFB, ND
Grand Forks AFB, ND
March 31 -- Malmstrom AFB, MT

April 3 -- NAS Meridian, MS
Tinker AFB, OK
April 5 -- Reese AFB, TX
Rome Lab, NY
Griffiss AFB, NY
Seneca Army Depot, NY
April 6 -- NSWC Louisville, KY
Red River Army Depot, TX
Brooks AFB, TX
Bergstrom AFB, TX
April 7 -- Defense Supply Center Philadelphia, PA
NCCOSC Warminster, PA
Selfridge Army Garrison, MI
Detroit Arsenal, MI
April 10 -- Pittsburgh Air Reserve Station, PA
Fort Indiantown Gap, PA
NAWC Indianapolis, IN

April 11 -- Defense Distribution Depot
Columbus, OH
Dugway Proving Ground, UT
Defense Distribution Depot
Ogden, UT
Fort Chaffee, AR
Savanna Depot, IL

April 13 -- Fitzsimons AMC, CO
NAS South Weymouth, MA

April 18 -- Kirtland AFB, NM

April 24 -- Fort Greely, AK

April 25 -- Sierra Army Depot, CA

April 26 -- Fort Hunter Liggett, CA
Onizuka Air Station, CA
Moffett Air Guard Station, CA

April 27 -- Long Beach Ship Yard, CA

April 28 -- Fort Buchanan, PR

May 1 -- NUWC New London, CT
Stratford Engine Plant, CT

May 2 -- Bayonne MOT, NJ

May 3 -- Fort Dix, NJ
NAWC Lakehurst, NJ

The Commission's regional hearing schedule, announced March 10, is as follows:

March 29	Guam
March 30	Grand Forks, North Dakota
March 31	Great Falls, Montana
April 4	Birmingham, Alabama
April 12	Chicago, Illinois
April 19	Dallas, Texas
April 20	Albuquerque, New Mexico
April 24	Delta Junction, Alaska
April 28-29	San Francisco, California
May 4	Baltimore, Maryland
May 5	New York City

30

- To Air Force Team - Using this sheet (by Wayne) and "Section D" of R&A hand book - start preparing for Base Visits - Hopefully release of Dates/Times will be today

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION (DBCRC)

INSTALLATION VISITS

3/16

At least one member of the 1995 DBCRC will visit each of the major installations recommended for closure or realignment by the Secretary of Defense. The primary purpose of these visits is to assess firsthand the base's military value. Each installation visit is unique in its own way, and there is reasonable latitude within the limited time Commission personnel have for on-sight investigation of pertinent issues. Please use the following checklist as a planning "tickler" or menu of suggestions:

1. Expect at least one (1) Commissioner and one (1) staff member. Usually the staff member will arrive one day in advance for informal staff coordination and to provide assistance as desired for the Commissioners visit the next day.

2. Expect only about half a day, give or take, for the Commissioner's visit. The Commissioner will basically be in "receive mode" to look, listen, and learn as part of the independent process to investigate the issues critical to your base and its mission. Here's what past experience has shown works pretty well as a notional itinerary:

a. Airport pickup and transportation to the base.

b. Arrival of DBCRC personnel at installation.

c. 15 minutes max press/media availability. Your public-affairs office can easily handle setup for this. You might have him/her contact Wade Nelson, Chuck Pizer, or John Earnhardt in our Communications Department, DSN 226-0504 or commercial (703) 696-0504.

d. Mission/function briefing at installation conference facility/commander's office. Potential attendees: installation leadership, state elected officials, downtown leadership (Mayor/city council/"save-the-base" committee spokespersons/etc.). Written materials will be placed in our library, which is available to the public, and information therein will be considered during our analyses.

e. Brief community presentation. As a reminder, the primary purpose of the visit is to assess military value. However, community leaders or groups may want time to present their case. Again, we accept all documents for our analyses.

e. Windshield/walking tour of installation/key areas.

f. Transportation back to airport.

3. Depending upon arrival/departure times, a working breakfast or lunch may be appropriate . If you decide to go this route, something simple like coffee, juice, pastries, sandwiches, soft drinks, etc., is all that is expected. We pay our own way in this area.

4. Please do not hesitate to call if you have any question or doubt about any aspect of the visit. There are no dumb questions or details too small! Contact Col. Wayne Purser, USAF, Military Assistant, through our main phone number DSN 226-0504 or commercial (703) 696-0504, seven days a week until July 1.

ID	BASE	ST	ACTION	LEAD TEAM	2ND TEAM	3RD TEAM	AF ANALYST	LEAD ANALYST	CATEGORY
2	NORTH HIGHLANDS AGS	CA	CLOSE	AF			CRAIG		ANG
3	ONTARIO IAP, AGS	CA	CLOSE	AF			CRAIG		ANG
5	ROSLYN AGS	NY	CLOSE	AF			CRAIG		ANG
6	SPRINGFLD-BECKLEY MAP, AGS	OH	CLOSE	AF			CRAIG		ANG
1	BROOKS AFB	TX	CLOSE	X-SVC	AF		CRAIG	DICK	LAB
20	MOFFETT FED AIRFIELD AGS	CA	CLOSE	AF			CRAIG		ANG
13	ROBINS AFB	GA	REALIGN	X-SVC	AF		DAVE	GLENN	DEPOT
10	MCCLELLAN AFB	CA	REALIGN	X-SVC	AF		DAVE	GLENN	DEPOT
18	KELLY AFB	TX	REALIGN	X-SVC	AF		DAVE	GLENN	DEPOT
17	TINKER AFB	OK	REALIGN	X-SVC	AF		DAVE	GLENN	DEPOT
19	HILL AFB (2)	UT	REALIGN	X-SVC	AF		DAVE/FRANK	GLENN/LES	DEPOT/T&E
28	MINOT AFB	ND	REALIGN	AF			DAVE/FRANK		LAC/MSL
14	MALMSTROM AFB	MT	REALIGN	AF			DAVE/RICK		LAC/MSL
16	GRAND FORKS AFB	ND	REALIGN	AF			DAVE/RICK		LAC/MSL
4	ROME LABORATORY (GRIFFISS)	NY	CLOSE	X-SVC	AF	ARMY	FRANK	DICK	LAB
27	GRIFFISS AFB (2) (ROME LAB)	NY	REDIRECT	X-SVC	AF	ARMY	FRANK	DICK	REDIRECT
15	KIRTLAND AFB	NM	REALIGN	AF	X-SVC/IA		FRANK/MARK	LES	LABS
11	ONIZUKA AS (MOFFETT)	CA	REALIGN	AF			MARK		SPACE
23	WILLIAMS AFB	AZ	REDIRECT	X-SVC	AF		MARK		T&E
24	LOWRY AFB	CO	REDIRECT	AF			MARK		SPACE
8	BERGSTROM ARB	TX	CLOSE	AF		NAVY	MERRILL		AFRES
25	HOMESTEAD AFB (2)	FL	REDIRECT	AF			MERRILL		AFRES
9	REESE AFB	TX	CLOSE	AF	NAVY		MERRILL/MARK		UPT
7	GR. PITTSBURGH IAP, ARS	PA	CLOSE	AF			RICK		AFRES
26	MACDILL AFB	FL	REDIRECT	AF			RICK		ADMIN
12	EGLIN AFB	FL	REALIGN	X-SVC	AF		RICK	LES	T&E
21	REDCAP	NY	REALIGN	AF	X-SVC		STEVE	STEVE	T&E
22	AF EW EVAL SIMULATOR	TX	CLOSE	X-SVC	AF		STEVE	LES	T&E

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

For Immediate Release

Contact: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

BASE CLOSURE COMMISSION ANNOUNCES REGIONAL HEARING SCHEDULE

Eleven regional hearings to be held between March 29 and May 5

WASHINGTON, DC, March 10, 1995 -- The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission is announcing its schedule of 11 regional hearings to be held around the country. The purpose of these Regional Hearings is to receive testimony from communities affected by the Secretary of Defense's recommendations to close or realign domestic military installations.

Today's announcement includes the dates and the cities the hearings will be held. Specific times and locations will be announced shortly.

The list of hearings:

March 29	Guam
March 30	Grand Forks, North Dakota
March 31	Great Falls, Montana
April 4	Birmingham, Alabama
April 12	Chicago, Illinois
April 19	Dallas, Texas
April 20	Albuquerque, New Mexico
April 24	Delta Junction, Alaska
April 28-29	San Francisco, California
May 4	Baltimore, Maryland
May 5	New York City

Here is the list of which installations fall under which regional hearing:

March 29 (Location: Territory of Guam)
Regional hearing regarding the following installations:
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Guam
Naval Air Station Agana Guam
Naval Activities Guam
Ship Repair Facility Guam

March 30 (Location: Grand Forks ND)
Regional hearing regarding the following installations:

Grand Forks Air Force Base ND
Minot Air Force Base ND

March 31 (Location: Great Falls MT)
Regional hearing regarding the following installations:

Fort Missoula MT
Malmstrom Air Force Base MT

April 4 (Location: Birmingham AL)
Regional hearing regarding the following installations:

Anniston Army Depot Al
Fort McClellan AL
Reserve Center Huntsville AL
Big Coppet Key FL
Eglin Air Force Base FL
Homestead Air Force Base FL
MacDill Air Force Base FL
Naval Air Station Cecil Field FL
Naval Air Station Key West FL
Naval Aviation Depot Pensacola FL
Naval Research Lab & Naval Underwater Sound Reference Detachment FL
Naval Training Center Orlando FL
Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center Orlando FL
Defense Contract Management District South Marietta GA
Robins Air Force Base GA
Naval Biodynamics Lab New Orleans LA
Reserve Center New Orleans (Region 10) LA
Naval Technical Training Center Meridian MS
Naval Air Station Meridian MS
Fort Buchanan Puerto Rico
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Charleston SC
Reserve Center Charlestown (Region 7) SC
Defense Distribution Depot Memphis TN

April 12 (Location: Chicago IL)
Regional hearing regarding the following installations:

Charles Melvin Price Support Center IL
Savanna Army Depot Activity IL
Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division Indianapolis IN
Reserve Center Olathe KS
Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane Division Detachment Louisville KY
Detroit Arsenal MI
Naval Air Facility Detroit MI
Reserve Center Cadillac MI
Selfridge Army Garrision MI
Aviation-Troop Command (ATCOM) MO
Defense Contract Management Command International OH
Defense Distribution Depot Columbus OH
Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station OH
Reserve Center Sheboygan WI

April 19 (Location: Dallas TX)
Regional hearing regarding the following installations:

Fort Chaffee AR
Tinker Air Force Base OK
Bergstrom Air Reserve Base TX
Brooks Air Force Base TX
Defense Distribution Depot Red River TX
Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator Activity Fort Worth TX
Kelly Air Force Base TX
Naval Air Station Corpus Christi TX
Red River Army Depot TX
Reese Air Force Base TX
Reserve Center Laredo TX

April 20 (Location: Albuquerque NM)
Regional hearing regarding the following installations:

Williams Air Force Base AZ
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center CO
Lowry Air Force Base CO
Kirtland Air Force Base NM
Defense Distribution Depot Ogden UT
Dugway Proving Ground UT
Hill Air Force Base UT

April 24 (Location: Delta Junction AK)
Regional hearing regarding the following installations:

Fort Greely AK
Naval Air Facility Adak AK

April 28-29 (Location: San Francisco CA)

Regional hearing regarding the following installations:

Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks CA
Camp Bonneville WA
Defense Contract Management District West El Segundo CA
East Fort Baker CA
Fort Hunter Liggett CA
Marine Corps Air Station El Toro CA
Marine Corps Air Station Tustin CA
McClellan Air Force Base CA
Moffett Federal Airfield Air Guard Station CA
Naval Command Control and Ocean Surveillance Center San Diego CA
Naval Health Research Center San Diego CA
Naval Personnel Research & Developmet Center San Diego CA
Naval Recruiting District San Diego CA
Naval Ship Yard Long Beach CA
Naval Training Center San Diego CA
North Highlands Air Guard Station CA
Onizuka Air Station CA
Ontario International Airport Air Guard Station CA
Reserve Center Pomona CA
Reserve Center Santa Ana Irvine CA
Reserve Center Stockton CA
Rio Vista Army Reserve Center CA
Sierra Army Depot CA
Supervisor of Shipbuilding Conversion and Repair Long Beach CA
Naval Air Station Barbers Point HI
Naval Undersea Warfare Center Keyport WA

May 4 (Location: Baltimore MD)

Regional hearing regarding the following installations:

Naval Recruiting Command DC
Naval Security Group Command Detachment Potomac DC
Army Bio-Medical Research Lab, Fort Detrick MD
Concepts Analysis Agency MD
Fort Meade MD
Fort Ritchie MD
Investigations Control and Automation Directorate Fort Holabird MD
Naval Medical Research Institute Bethesda MD
Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division Detachment Annapolis MD
Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren Division Detachment White Oak MD
Publications Distribution Center Baltimore MD
Recreation Center #2 NC
Charles E. Kelly Support Center PA
Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny PA
Defense Industrial Supply Center Philadelphia PA
Fort Indiantown Gap PA

Greater Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station PA
Naval Command Control and Ocean Surveillance Center Warminster PA
Naval Aviation Engineering Support Unit Philadelphia PA
Naval Air Technical Services Facility Philadelphia PA
Letterkenny Army Depot PA
Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Div Open Water Test Facililty Oreland PA
Naval Shipyard Norfolk Detachment Philadelphia PA
Fort Lee VA
Fort Pickett VA
Information Systems Software Command (ISSC) VA
Naval Command Control and Ocean Surveillance Center In-Service Engineering East Coast Detachment Norfolk VA
Naval Information Systems Management Center Arlington VA
Naval Management Systems Support Office Chesapeake VA
Naval Sea Systems Command Arlington VA
Office of Naval Research Arlington VA
Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command Arlington VA
Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity WV

May 5 (Location: New York City)
Regional hearing regarding the following installations:

Naval Undersea Warfare Center Newport Division New London CT
Hingham Cohasset MA
Naval Air Station South Weymouth MA
Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal NJ
Bellmore Logistics Activity NJ
Camp Kilmer NJ
Camp Pedricktown NJ
Caven Point Reserve Center NJ
Fort Dix NJ
Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division Lakehurst NJ
Fort Hamilton NY
Fort Totten NY
Griffiss Air Force Base NY
Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor Activity Buffalo NY
Reserve Center Staten Island NY
Rome Laboratory NY
Roslyn Air Guard Station NY
Seneca Army Deport NY
Stratford Army Engine Plant CT
Sudbury Training Annex NY

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: Please call the Commission to confirm dates, times, and locations prior to each event. Individuals needing special assistance should contact the Commission in advance of each event to facilitate their requirements.

###

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Regional Hearing Locations
March 29 - May 5, 1995



11 Regional Hearing Sites

NAAG

STAFF
interesting edition

PRESIDENT
Charles W. Burson
Attorney General of Tennessee

PRESIDENT-ELECT
Tom Udall
Attorney General of New Mexico

VICE PRESIDENT
Scott Harshbarger
Attorney General of Massachusetts

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT
Hubert H. Humphrey III
Attorney General of Minnesota

MILITARY BASE CLOSURI BULLETIN

Frank Cirillo
Air Force Team Leader
Defense Base Closure and Realignment
Commission
700 North Moore Street Suite 1425
Arlington VA 22209

MARCH 1995

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDS CLOSING 33 MAJOR MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND REALIGNING 26 OTHERS TO SUPPORT SMALLER MILITARY

Secretary of Defense William Perry recommended on February 28, 1995, that 33 major military bases be closed and 26 others be realigned to support a smaller, post-Cold War military force. In addition, the Secretary recommended closing, realigning, disestablishing, or relocating 60 activities and smaller bases and changing 27 previously approved recommendations. A list of the major bases recommended for closure or realignment by the Secretary is included in this issue of the *Bulletin* as an insert. Nine of the major bases recommended for closure and seven of the major bases recommended for realignment are on the National Priorities List (NPL).

These base closures will be in addition to the other bases already closed or realigned or scheduled to be closed or realigned under the 1988, 1991, and 1993 rounds of closures and realignments. "These recommendations, though painful, are necessary to achieve the levels of readiness and modernization we need within the budget we have," said Secretary Perry. "Our armed forces and our budget have been cut by one-third or more, but our infrastructure only about half that. Today's recommendations will save the taxpayers and [DOD] some $18 billion over the next two decades." *See Table 1 for the net savings and job related impacts of the 1995 and previous rounds of base closures.* The 1995 closures will, based on Pentagon figures, cost less than the 1993 closures and will generate more savings than the 1993 closures.

During a hearing of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission held on March 1, 1995, to receive the Secretary's recommendations, Secretary Perry also indicated that DOD would need to close even more bases in the future and called for at least one additional round of closures in 4 years. These additional base closures, according to Secretary Perry, are needed because (1) DOD will continue to have excess infrastructure even after the 1995 recommendations are implemented; (2) DOD needs time to absorb current closures; and (3) future threats might justify additional closures or realignments of the force structure.

In addition to the March 1 hearing, the Commission held a series of hearings in Washington, DC, on the justifications for closing the bases, funding for closure activities, and environmental problems at the bases recommended for closure or realignment. The Commission will also be holding eleven regional hearings throughout the country during April and May to receive testimony from the communities affected by the Secretary's recommendations. *A list of the regional hearings is on page 4.*

By July 1, 1995, the Commission will complete its review of the Secretary's recommendations and send a final list to President Clinton for his approval. The President will have until July 15 to approve or disapprove the entire list. If the President rejects the list, the Commission will revise and submit another list to the President by August 15. If the President does not approve the revised list by September 1, 1995, the base closure process terminates this year. If the first list or a revised list is approved by the President,

Congress can block the closures only by passing a joint resolution, subject to veto, disapproving the whole list.

BRAC '95	Closure Costs	FY 96 $ Billions* Annual Savings	Total Savings	Net Direct Civilian Job Loss (000s)
Army	$ 1.1	$ 0.7	$ 6.8	14.5
Navy	1.2	0.6	7.4	10.7
Air Force	1.1	0.4	3.1	6.1
Agencies	0.4	0.1	1.1	2.9
Total	3.8	1.8	18.4	34.2
BRAC '93	6.9	1.9	15.7	42.3
BRAC '91	4.0	1.6	15.8	27.9
BRAC '88	2.2	0.7	6.8	11.9

* The net savings figures exclude the costs of environmental cleanup at the bases and revenues from land sales and represent the savings over 20 years, discounted to their present value at 4.2 %.

Table 1: The savings and job related impacts of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 base closures.

PRESIDENT CLINTON NOMINATES AND SENATE CONFIRMS ALL THE NOMINEES TO THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

President Clinton nominated Josue Robles, Jr., for the last open position on the Defense Closure and Realignment Commission on February 28, 1995. President Clinton had nominated six others to serve on the Commission earlier in February. *See President Clinton Nominates Six to Serve on the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission in the February Bulletin.* Mr. Robles is currently senior vice president, chief financial officer, and corporate controller for USAA Financial Services. Mr. Robles is also a 28-year veteran of the U.S. Army. His last served as Commanding General of the 1st Mechanized Infantry Division at Fort Riley, Kansas.

On March 2, 1995, the U.S. Senate confirmed Mr. Robles and the other nominees to the Commission. The commissioners were sworn in shortly after their confirmation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE VOTE TO RESCIND A PORTION OF THE FUNDING FOR CLEANUPS AT OPERATING DOD FACILITIES

The U.S. House of Representatives, on February 22, 1995, voted to rescind $150 million of the funds appropriated for the 1995 fiscal year for the Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA), the account which funds environmental compliance and restoration activities at operating bases. The U.S. Senate, voting on the House bill on March 16, 1995, voted to rescind $300 million from the DERA account. The actions in both the House and Senate were taken as part of a supplemental appropriations bill for the Department of Defense (DOD) to cover the costs of unplanned military operations during the 1995 fiscal year, including the occupation of Haiti and the deployment of troops to the Persian Gulf to counter Iraqi troops along the border of Kuwait. A conference committee has been appointed to resolve the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill.

MAJOR DOMESTIC MILITARY INSTALLATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE*

Major Bases Recommended for Closure

(closures which will result in a loss of 300 or more civilian and/or military jobs)

Army

Fort McClellan, Alabama
Fort Chaffee, Arkansas
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado
Price Support Center, Illinois
Savanna Army Depot Activity, Illinois**
Fort Ritchie, Maryland
Selfridge Army Garrison, Michigan
Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey
Seneca Army Depot, New York**
Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania
Red River Army Depot, Texas
Fort Pickett, Virginia

Navy

Naval Air Facility, Adak, Alaska**
Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California
Ship Repair Facility, Guam
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis, Indiana
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division Detachment, Louisville, Kentucky
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division Detachment, White Oak, Maryland
Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts**
Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Lakehurst, New Jersey**
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Warminster, Pennsylvania**

Air Force

North Highlands Air Guard Station, California
Ontario IAP Air Guard Station, California
Rome Laboratory, Rome, New York**
Roslyn Air Guard Station, New York
Springfield-Beckley MAP, Air Guard Station, Ohio

---

* Pursuant to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, P.L. 101-510 as amended, the Secretary of Defense's recommendations, including the 87 activities and smaller bases recommended for closure, realignment, or termination, and the justification, return on investment, and impact of each closure or realignment were published in the Federal Register on March 1, 1995. *See* 58 FED. REG. 11439-11607 (March 1, 1995).

** Facility is currently listed on the National Priorities List (NPL) of hazardous waste sites targeted for remediation by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The Rome Laboratory, Rome, New York, is not listed by name on the NPL, but the Griffiss Air Force Base, which the Laboratory is a part of, is listed.

Greater Pittsburgh IAP Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania
Bergstrom Air Reserve Base, Texas
Brooks Air Force Base, Texas
Reese Air Force Base, Texas

Defense Logistics Agency

Defense Distribution Depot, Memphis, Tennessee**
Defense Distribution Depot, Ogden, Utah**

Major Base Realignments

(realignments which will result in a loss of 300 or more civilian and/or military jobs)

Army

Fort Greely, Alaska
Fort Hunter Liggett, California
Sierra Army Depot, California
Fort Meade, Maryland
Detroit Arsenal, Michigan
Fort Dix, New Jersey**
Fort Hamilton, New York
Charles E. Kelly Support Center, Pennsylvania
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania**
Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah
Fort Lee, Virginia

Navy

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida
Naval Activities, Guam
Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas
Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Keyport, Washington**

Air Force

McClellan Air Force Base, California** ***
Onizuka Air Station, California
Eglin Air Force Base, Florida
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia** ***
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma** ***
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas***
Hill Air Force Base, Utah** ***

*** Various functions at the Air Logistics Centers at McClellan AFB, Robins AFB, Tinker AFB, Kelly AFB, and Hill AFB were recommended for consolidation to reduce excess depot maintenance capacity.

In September 1994, Congress appropriated nearly $1.8 billion to the DERA account for the 1995 fiscal year. The DERA account is used to fund environmental compliance and restoration activities at operating military facilities. President Clinton had requested about $2.2 billion, an additional $400 million. DOD, assuming the rescission bill becomes law, expects insufficient funding will be available this year to perform environmental restoration activities with a low or medium priority. Furthermore, some high priority projects might also be affected by a rescission. Some activities at closing military bases are also funded from the DERA account. However, an amendment to the Senate version of the bill would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from taking into account the rescission in obligating funds at closing military facilities.

NAAG TO HOST SEMINAR ON ENVIRONMENTAL AND PROPERTY TRANSFER ISSUES AT CLOSING MILITARY BASES

The National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) will host a seminar, with the cooperation of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), focusing on the environmental and land transfer issues at closing military bases in the United States on May 10, 11, and 12, 1995. The seminar will be held in Boston, Massachusetts, and at Fort Devens, a closing U.S. Army base located outside of Boston.

The seminar was designed specifically for attorneys in the offices of the Attorneys General and state regulatory agencies. The agenda includes discussions of long-term lease issues, property transfer issues such as reverter clauses and public benefit and economic development transfers, Restoration Advisory Boards (also known as RABs), screening procedures for homeless providers, Superfund reauthorization, and indemnification. The highlight of the seminar will be a tour of Fort Devens and discussions with the base commander, reuse authority, and EPA and Massachusetts regulatory officials.

The seminar is open to attorneys from the offices of the Attorneys General and state regulatory agencies. For registration information, please call Tina Morgan at (202) 434-8024. **The deadline for registering for the seminar is Friday, April 21, 1995.**

REPORTS AVAILABLE FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE AND GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Cleaning Up Defense Installations: Issues and Options The Congressional Budget Office (CBO), in this paper, describes the progress made by the Department of Defense (DOD) in cleaning up its facilities and examines the cost and budget history of the cleanups. The paper also discusses current issues affecting the implementation of remediation activities by DOD. CBO recommends, among other things, that DOD (1) establish priorities for cleanup, rank all contaminated sites on defense installations and formerly used defense site (FUDS), and give priority to those sites which pose the greatest risk to public health and the environment; (2) delay the most difficult and expensive remediation activities at sites that do not pose an immediate danger to public health and safety; and (3) employ more cost efficient technologies. CBO also recommends that Congress consider legislation that would allow DOD and the federal and state regulatory agencies to use more flexible standards or adopt less restrictive standards on a generic basis for various types of contaminants.

Military Bases: Environmental Impact at Closing Installations (GAO/NSIAD-95-70) In this report, the GAO reviews the (1) cleanup costs, transferability, and reuse of property by nonfederal users and (2) progress, difficulties, and plans to address environmental problems at closing bases. The GAO concludes that (1) the Department of Defense's cost estimates have historically been low and continue to be low, (2) environmental issues have held up the reuse of some property, (3) DOD has made limited cleanup progress, and (4) impediments remain to quick cleanups.

A copy of the CBO paper is available from NAAG by faxing a request, which includes your name, mailing address, and telephone number, to Tina Morgan at (202) 434-8058. A copy of the GAO report may be obtained free of charge by writing to the GAO at P.O. Box 6015, Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015 or faxing a request to (301) 258-4066 or by calling (202) 512-6000.

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION REGIONAL HEARING SCHEDULE

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission will be holding 11 regional hearings between March 29, 1995, and May 5, 1995. The purpose of the regional hearings is to receive testimony from the communities affected by the Secretary of Defense's recommendations to close or realign military bases, and the subject of each hearing will be the bases proposed for closure or realignment within the general area of the hearing. The dates and locations of the hearings are as follows:

March 29, 1995	Guam
March 30, 1995	Grand Forks, North Dakota
March 31, 1995	Great Falls, Montana
April 4, 1995	Birmingham, Alabama
April 12, 1995	Chicago, Illinois
April 19, 1995	Dallas, Texas
April 20, 1995	Albuquerque, New Mexico
April 24, 1995	Delta Junction, Alaska
April 28-29, 1995	San Francisco, California
May 4, 1995	Baltimore, Maryland
May 5, 1995	New York, New York

The times and specific locations of the hearings are not available yet. That information should be available shortly from the Commission and may be obtained from Howard L. "Chip" Walgren, Manager, State and Local Liaison, at (703) 696-0504. **Regardless of when you last spoke with the Commission, it is highly recommended that you confirm the date, time, and specific location of any hearing no more than a day or two before it is scheduled.** A copy of the news release listing the hearings and which bases on the Secretary's list of proposed closures and realignments will be covered by which regional hearing is available from the National Association of Attorneys General by telecopying a request for the release to Tina Morgan at (202) 434-8058. Please include your name, title, organization, and facsimile number in your request.

Printed on paper containing 50% recycled paper.
Copyright 1995 by the National Association of Attorneys General. (No copyright claimed for government works.)

MILITARY BASE CLOSURE BULLETIN is published 10 times per year by the Environment Project of the National Association of Attorneys General 444 North Capitol Street, Suite 339, Washington, D.C. 20001. MBCB is edited by Brian J. Zwit, Environment Counsel. Subscription rate: $75.00 per year. For subscription services, call (202) 434-8030.

The publication of MBCB is funded, in part, by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under cooperative agreement number CR-823591-01. The contents of this bulletin do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency nor of the National Association of Attorneys General, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

ALAN J. DIXON, CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONERS:
AL CORNELLA
REBECCA COX
GEN J. B. DAVIS, USAF (RET)
S. LEE KLING
RADM BENJAMIN F. MONTOYA, USN (RET)
MG JOSUE ROBLES, JR., USA (RET)
WENDI LOUISE STEELE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

April 11, 1995, Washington, DC -- The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission will hold a public hearing on April 17, 1995 starting at 8:00 AM in the Hart Senate Office Building, Room 216.

At this hearing, the Commission will hear testimony from the General Accounting Office (GAO), as required by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. The Commission is scheduled to receive GAO's report on the Department of Defense's recommendations on April 15.

The Commission will also hear testimony from the Department of Defense's Joint Cross Service Groups -- Depot Maintenance, Undergraduate Pilot Training, Medical, Labs, and Test and Evaluation -- and from representatives of the Military Departments and the Defense Logistics Agency.

The schedule is as follows:

8:00 AM-10:00 AM
General Accounting Office

--Mr. Henry L. Hinton, Assistant Comptroller General, National Security and International Affairs, GAO.

--Mr. David Warren, Director, Defense Management and NASA Issues, GAO.

--Mr. Barry W. Holman, Assistant Director, Defense Management and NASA Issues, GAO.

10:00 AM-12:00 PM
Depot Maintenance

--Mr. James Klugh, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics.

12:00 PM-1:00 PM
--Break

1:00 PM-2:00 PM
Undergraduate Pilot Training

--Mr. Louis C. Finch, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Readiness.

2:00 PM-3:00 PM
Medical

--Edward D. Martin, M.D., Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs.

3:00 PM - 4:00 PM
Labs, Test and Evaluation

--Mr. Philip E. Coyle, Director, Operational Test and Evaluation.

--Mr. John A. Burt, Director, Test, Systems Engineering and Testing.

--Dr. Craig Dorman, Deputy Director (Laboratory Management).

Also offering testimony will be:

--Brigadier General James E. Shane, Jr., Director of Management, Office of the Chief of Staff of the Army.

--Mr. Charles Nemfakos, Vice Chairman, Navy Base Structure Evaluation Committee.

--Major General Jay D. Blume, Jr., Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff of the Air Force for Base Realignment and Transition.

--Ms. Marge McManamay, Chief, Defense Logistics Agency BRAC Working Group.

30

Individuals needing special assistance should contact the Commission prior to the hearing.

To: Jim S
cc: Madelyn

Jim For use For the Wendy Steele phone call to the Plattsburgh community

New York Sues to Halt Closure Of Plattsburgh Air Force Base

1993

ALBANY, Dec. 6 (AP) — New York State filed a lawsuit today seeking to overturn recommendations of the base-closing commission and keep Plattsburgh Air Force Base open.

The lawsuit, filed in Federal District Court in Albany, argues that the commission overstepped its powers when it recommended closing Plattsburgh.

The state also is asking the court to issue an injunction to prevent the Department of Defense from carrying out the closure plans.

"This is a unified effort to make sure that the law is upheld, and that no harm is done to the nation's defense or to the citizens who rely upon Plattsburgh Air Force Base for their livelihood," Gov. Mario M. Cuomo said.

After Air Force officials proposed that Plattsburgh's mission be expanded, the commission voted last June to recommend that Plattsburgh be closed and that operations at Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome be drastically reduced. The expanded mission went to McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey.

3,000 Jobs at Risk

In July, President Clinton accepted the commission's recommendations that 175 military installations worldwide be closed or realigned.

"Congress explicitly limited the powers of the commission to overturn the recommendations of the military experts, and those powers were clearly exceeded when the commission sought to close Plattsburgh," Mr. Cuomo said.

Plattsburgh stands to lose about 3,000 military and civilian jobs if the base is closed as planned in 1995. Griffiss will lose about 4,500 jobs when operations there are shut down the same year.

Several states have filed similar lawsuits to save their military bases. In October, the United States Supreme Court agreed to decide whether states and communities could challenge the base closings in court. The decision is expected in July 1994.

The New York lawsuit was filed on behalf of the state by Mr. Cuomo and other New York officials, including United States Representative John McHugh and State Senator Ronald Stafford, whose districts include Plattsburgh. Those named in the lawsuit are the commission and its seven members, Secretary of Defense Les Aspin and Secretary of the Air Force Sheila Widnall.

In April 94 the community filed a Restraining order to slow down the move until Final decision on the suit, The entire suit was withdrawn when the Supreme Court ruled on "Pedre"

Attorney Client Privileged Communication

Attorney Client Communication

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Jim Courter, Chairman
Matt Behrmann, Staff Director
Commission Staff

From: Mary A. Hook, Acting General Counsel

Re: Update on Plattsburgh: Motion for a Preliminary Injunction

Date: April 18, 1994

State of New York, Cuomo, McHugh et al. v. Defense Base Closure Commission et al.: Plattsburgh AFB

On December 2, 1993, plaintiffs filed a civil action for declaratory judgment against the Commission, DOD and the Air Force to enjoin the Secretary of Defense from taking any action to close Plattsburgh AFB, New York.

The complaint cites numerous causes of action including; (1) the Commission exceeded its statutory authority and (2) the Commission did not find substantial deviation by the Secretary in rendering its recommendation on McGuire/Plattsburgh AFB, (3) the Commission failed to follow its procedural requirements of a 30 day publication in the Federal Register, (4) the Commission improperly interpreted its enabling statute's requirements for the decision-making process.

Summary Update: In late March, 1994 the Plaintiffs filed a request for a preliminary injunction motion to stop all actions (aircraft and military and civilian personnel movement) by the Secretary of Defense in implementing the closure of Plattsburgh until the Supreme Court's decision on Specter is handed down in June/July of 1994.

Arguments on the motion were held on the injunction request in the Northern District of New York District Court on April 11, 1994. The Judge did not rule on the motion, rather he asked the parties to attempt to arrive at an agreement.

On April 15, 1994, the parties agreed to write a stipulation where the Air Force would proceed with its current plan to move six

aircraft and [illegible] military personnel. The stipulation result is that no civilians will lose their jobs pending the Specter decision. If the Air Force needs to alter the plan between now and June, it will provide plaintiffs with 10 days notice.

The motion for summary judgment and the government's motion to dismiss will be stayed until June 1994.

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

MEDIA RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
May 24, 1994

Contact: Tom Houston
(703) 696-0504

COURTER APPLAUDS SUPREME COURT DECISION

Jim Courter, Chairman of the independent Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, today hailed the Supreme Court's unanimous rejection of all legal challenges to the military base closure process.

The high court's decision closed the door on a claim that the Commission's recommendation to close the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard did not comply with the requirements set forth in the Base Closure Act. The claim was upheld last year by the United States Third Circuit Court of Appeals, but Monday's Supreme Court action reversed the lower court's ruling and effectively ruled out future challenges.

"We consider this a broad rejection of the court's ability to review the Secretary's, the Commission's, or the President's actions in the base closure process," Courter said. "We are very hopeful that this decision will bring an end to litigation that attempts to invalidate the process. We are relieved and are anxious to turn our full attention to the important task of closing unnecessary military bases.

"This decision will bring a long-awaited sense of finality to a process that was created for that very purpose. Without that provision for finality, the entire base closure process as we know it would be thwarted and the tremendous savings associated with base closures would be unnecessarily delayed or never realized at all."

Under Courter's leadership, the Commission since 1991 has recommended the closure of 164 U.S. military installations and the realignment of 93 others. These actions, according to Commission estimates, will result in net Fiscal Year 1992-99 savings of $5.8 billion and recurring savings of $3.6 billion each year thereafter.

Under a different but similar law, the Commission in 1988 marked 86 additional bases for closure and 59 for realignment with an estimated savings of $693.6 million annually.

###

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

ALAN J. DIXON, CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONERS:
AL CORNELLA
REBECCA COX
GEN J. B. DAVIS, USAF (RET)
S. LEE KLING
RADM BENJAMIN F. MONTOYA, USN (RET)
MG JOSUE ROBLES, JR., USA (RET)
WENDI LOUISE STEELE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

Washington, DC -- May 3, 1995: The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission will hold a public hearing at 9:30 AM on May 10, 1995 in the Hart Senate Office Building, Room 216 to consider adding domestic military bases to the Secretary of Defense's list of installations to be closed or realigned.

A majority vote of commissioners present is required to add a new base to the list for closure or realignment, or to increase the scope of a realignment already recommended by the Secretary of Defense.

The format for the hearing will be as follows: DBCRC staff will appear as witnesses, under oath, to brief commissioners regarding bases that have been analyzed since March 1, 1995 for possible addition to the list.

The Air Force briefing will be first, followed by the Navy, Army, and Defense Logistics Agency.

When the list of additions is complete, the Commission will develop a schedule of base visits and regional hearings aimed at gathering more data on the added installations. Those hearings and visits will be completed by June 9.

On June 12 and 13, the Commission will conduct hearings in Washington, D.C., at which members of Congress will testify regarding proposed closures and realignments.

The full Commission is tentatively scheduled to begin its final voting on June 22, in Washington, D.C.

Individuals needing special assistance should contact the Commission prior to the hearing date.

30

THE CENTER FOR SECURITY POLICY

DECISION BRIEF

DECISION BRIEF
For Immediate Release

No. 95-D 30
8 May 1995
(202) 466-0515

MISCHIEF IN MOSCOW, CRISIS IN WASHINGTON: WILL CLINTON DEFY CONGRESS ON MISSILE DEFENSE?

Of all the mistakes President Clinton appears poised to make in his summit with President Yeltsin -- including legitimating Yeltsin's Stalinesque genocide in Chechnya, his nuclear proliferation to Iran and his NATO-wrecking operation -- one is in a class by itself: Mr. Clinton's efforts to impede, if not preclude, effective anti-missile defenses threatens not only to jeopardize U.S. national security interests; it could also produce a constitutional crisis.

Summit Shenanigan

This singularly portentous problem arises from communique language the Clinton Administration has developed with the Russians. The plan is for the two presidents to pronounce the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty the "cornerstone" of U.S.-Russian relations and strategic stability.

The Administration hopes with this statement to lock-in the United States' commitment to an agreement that effectively bans missile defenses for the American people, notwithstanding the facts that it was forged with a country (the Soviet Union) that no longer exists and it was drafted in a strategic environment that no longer pertains (namely, one in which essentially only the Soviets' nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles posed a threat to the U.S. and its troops and allies overseas). Despite these dramatic changes, the United States remains without deployed, effective anti-missile defenses. And, if the Clinton team has its way, this will remain the case indefinitely.

Worse yet, the summiteers are expected to embrace written commitments that would have the effect of dramatically *expanding* the ABM Treaty's scope. By agreeing not to deploy "regional defenses" against each other's ballistic missiles and to assure "non-circumvention" of the treaty, Mr. Clinton would give the Kremlin important rights. Three key leaders of the House of Representatives -- Appropriations Committee Chairman Robert Livingston, National Security Committee Chairman Floyd Spence and Appropriations Defense Subcommittee Chairman Bill Young -- wrote the President the attached letter last Thursday. It warns that:

> "[These limitations] suggest unacceptable geographical limitations on U.S. theater missile defenses (TMD) and could open the door for Russia to oppose *any* U.S. TMD deployments. In addition, the reported 'non-circumvention' language could cause Russia to challenge our international cooperative theater defense programs."

The legislators went on to note their continuing opposition to the Clinton Administration's efforts to negotiate the "multilateralization" of the ABM Treaty. That initiative would open the Treaty to additional signatories, a step calculated to make it more difficult to change its terms in the future. They also reiterated their opposition to the current U.S. negotiating position which would "place velocity limits on TMD interceptors...[and] hamstring our ability to provide the most capable missile defenses to our forward-deployed forces." Messrs. Livingston, Spence and Young concluded by observing:

- more -

1250 24th Street, N.W., Suite 350, Washington, D.C. 20037 (202) 466-0515 FAX (202) 466-0518

"...President Yeltsin must be made to realize that we are ready to act cooperatively [with Russia] if we can, but unilaterally if we must when it comes to missile defenses. The importance of this issue to U.S. security is simply too great to extend Russia or any other nation a veto."

The Constitutional Question

Such a warning to the President of the United States from senior members of the House of Representatives who control the government's purse-strings cannot prudently be ignored. It would be more than foolish, however, for the Administration to ignore a letter, also attached, which was sent on May 2nd by fifty members of the U.S. Senate -- including Majority Leader Robert Dole and virtually every other member of the Republican leadership. This letter served formal notice on Mr. Clinton:

"We are deeply troubled by indications that you intend to proceed, in the face of clearly stated congressional opposition, to make commitments in Moscow that would impede U.S. efforts to provide American troops with effective protection against missile attack. We find particularly troubling press reports describing the draft communique language being developed for that meeting....We want you and the Russians to be fully aware of our determination to prevent the creation of new impediments to missile defenses."

The fifty signatories to this letter represent more than enough to defeat any new missile defense treaty or ABM amendment that President Clinton might submit for Senate advice and consent, as required by the U.S. Constitution. Therefore, the Administration seems to believe that it can do as it did with the notorious North Korean "agreed framework" -- namely, ignore altogether the Senate's role in treaty-making. Senator Dole and his colleagues must not allow an Administration bent on "dumbing-down," if not altogether precluding, U.S. missile defense capabilities to dumb-down the Constitution in the process.

The Bottom Line

It is noteworthy that in addition to Senator Dole, two other Senate Republicans -- Phil Gramm, Dick Lugar and Arlen Specter -- who share Mr. Dole's desire to bring an early end to the Clinton presidency, are among those who signed the May 2nd letter. **If Mr. Clinton will not be deterred from making a serious mistake on missile defenses at the summit by virtue of either the strategic dangers or the potential constitutional crisis it may precipitate, perhaps the political risks associated with leaving the United States exposed to missile attack will do the trick.**

After all, the President has been at pains in the wake of the Oklahoma City bombing to promise the populace that he would take every step to protect it. Does he really mean that he will do so *unless* the attacker uses a ballistic missile, in which case the public is on its own? **If so, Mr. Clinton will be roughly as vulnerable politically as he would leave the American people.**

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

4 May 1995

The Honorable William J. Clinton
President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

As you prepare for your upcoming trip to Moscow, we wish to register our concern over the Administration's latest attempt to resolve the issue of theater missile defenses and the ABM Treaty and our strong opposition to any agreement that restricts the ability to defend our troops abroad from ballistic missile attack.

Reports of draft communique language describing the ABM Treaty as the "cornerstone" of the U.S.-Russian arms control relationship once again illustrate the difficulty the Administration is having in coming to terms with post-Cold War realities. An agreement to ban deployment of "regional defenses against the other's ballistic missiles" suggests unacceptable geographical limitations on U.S. TMD deployments and could open the door for Russia to oppose <u>any</u> U.S. TMD deployments. In addition, the reported "non-circumvention" language could cause Russia to challenge our international cooperative theater defense programs.

Moreover, the Administration's negotiating position continues to support the multilateralization of the Treaty, which would make future amendments more difficult. It also continues to place velocity limits on TMD interceptors, which would hamstring our ability to provide the most capable missile defenses to our forward deployed forces. We encourage you to inform President Yeltsin that the United States is opposed to such limits.

The focus of any negotiations with the Russians should be on finding ways to move forward cooperatively, not to limit U.S. capabilities. We encourage you to seek Russia's agreement to resume the discussions that began in 1992 on a "global protection system," including early warning data sharing, and related issues of mutual benefit. However, President Yeltsin must be made to realize that we are ready to act cooperatively if we can, but unilaterally if we must when it comes to missile defenses. The importance of this issue to U.S. security is simply too great to extend Russia or any other nation a veto.

Sincerely,

Floyd D. Spence
Chairman
Committee on National Security

Robert L. Livingston
Chairman
Committee on Appropriations

C. W. Bill Young
Chairman
Subcommittee on National Security
Committee on Appropriations

BOB DOLE
KANSAS

United States Senate

OFFICE OF THE REPUBLICAN LEADER
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-7010

May 2, 1995

The President
The White House
Washington

Dear Mr. President:

We are writing in advance of your summit meeting in Moscow to reiterate our strenuous objections to any action which would politically strengthen the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, expand its scope, increase the number of signatories, or otherwise add impediments to the development and deployment of effective U.S. theater missile defenses. On four separate occasions -- January 17, February 6, March 8, and April 6 -- Senate Republicans have written to you on this critical issue, indicating our opposition to such efforts and underscoring our position that any such treaty changes would be subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. Unfortunately, there are indications that your administration has not been dissuaded from pursuing a course which would place serious new constraints on our ability to pursue effective missile defenses.

The threat posed by the proliferation of ballistic missile technology and weapons of mass destruction grows daily. We had a close look at this threat during the Gulf War. The next time a conflict arises, our troops and our allies could face a greater threat, as terrorist regimes like Iran, bent on acquiring missile technology, nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction move closer to that goal. The Russians' intent to follow through with a reactor deal that would add to Iran's nuclear know-how only makes the situation more urgent.

As such, we are deeply troubled by indications that you intend to proceed, in face of clearly stated Congressional opposition, to make commitments in Moscow that would impede U.S. efforts to provide American troops overseas and allies with effective protection against missile attack. We find particularly troubling press reports describing the draft communique language being developed for that meeting. Furthermore, we note that in January 1992, Russian President Boris Yeltsin proposed not only deeper offensive force reductions, but collaboration with the United States on a joint "Global Protection System" of anti-missile defenses. This would be a much more appropriate and constructive avenue for your discussions with President Yeltsin.

Failing to get Russia to back down on its nuclear reactor deal with Iran, while simultaneously acting to severely limit our ability to protect U.S. forces, allies, and American citizens would be inexcusable. Should this be the outcome, we want you and the Russians to be fully aware of our determination to prevent the creation of new impediments to missile defenses.

Sincerely,

Robert Dole	William S. Cohen	Rodney Grams	Richard Lugar	Richard Shelby
Spencer Abraham	Paul Coverdell	Charles Grassley	Connie Mack	Alan K. Simpson
John Ashcroft	Larry E. Craig	Judd Allan Gregg	John McCain	Robert Smith
Robert Foster Bennett	Alfonse D'Amato	Orrin Hatch	Mitch McConnell	Olympia J. Snowe
Christopher S. Bond	Mike DeWine	Jesse Helms	Frank Murkowski	Arlen Specter
Hank Brown	Pete V. Domenici	Kay Bailey Hutchison	Don Nickles	Ted Stevens
Conrad Burns	D. M. 'Lauch' Faircloth	James M. Inhofe	Bob Packwood	Craig Thomas
Ben Nighthorse Campbell	Bill Frist	Dirk Kempthorne	Larry Pressler	Fred Thompson
Daniel R. Coats	Slade Gorton	Jon L. Kyl	William W. Roth	Strom Thurmond
Thad Cochran	Phil Gramm	Trent Lott	Rick Santorum	John W. Warner

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

MINOT AFB, NORTH DAKOTA ADDED TO LIST FOR REALIGNMENT

Washington, DC, March 7 -- The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission formally added Minot AFB, North Dakota to the list of military bases being considered for realignment.

The commission voted 7-0 to add Minot AFB to the list for consideration to clarify its status and officially notify interested parties.

Minot AFB did not appear separately on the list released by the Secretary of Defense on February 28. Instead, it was mentioned as a recommendation to replace Grand Forks, AFB, North Dakota on the realignment list should the Secretary of Defense determine that Grand Forks ballistic missile defense (BMD) options (321st Missile Group) need to be retained because of treaty considerations.

The Air Force's recommendation is that if the Secretary of Defense makes this determination then realignment at Grand Forks AFB would effectively be precluded and, "Minot AFB, North Dakota, will be realigned and the 91st Missile Group will inactivate."

The commissioners added Minot to the realignment list to clarify its status.

30

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

ALAN J. DIXON, CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONERS:
AL CORNELLA
REBECCA COX
GEN J. B. DAVIS, USAF (RET)
S. LEE KLING
RADM BENJAMIN F. MONTOYA, USN (RET)
MG JOSUE ROBLES, JR., USA (RET)
WENDI LOUISE STEELE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CORRECTED VERSION AS OF 8:00 PM EST

Contact: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

COMMISSION ADDS 31 NEW BASES TO CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT LIST

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 10, 1995 -- The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission today voted to add 31 military installations to the list of bases it is reviewing for realignment or closure.

In a hearing in Washington, D.C., the eight-member commission also voted to evaluate for greater realignment or complete closure 4 bases that were recommended only for realignment by the Secretary of Defense when he submitted his list to the Commission February 28.

"Just because a base was added to the list today doesn't mean it will close or be realigned," said former U.S. Senator Alan J. Dixon, the commission chairman. "It means the commission believes a fuller evaluation of the base is a reasonable thing to undertake at this time.

"We do not make additions to the list lightly, but it is the responsibility of the commission to submit to the President by July 1 the best possible closure and realignment list," Dixon said.

The commission's actions today affected bases in two overall categories: those that were not on the Secretary's February list and those that were.

Those that were not on the list were added today "for realignment or closure." Those that were on the list were added "for further realignment or closure." "Further realignment" means an action that will result in greater job loss at the installation than contemplated by the Secretary's list.

Between now and June 11, the commissioners will visit bases added to the list today and conduct regional hearings at which the affected communities will be able to testify regarding the base. Members of Congress will testify before the commission June 12-13 in Washington, D.C. and a date will be set for Defense Department officials to testify regarding the added bases.

The commission will begin its final deliberations June 22 in Washington.

more

Here is the list of bases added to the list today:

BASES NEWLY ADDED FOR REALIGNMENT OR CLOSURE - 31

AIR FORCE (13)

Chicago O'Hare IAP Air Reserve Station	Chicago, ILLINOIS
Minneapolis-St. Paul IAP Air Reserve Station	Minneapolis, MINNESOTA
Columbus Air Force Base	Columbus, MISSISSIPPI
Niagara Falls IAP Air Reserve Station	Niagara Falls, NEW YORK
Youngstown-Warren MAP Air Reserve Station	Youngstown, OHIO
Vance Air Force Base	Enid, OKLAHOMA
Carswell Air Reserve Station	Fort Worth, TEXAS
Laughlin Air Force Base	Del Rio, TEXAS
General Mitchell Air Reserve Station	Milwaukee, WISCONSIN
McClellan Air Force Base	Sacramento, CALIFORNIA
Robins Air Force Base	Warner-Robins, GEORGIA
Tinker Air Force Base	Oklahoma City, OKLAHOMA
Kelly Air Force Base	San Antonio, TEXAS

ARMY (4)

Space and Strategic Defense Command (Leased Facilities)	Huntsville, ALABAMA
Oakland Army Base	Oakland, CALIFORNIA
Fort Holabird	Baltimore, MARYLAND
Tobyhanna Army Depot	Wilkes-Barre, PENNSYLVANIA

NAVY (8)

Engineering Field Activity, West	San Bruno, CALIFORNIA
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center	Oakland, CALIFORNIA
Naval Air Station Point Mugu	Oxnard, CALIFORNIA
Naval Warfare Assessment Division	Corona, CALIFORNIA
Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion, and Repair	San Francisco, CALIFORNIA
Naval Air Station	Atlanta, GEORGIA
Public Works Center	GUAM
Portsmouth Naval Ship Yard	Kittery, MAINE

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (6)

Defense Distribution Depot McClellan	Sacramento, CALIFORNIA
Defense Distribution Depot Warner-Robins	Warner-Robins, GEORGIA
Defense Distribution Depot Okla. City	Oklahoma City, OKLAHOMA
Defense Distribution Depot Tobyhanna	Wilkes-Barre, PENNSYLVANIA
Defense Distribution Depot San Antonio	San Antonio, TEXAS
Defense Distribution Depot Hill	Ogden, UTAH

BASES ON THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE'S CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT LIST

ADDED TODAY BY THE COMMISSION FOR FURTHER REALIGNMENT OR CLOSURE - 4

AIR FORCE (3)

Homestead Air Reserve Station	Florida City, FLORIDA
Grand Forks Air Force Base	Grand Forks, NORTH DAKOTA
Hill Air Force Base	Ogden, Utah

ARMY (1)

Letterkenny Army Depot	Letterkenny, PENNSYLVANIA

# # #

1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 Air Force Association
Air Force Magazine

May, 1995

SECTION: USAF ALMANAC; Pg. 70

LENGTH: 773 words

HEADLINE: Major Commands;
Air Combat Command

HIGHLIGHT:
A major command is a subdivision of the Air Force assigned a major part of the Air Force mission and directly subordinate to Hq. USAF. In general, there are two types of major commands: operational and support.

BODY:

Headquarters Langley AFB, Va.
Established June 1, 1992
Commander Gen. John Michael Loh

MISSIONS
Operate USAF bombers
Operate USAF's CONUS-based, combat-coded fighter and attack aircraft
Organize, train, equip, and maintain combat-ready forces
Provide nuclear-capable forces for US Strategic Command

COROLLARY MISSIONS
Monitor and intercept illegal drug traffic
Test new combat equipment

OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES
Supply aircraft to the five geographic unified commands: Atlantic, European, Pacific, Southern, and Central Commands
Provide air defense forces to North American Aerospace Defense Command
Operate certain air mobility forces in support of US Transportation Command

Equipment
(Primary Aircraft Authorized)

Bombers (B-1B, B-2, B-52	121
Fighters (F-15A/C, F-16)	324
Attack aircraft (A/OA-10, F-15E, F-111, F-117)	231
EC/EW aircraft (F-4G, EF-111)	48
Aerial refuelers (KC-10, KC-135)	12
Combat delivery (C-130, C-27)	135
Other aircraft (all types)	175

FORCE STRUCTURE
Four numbered air forces: 1st (ANG), Tyndall AFB, Fla.; 8th, Barksdale AFB, La.; 9th, Shaw AFB, S.C.; 12th, Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz.

Two direct reporting units: USAF Air Warfare Center, USAF Weapons and Tactics Center

Twenty-nine wings

PERSONNEL		
Active-duty		112,166
Officers	15,918	
Enlisted	96,248	
Reserve component		107,521
ANG	81,192	
AFRES	26,329	
Civilian		16,412
Total		236,099
OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY		
Flying hours	45,000 per month	

Major overseas deployments
Bright Star (Central Command), Central Enterprise, Crested Cap (European Command), Cobra Gold (Pacific Command), Northern Viking, Strong Resolve (Atlantic Command)

Major CONUS JCS exercises
JTFEX (USACOM)
Roving Sands (USACOM)

Major training exercises
Air Warrior, Nellis AFB, Nev.
Air Warrior II, Barksdale AFB, La., and Little Rock AFB, Ark.
Blue Flag, Hurlburt Field, Fla.
Coalition flag, Nellis AFB, Nev.
Green Flag, Nellis AFB, Nev.
Maple Flag, CFB Cold Lake, Canada
Red Flag, Nellis AFB, Nev.

UNIT	BASE	WEAPONS
1st Figher Wing	Langley AFB, Va.	C-21A, F-15C/D, UH-1N (also HH-60, HC-130N/P at Patrick AFB, Fla.)
2d Bomb Wing	Barksdale AFB, La.	B-52H, T-38
4th Wing	Seymour Johnson AFB, N.C.	F-15E, KC-10A
5th Bomb Wing	Minot AFB, N.D.	B-52H, T-38
6th Air Base Wing	MacDill AFB, Fla.	--
7th Wing	Dyess AFB, Tex.	B-1B, C-130H, T-38
9th Reconnaissance Wing	Beale AFB, Calif.	U-2, T-38
20th Fighter Wing	Shaw AFB, S.C.	A-10, F-16
23d Wing	Pope AFB, N.C.	A-10, F-16, C-130E
24th Wing	Howard AFB, Panama	C-21A, C-27, CT-43
27th Fighter Wing	Cannon AFB, N.M.	F-111F, EF-111A
28th Bomb Wing	Ellsworth AFB, S.D.	B-1B, T-38
33d Fighter	Eglin AFB, Fla.	F-15C/D

Wing		
49th Fighter Wing	Holloman AFB, N.M.	F-117A, F-4E, T-38, HH-60
55th Wing	Offutt AFB, Neb.	C-21A, E-4B, RC-135S/U/V/W/X, EC-135C, TC-135S/W, C-135, WC-135, OCO-135, T-37
57th Wing	Nellis AFB, Nev.	A-10, F-4G, F-15C/D/E, F-16, HH-60
65th Air Base Wing	Lejes Field, the Azores (support)	--
85th Wing	NAS Keflavik, Iceland (becomes 85th Group July 1, 1995)	HH-60
93d Bomb Wing	Castle AFB, Calif. (base closes Sept. 30, 1995)	--
99th Wing	Ellsworth AFB, S.D.	--
314th Airlift Wing	Little Rock AFB, Ark.	C-130E/H
347th Wing	Moody AFB, Ga.	F-16, C-130E, A-10
355th Wing	Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz.	A-10, EC-130E/H
366th Wing	Mountain Home AFB, Idaho	F-15C/D/E, F-16, T-37, KC-135R (also B-1B at Ellsworth AFB, S.D.)
388th Fighter Wing	Hill AFB, Utah	F-16
410th Bomb Wing	K. I. Sawyer AFB, Mich. (base closes Sept. 30, 1995)	--
416th Bomb Wing	Griffiss AFB, N.Y. (base closes Sept. 30, 1995)	--
509th Bomb Wing	Whiteman AFB, Mo.	B-2, T-38
552d Air Control Wing	Tinker AFB, Okla.	E-3B/C, EC-135K, T-37
79th Test & Evaluation Group	Eglin AFB, Fla	F-15C/D/E, F-16, F-111F, EF-111A

COMMAND NOTES

Air Combat Command, with headquarters at Langley AFB, Va., acts as the primary provider of combat air forces and is the proponent for fighter, bomber, reconnaissance, combat delivery, battle-management, and rescue aircraft and command, control, communications, and intelligence systems.

As a force provider, ACC organizes, trains, equips, and maintains combat-ready forces for rapid deployment and employment while ensuring that strategic air defense forces are ready to meet the challenges of peacetime air sovereignty and wartime air defense.

GRAPHIC: Staff Photo, With headquarters at Langley AFB, Va., Air Combat Command operates the Air Force's bombers, fighters, and attack aircraft. The C-130, A-10, and F-16 aircraft equip one of the Air Force's newest units, the 347th Wing at Moody AFB, Ga. This composite wing is one of twenty-nine wings in ACC. by Guy Aceto; Diagram 1, AIR COMBAT COMMAND * HEADQUARTERS, LANGLEY AFB, VA.; Diagram 2, 1st AIR FORCE (ANG) * HEADQUARTERS, TYNDALL AFB, FLA.; Photo, In

1994, ACC took part in sixty-seven overseas deployments. ACC personnel, such as these maintainers checking information on an F-15, handle tremendous responsibilities in helping the Air Force's largest operational command organize, train equip, and maintain the combat-ready forces. by Randy Jolly; Diagram 3, 8th AIR FORCE (ACC) * HEADQUARTERS, BARKSDALE AFB, LA.; Diagram 4, 9th AIR FORCE (ACC) * HEADQUARTERS, SHAW AFB, S.C.; Diagram 5, 12th AIR FORCE (ACC) * HEADQUARTERS, DAVIS-MONTHAN AFB, ARIZ.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE-MDC: May 10, 1995

2ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 Air Force Association
Air Force Magazine

May, 1995

SECTION: USAF ALMANAC; Pg. 97

LENGTH: 8492 words

HEADLINE: Field Operating Agencies

HIGHLIGHT:
A field operating agency (FOA) is a subdivision of the Air Force that carries out field activities under the operational control of an Hq. USAF functional manager. Though the FOAs have the same administrative and organizational responsibilities as the major commands, their missions remain separate from those of the major commands.

BODY:

Air Force Audit Agency

Headquarters	Washington, D.C.
Established	July 1, 1948
Director	Jackie R, Crawford

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide internal audit evaluations for all levels of Air Force management
Produce audit reports that evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy of Air Force programs and activities
STRUCTURE
Acquisition and Logistics Audit Directorate, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio
Financial and Support Audit Directorate, March AFB, Calif.
Field Activities Directorate, Washington, D.C.
Four regional offices
Fifty-four field offices
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	6
Officers	3
Enlisted	3
Reserve component	0
Civilians	916
Total	922

NOTE
The director of AFAA is the Auditor General of the Air Force.

Air Force Base Conversion Agency

Headquarters	Arlington, Va.
Established	November 15, 1991
Director	Alan K. Olsen

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide integrated execution management for Air Force bases in the US as they are closed under the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1988 and the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990
STRUCTURE
Office of the Director

Base operating locations
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	2
Officers	2
Enlisted	0
Reserve component	0
Civilians	340
Total (authorized)	342

Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence

Headquarters	Brooks AFB, Tex.
Established	July 23, 1991
Commander	Col. Thomas W. Gorges

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide Air Force commanders wortdwide with services in environmental remediation, compliance, planning, and pollution prevention, including independent testing and application of environmental restoration and pollution prevention technologies
STRUCTURE
Air Force Design Group
Construction Management Directorate
Environmental Restoration Directorate
Environmental Conservation and Planning Directorate
Pollution Prevention Directorate
Three regional compliance offices
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	55
Officers	53
Enlisted	2
Reserve component	40
ANG	0
AFRES	40
Civilians	358
Total	453

Air Force Civil Engineer Support Agency

Headquarters	Tyndall AFB, Fla.
Established	August 1, 1991
Commander	Col. Paul W. Hains III

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide tools, practices, and professional support to maximize Air Force civil engineer capabilities in base and contingency operations
STRUCTURE
Contingency Support Directorate
Technical Support Directorate
Operations Support Directorate
CMI Engineer Maintenance, Inspection, and Repair Team
Field Support
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	92
Officers	22
Enlisted	70
Reserve component	3
ANG	1
AFRES	2
Civilians	119
Total	214

Air Force Civilian Personnel
Management Center

Headquarters	Randolph AFB, Tex.
Established	January 1, 1986
Director	John R. Graham

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Manage, operate, and support Air Force civilian career management programs and systems
STRUCTURE
Career Management Division
Integrated Systems Management Division
Operations Support Division
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	1
Officers	1
Enlisted	0
Reserve component	0
Civilians	170
Total	171

Air Force Command, Control,
Communications, and Computer Agency

Headquarters	Scott AFB, III.
Established	May 28, 1993
Commander	Col. (Brig. Gen. selectee) Harry D. Raduege, Jr.

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Support the Air Force deputy chief of staff for Command, Control, Communications, and Computers (C<4>)
Develop and validate C<4> architectures, technical standards, requirements, policies, procedures, and solutions
Ensure integration and interoperability among Air Force C<4> systems
Ensure that policies, procedures, and applications take full advantage of C<4> capabilities to meet future information requirements
Serve as the technical arm and extension of Hq. USAF/Deputy Chief of Staff, C<4>
STRUCTURE
Four headquarters functional areas: Plans and Analysis, Systems and Procedures, Interoperability and Technology, and Resources
C<4> Technology Validation Office, Barksdale AFB, La.
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	297
Officers	138
Enlisted	159
Reserve component	2
ANG	0
AFRES	2
Civilians	288
Total	587

NOTE
Air Force Communications Command became the Air Force C<4> Agency May 28, 1993.
Air Force Cost Analysis Agency

Headquarters Arlington, Va.
Established August 1, 1992
Commander Col. Gordon D. Kage II

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS

Conduct Component Cost Analyses (CCAs) for major weapon system acquisition programs and automated information systems as required by public law and DoD directives

Develop independent estimates for the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Air Force Acquisition Executive, Program Executive Officers, and other senior executives

Perform cost research on emerging technologies, software, operating costs, and subsystems to support CCAs

STRUCTURE

Aircraft Programs Division
Command, Control, Communications Programs Division
Management Information Systems Programs Division
Program Control/Research Division
Small Missiles and Munitions Programs Division
Space Systems and Boosters Programs Division

PERSONNEL

Active-duty	30
Officers	30
Enlisted	0
Reserve component	0
Civilians	23
Total	53

Air Force Doctrine Center

Headquarters Langley AFB, Va.
Established July 21, 1993
Commander Col. Robert D. Coffman

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS

Develop and publish basic and operational-level doctrine for the Air Force

Provide Air Force input into joint and multinational doctrine development

Ensure that Air Force doctrine is consistent with policy and joint doctrine

Serve as the Coordinating Review Authority for joint doctrine and for joint tactics, techniques, and procedures for which the Air Force is not the lead agent

Prepare and present coordinated Air Force comments on joint doctrine, tactics, techniques, and procedures and their development

PERSONNEL

Active-duty	16
Officers	16
Enlisted	0
Reserve component	0
Civilians	4
Total	20

Air Force Flight Standards Agency

Headquarters Andrews AFB, Md.
Established October 1, 1991
Commander Col. Dennis W. Traynor III

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS

Develop, standardize, evaluate, and certify Air Force policy, procedures, and equipment for global flight operations and centrally manage the Air Force Air Traffic Control and Landing Systems (ATCALS)
Perform worldwide flight inspection of airfields, navigation systems, and instrument approaches during combat, contingencies, and Joint Staff exercises
Represent the Secretary of the Air Force and Hq. USAF in Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airspace management and air traffic control issues
Represent the Department of Defense on issues of international airspace and air traffic control
Provide flight standards and aeronautical services to develop USAF instrument requirements and training
Certify procedures and directives for current and emerging cockpit display technologies and new navigation systems
Provide the Air Force with air traffic control and airfield procedures, functional management, operational evaluation of air traffic control systems, and airspace management procedures
Lead ATCALS planning and programming, sustainment, and coordination with FAA and military services
Maintain the USAF ATCALS database
STRUCTURE
USAF Representative to FAA, Hq. FAA, Washington, D.C.
Flight Inspection Center, Oklahoma City, Okla.
Airfield Operations Directorate, Andrews AFB, Md.
Operations Directorate, Andrews AFB, Md.
Resources and Requirements Directorate, Andrews AFB, Md.
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	143
Officers	76
Enlisted	67
Reserve component	4
ANG	0
AFRES	4
Civilians	29
Total	176

EQUIPMENT
Two C-21 Learjets

Air Force Frequency Management Agency

Headquarters	Arlington, Va.
Established	October 1, 1991
Commander	Col. Kimberly J. Dalrymple

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Develop USAF policy and procedures for radio frequency spectrum management in support of air and space combat operations
Represent USAF requirements and capabilities to regulatory agencies at national and international levels
Direct frequency assignments in support of global air and space operations and contingencies
STRUCTURE
Plans Division
Systems Engineering Division
Technical Services Division

PERSONNEL

Active-duty	19
Officers	11
Enlisted	8
Reserve component	0
Civilians	20
Total	39

Air Force Historical Research Agency

Headquarters	Maxwell AFB, Ala.
Established	September 12, 1949
Commander	Col. Richard S. Rauschkolb

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS

Serve as the repository for more than sixty-five million pages of historical documents, ranging from the Civil War to the Persian Gulf War

Maintain the largest specialized collection of documents on US military aviation in the world

Provide manpower and historical support to preserve documents during contingency operations

Preserve Air Force history and provide data and analyses to support the Air Staff and major commands

Operate research facilities for professional military education students, faculty, visiting scholars, and the general public

STRUCTURE

Information Systems Division

Research Division

PERSONNEL

Active-duty	10
Officers	4
Enlisted	6
Reserve component	20
ANG	0
AFRES	20
Civilians	44
Total	74

Air Force History Support Office

Headquarters	Washington, D.C.
Established	September 30, 1994
Commander	Col. George K. Williams

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS

Research, write, and publish books and other studies on the history of the Air Force

Provide historical support through the Air Force historian to Hq. USAF

Publish books to help the Air Force formulate strategy, plans, and doctrine to conduct its operations; educate Air Force students at professional military schools; provide scholars with research and teaching materials; and inform the public about the role of the Air Force and airpower in national security

STRUCTURE

Histories Division

Research Division

Special Projects Division

PERSONNEL

Active-duty	5

Officers	3
Enlisted	2
Reserve component	4
ANG	0
AFRES	4
Civilians	25
Total	34

NOTE
AFHSO was formerly the Center for Air Force History.

Air Force Inspection Agency

Headquarters	Kirtland AFB, N.M.
Established	August 1, 1991
Commander	Col. Robert M. Murdock

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide Air Force leadership with objective and independent assessments of Air Force readiness, discipline, and management efficiency and effectiveness
Conduct special reviews and inquiries as directed by the Air Force Secretary, Chief of Staff, and Inspector General
STRUCTURE
Acquisition Inspection Directorat
Field Inspection Directorate
Management Inspection Directorate
Medical Inspection Directorate
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	125
Officers	97
Enlisted	28
Reserve component	1
ANG	1
AFRES	0
Civilians	21
Total	147

Air Force Legal Services Agency

Headquarters	Boiling AFB, D.C.
Established	September 1, 1991
Commander	Col. (Brig. Gen. selectee) Olan G. Waldrop, Jr.

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide civil and military legal services to the Air Force and Air Force personnel
Handle Air Force patent and copyright matters
Provide judges and counsel for courts-martial and review trial results
Provide computer support and database management for the Office of The Judge Advocate General
STRUCTURE
Air Force Court of Military Review
Civil Law and Litigation Directorate
Contract Litigation Division
Environmental Law and Litigation Division
General Claims Division
General Litigation Division
Legal Assistance Division
Patent Law Division

Tort Claims and Litigation Services Division
Judiciary Directorate
Appellate Defense Division
Clemency, Corrections, and Officer Review Division
Government Trial and Appellate Counsel Division
Military Justice Division
Trial Defense Division
Trial Judiciary Division
Legal Information Services Directorate

PERSONNEL	
Active-duty	414
Officers	287
Enlisted	127
Reserve component	87
ANG	0
AFRES	87
Civilians	137
Total	638

Air Force Logistics Management Agency

Headquarters	Maxwell AFB, Gunter Annex, Ala.
Established	September 30, 1975
Commander	Col. Clarence T. Lowry

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Develop, analyze, test, evaluate, and recommend new or improved concepts, methods, systems, policies, and procedures to enhance logistics efficiency and effectiveness
Publish the Air Force Journal of Logistics
STRUCTURE
Functional directorates
Contracting
Logistics Plans
Maintenance and Munitions
Supply
Transportation
Support directorates
Logistics Analysis
Plans and Programs

PERSONNEL	
Active-duty	69
Officers	53
Enlisted	16
Reserve component	0
Civilians	22
Total	91

Air Force Management Engineering Agency

Headquarters	Randolph AFB, Tex.
Established	November 1, 1975
Commander	Col. Chades F. Dibrell, Jr.

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Work with Air Staff and major commands to achieve significant improvement through process reengineering
Determine manpower requirements and manage manpower resources
Provide commanders and functional managers with technical

expertise and process improvement techniques
Oversee the implementation of technical and procedural guidance for Air Force Management Engineering and Productivity Programs
Serve as the executive agent for the Navy, Army, and Air Force for the development of DoD medical manpower determinants through the Joint Health-Care Management Engineering Team

PERSONNEL	
Active-duty	87
Officers	26
Enlisted	61
Reserve component	0
Civilians	64
Total	151

Air Force Medical Operations Agency

Headquarters	Boiling AFB, D.C.
Established	July 1, 1992
Commander	Maj. Gen. Charles H. Roadman II

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Formulate plans, practices, and procedures and direct programs for the Air Force Medical Service in aerospace medicine, family advocacy, clinical investigations, clinical quality management, radiation protection, and health promotion
STRUCTURE
Aerospace Medicine Division
Clinical Investigations and Life Sciences Division
Clinical Quality Management Division
Family Advocacy Division, Brooks AFB, Tex.
Health Promotion Division
USAF Radioisotope Committee Secretariat, Brooks AFB, Tex.

PERSONNEL	
Active-duty	40
Officers	33
Enlisted	7
Reserve component	4
ANG	0
AFRES	4
Civilians	18
Total	62

Air Force Medical Support Agency

Headquarters	Brooks AFB, Tex.
Established	July 1, 1992
Commander	Col. Richard W. Rushmore

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Improve global performance and capability of the medical service in supporting combat forces and maintaining the health of beneficiaries
Serve as the Air Force Surgeon General's focal point for policy development, strategy, plans, consultant services, and requirements for facilities, supplies, equipment, acquisition, information systems and resources, and patient administration
STRUCTURE
Directorate of Medical Support
Health Facilities Division

Medical Information Systems Division
Medical Logistics Division
Patient Administration Division
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	41
Officers	3
Enlisted	6
Reserve component	0
Civilians	33
Total	74

Air Force Military Personnel Center

Headquarters	Randolph AFB, Tex.
Established	July 25, 1963
Commander	Maj. Gen. William B. Davitte

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide personnel operations service
STRUCTURE
Assignments
Mission Support
Personnel Accountability
Personnel Data Systems
Personnel Operations
Personnel Programs Management
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	867
Officers	268
Enlisted	599
Reserve component	8
ANG	3
AFRES	5
Civilians	448
Total	1,323

NOTE
In 1995, AFMPC will reorganize to allow the center to group similar processes and improve customer support.
Air Force News Agency

Headquarters	Kelly AFB, Tex.
Established	June 1, 1978
Commander	Col. Joseph S. Panvini

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Support public affairs offices by creating and delivering timely and credible products and services
Communicate and broadcast news, information, and entertainment through print and electronic media, keeping the Total Force and the American public informed during peace and war
STRUCTURE
Air Force Broadcasting Service
Air Force Internal Information Directorate
Army and Air Force Hometown News Service
Resource Management Directorate
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	352
Officers	22
Enlisted	330
Reserve component	0

Civilians	136
Total	488

NOTES
Air Force Internal Information Directorate news products include Airman Magazine, the Air Force Policy Letter, Air Force Television News, and Air Force Radio News. The Air Force Broadcasting Service operates all USAF-managed Armed Forces Radio and Television Service outlets.

Air Force Office of Special Investigations

Headquarters	Bolling AFB, D.C.
Established	August 1, 1948
Commander	Brig. Gen. Robert A. Hoffman

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide criminal investigative and counterintelligence information and services to commanders
Identify and prevent criminal activity, including homicide, drug abuse, espionage, terrorism, sabotage, economic (major defense contractor fraud and local fraud), environmental, and other crimes that threaten Air Force and DoD resources
Provide force protection to deployed wings and units
STRUCTURE
USAF Special Investigations Academy
Seven regional offices
Seven overseas squadrons
160 detachments and operating locations
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	1,480
Officers	378
Enlisted	1,102
Reserve component	420
ANG	0
AFRES	420
Civilians	487
Foreign nationals	37
Total	2,424

Air Force Operations Group

Headquarters	Washington, D.C.
Established	July 26, 1977
Commander	Col. Robert W. Tapaszi, Jr.

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Support the Air Force Chief of Staff and deputy chief of staff for Plans and Operations
Maintain a twenty-four-hour watch on all current operations
Handle emergency actions through the Air Force Operations Support Center
Provide facilities, policy, procedures, and staff for the Hq. USAF Crisis Action Team during crises, contingencies, and exercises
Develop policy and monitor USAF readiness and resource allocation worldwide
Coordinate actions between USAF major commands, other field operating agencies, and direct reporting units in response to taskings from the Joint Chiefs of Staff National Military

Command Center (NMCC)
Provide operational oversight of USAF counterdrug operations
Assist in providing military support to civilian authorities
Prepare and provide weather data to the President, Secretary of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, NMCC, Army Operations Center, and other federal agencies
Maintain the USAF portion of the Worldwide Military Command and Control System Intercomputer Network, the Air Force's resources and training system database and worldwide exercise scheduling database, and the Joint Uniform Lessons Learned database
FORCE STRUCTURE
AFOG is supported by ten Air Staff functional areas: Operations, Plans, Logistics, Manpower and Personnel, Intelligence, Civil Engineering, Security Police, Information Systems Management, Medical Readiness Division, and Chaplain Response Forces.
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	225
Officers	149
Enlisted	76
Reserve component	0
Civilians	15
Total	240

NOTE
AFRES and ANG are also integrated into AFOG, which was formerly the Air Force Combat Operations Staff.
Air Force Pentagon Communications Agency

Headquarters	Washington, D.C.
Established	October 1, 1984
Commander	Col. Stephen E. Anno

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide twenty-four-hour-a-day communications and computer support to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, National Military Command Center (NMCC), the Air Staff, and the Air Force Operations Center
Maintain five red (secure) communications switches and three black (nonsecure) switches, including the Washington Tactical Switch, 8,000 telephones, and 2,500 leased circuits
Handle 3,000 specialized secure telephone units, NMCC and AFOC networks, and an extensive pager and cellular telephone network
STRUCTURE
Air Staff Systems Directorate
Mission Support Directorate
OSD Systems Directorate
Security Directorate
Systems Management Directorate
Plans and Programs Directorate
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	635
Officers	196
Enlisted	439
Reserve component	2

ANG	0
AFRES	2
Civilians	277
Total	914

NOTE
AFPCA was formerly the 7th Communications Group.

Air Force Personnel Operations Agency

Headquarters	Washington, D.C.
Established	August 15, 1993
Commander	Steve N Smith

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Execute personnel programs and portions of programs located in the Washington, D.C., area in proximity to the policy- and decision-making personnel organizations
Develop and operate officer, enlisted, and civilian models and databases for management information
Handle small computer acquisition, technical support, and network management for the deputy chief of staff for Personnel and for local users of the Personnel Data System
Process congressional inquiries and third-party civilian complaints and actions
Execute the Air Force Employee Development Program and training budgets
Manage the Air Force Relocation, Employee, and Labor Relations Programs
Conduct Air Force Quality Assessments and the quality awards program
STRUCTURE
Analysis Division
Performance Management Division
Systems Support Division
Work Force Appeals and Relations Division
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	38
Officers	27
Enlisted	11
Reserve component	0
Civilians	31
Total	69

Air Force Program Executive Office

Headquarters	Washington, D.C.
Established	November 1990
Service Acquisition Executive	Clark G. Rester

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Manage and account for the execution of major and selected Air Force acquisition programs
STRUCTURE
Service Acquisition Executive
Program Executive Officers:
Brig. Gen. William F. Moore, Bombers, Missiles, and Trainers
Harry E. Shulte, Conventional Strike Systems
Brig. Gen. (Maj. Gen. selectee) James S. Childress, Tactical and Airlift Programs
John M. Gilligan, Combat Support Systems
Maj. Gen. Garry A. Schnelzer, Space Systems
Brig. Gen. Berwyn A. Reiter, Command, Control, and Commu-

nications Systems
Kathy L. Boockholdt, Acquisition Career Management Programs

PERSONNEL	49

Air Force Real Estate Agency

Headquarters	Boiling AFB, D.C.
Established	August 1, 1991
Director	Anthony R. Jonkers

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Acquire, manage, and dispose of real property worldwide for the Air Force
Maintain a complete land and facilities inventory
Plan and execute the Real Property Management program
Provide instructions to assist USAF in complying with public laws and federal and DoD guidance

PERSONNEL	
Active-duty	0
Reserve component	0
Civilians	13
Total	13

Air Force Reserve

Headquarters	Robins AFB, Ga.
Established	April 14, 1948
Commander	Maj. Gen. Robert A. McIntosh

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Support the active-duty force
Serve in missions including fighter, bomber, airlift, aerial refueling, rescue, special operations, aeromedical evacuation, aerial fire-fighting, weather reconnaissance, and space operations
Provide support and disaster relief in the US
Support national counterdrug efforts
FORCE STRUCTURE
Three numbered air forces: 4th, McClellan AFB, Calif.; 10th, Bergstrom ARS, Tex.; 22d, Dobbins ARB, Ga.
Thirty-seven flying wings
128 groups
392 squadrons
111 flights

PERSONNEL	
Officers	16,015
Enlisted	61,919
Civilians (non-ART)	5,235
Total	83,169
EQUIPMENT	
B-52H bombers	9
F-16 fighters	121
A/OA-10 attack aircraft	44
C-5A airlifters	32
C-141B airlifters	36
C-130E/H airlifters	109
KC-135E/R tankers	62
HC-130N/P rescue aircraft	10
HH-60G rescue helicopters	25
C-130A gunships	10
WC-130H weather planes	10

Total primary aircraft authorized 468
OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY
Coronet Oak (Central and South America), Deny Flight and Provide Promise (Bosnia-Hercegovina), Provide Comfort (northern Iraq), Provide Hope II (former Soviet Union), Provide Relief (Kenya and Somalia), Restore Hope (Somalia), Support Hope (Rwanda), Uphold Democracy (Haiti)
Relief effort for victims of the 1994 Georgia floods; support in 1994 storm relief
NOTES
The AFRES commander also serves as chief, Air Force Reserve, Washington, D.C. AFRES serves under federal government jurisdiction. Officer and enlisted personnel figures are Selected Reserve, including Air Reserve technicians-Civil Service employees in dual status. Approximately 12,000 of these Air Force Reservists are assigned to active-duty units under the Individual Mobilization Augmentee program. Reserve crews also fly active-duty KC-10, C-5, C-141, KC-135, C-17, and C-9 aircraft daily under the associate program.
Air Force Review Boards Agency
Headquarters Andrews AFB, Md.
Established June 1, 1980
Deputy Joe G. Lineberger
MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Manage military and civilian appellate processes for the Secretary of the Air Force
Develop overall policy and act for the Secretary of the Air Force in deciding individual cases before the boards
STRUCTURE
Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records
Air Force Civilian Appellate Review Office
Air Force Personnel Council
Air Force Personnel Boar
Board of Review
Clemency and Parole Board
Decorations Board
Discharge Review Board
DoD Civilian/Military Service Review Board
Physical Disability Appeal Board
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	11
Officers	4
Enlisted	7
Reserve component	3
ANG	1
AFRES	2
Civilians	33
Total	47

Air Force Safety Agency
Headquarters irtland AFB, N.M.
Established August 1, 1991
Commander Col. Bernard B. Burklund, Jr.
MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Execute Air Force safety and nuclear surety policies, plans,

and programs
Oversee all USAF mishap-prevention programs, including nuclear weapons surety, ballistic missiles, remotely piloted vehicles, and satellites
Conduct USAF aircraft mishap investigation, chief of safety, and flight safety officer courses
Contract ground safety training for USAF personnel
Investigate and report on- and off-duty mishaps
Oversee major command mishap investigations and evaluate corrective actions for applicability and implementation USAF-wide
STRUCTURE
Mission directorates
 Flight Safety
 Ground Safety
 Nuclear Surety
 Weapons and Space Safety
Support directorates
 Data Operations and Analysis
 Life Sciences
 Engineering and Technical Services
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	73
Officers	55
Enlisted	18
Reserve component	1
ANG	0
AFRES	1
Civilians	69
Total	143

NOTE
AFSA publishes Flying Safety Magazine, Road and Rec Magazine, and USAF Nuclear Surety Journal.
Air Force Security Police Agency

Headquarters	Kirtland AFB, N.M.
Established	February 1991
Commander	Col. John E. Killeen

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide expertise for the security of nuclear weapons and weapon systems
Prepare guidance on air base defense operations and continuation training and guidance for law enforcement, resources protection, and antiterrorism USAF-wide
Develop and implement base-level training and combat arms training and maintenance programs
Assist in planning, allocating, and evaluating security police resources, equipment, and future technology requirements
Develop and maintain tables of allowance identifying security police equipment requirements
Manage Air Force corrections activities
STRUCTURE
Directorate of Corrections
Directorate of Law Enforcement and Training
Directorate of Physical Security
Directorate of Resources and Equipment
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	117

Officers	25
Enlisted	92
Reserve component	11
ANG	0
AFRES	11
Civilians	20
Total	148

FACILITIES
Det. 1, US Disciplinary Barracks, Fort Leavenworth, Kan.
Det. 2, Naval Consolidated Brig, NAS Miramar, Calif.
Det. 3, Naval Consolidated Brig, Charleston Naval Weapons Center, S.C.

NOTE
AFSPA publishes SP Digest.

Air Force Services Agency

Headquarters	San Antonio, Tex.
Established	February 5, 1991
Commander	Col. Stephen R. Wingfield

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Support the bases, major commands, and Air Staff by providing technical assistance, fielding new initiatives, developing procedures, and managing selected central support functions to ensure successful services programs
Manage Air Force nonappropriated central funds and operate central systems, such as banking, investments, purchasing, data flow, insurance, and benefit programs

STRUCTURE
Base-level services managers

PERSONNEL

Active-duty	71
Officers	22
Enlisted	49
Reserve component	9
Civilians	339
Total	419

Air Force Studies and Analyses Agency

Headquarters	Washington, D.C.
Established	February 1991
Commander	Col. Thomas L. Allen

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide analyses and simulation and modeling tools to support the assessment of force-structure options and acquisition decisions for the assistant secretaries of the Air Force and the Air Staff
Aid Air Force decision-makers in addressing force-sizing and force-shaping issues, weapon systems employment, resource allocation, and arms reductions proposals
Assist the Air Staff in preparing responses to congressional inquiries and requests for testimony
Serve as the configuration manager for a variety of simulation models used within the Air Force by other DoD agencies and by civilian contractors

STRUCTURE
Force Application Division

Force Enhancement Division
Resource Management Division
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	54
Officers	46
Enlisted8	
Reserve component	3
ANG	0
AFRES	3
Civilians	25
Total	82

Air Force Technical Applications Center

Headquarters	Patrick AFB, Fla.
Established	May 1, 1960
Commander	Col. Glen D. Shaffer

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Monitor compliance with several international nuclear treaties, including the Limited Test Ban Treaty, Threshold Test Ban Treaty, and Peaceful Nuclear Explosion Treaty
Operate and maintain a global network of subsurface, surface, airborne, and spacebased sensors and analytical laboratories that provide national authorities with technical measurements with which to monitor foreign nuclear activity
Conduct research and development of proliferation-detection technologies for all weapons of mass destruction
STRUCTURE
Headquarters and Analysis Center, Patrick AFB, Fla.
McClellan Central Laboratory, Technical Operations Division, McClellan AFB, Calif.
Seven operational sites/detachments worldwide
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	942
Officers	188
Enlisted	754
Reserve component	0
Civilians	104
Total	1,046

EQUIPMENT
Eighteen seismic arrays consisting of seismometers and associated central terminals and workstations
Six hydroacoustic recording locations
More than 130 sensors on thirty-six satellites, with associated ground systems instrumentation and data-processing equipment
Airborne and groundbased equipment to collect nuclear event debris
Atmospheric sampling equipment for TC-135 and U-2 aircraft
Military and civilian laboratories that perform low-level radioactive sample analysis
Air Intelligence Agency

Headquarters	Kelly AFB, Tex.
Established	October 1, 1993
Commander	Brig. Gen. (Maj. Gen. selectee) John P. Casciano

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide direct intelligence, security, electronic combat, for-

eign technology, and treaty-monitoring support to national decision-makers and field air component commanders
Develop principles and doctrines of information dominance for application in future warfare
Provide combat commanders with data enabling them to decide when to exploit, jam, deceive, or destroy hostile military communications
Provide human and scientific-technical intelligence support
Provide tailored intelligence assessments in support of Air Staff planning and policy formulation
Conduct USAF Sensitive Compartmented Information security functions
Assist Air Force components in the development of concept, exercises, and employment of agency assets to support low-intensity conflict, counterdrug, and special operations
Provide nuclear intelligence production and support (including data collection, analysis, and exploitation)
EQUIPMENT
Two AN/FLR-9 antennas located in Alaska and Japan
FORCE STRUCTURE
Air Force Information Warfare Center, Kelly AFB, Tex.
National Air Intelligence Center, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio
67th Intelligence Wing, Kelly AFB, Tex.
26th Intelligence Group, Vogelweh, Germany
67th Intelligence Group, Kelly AFB, Tex.
497th Intelligence Group, Boiling AFB, D.C.
480th Intelligence Group, Langley AFB, Va.
544th Intelligence Group, Peterson AFB, Colo.
692d Intelligence Group, Hickam AFB, Hawaii
694th Intelligence Group, Fort Meade, Md.
Intelligence Systems Group, Kelly AFB, Tex.
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	12,667
Officers	1,870
Enlisted	10,797
Reserve component	1,883
ANG	187
AFRES	1,696
Civilians	2,378
Total	16,928

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY
Provide Comfort (northern Iraq), Southern Watch southern Iraq), Support/Uphold Democracy (Haiti)
NOTES
AIA was formed by integrating personnel and missions of the former Air Force Intelligence Command and Air Force Intelligence Support Agency and elements of Air Combat Command.
The agency reports directly to the assistant chief of staff for Intelligence. In 1994, the agency supported more than fifty worldwide, joint, unified, and specified command-sponsored exercises. General Casciano also serves as director of the Joint Command and Control Warfare Center.
Air National Guard

Headquarters	Washington, D.C.
Established	September 18, 1947
Director	Maj. Gen.

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide air defense of continental US
In emergencies, under federal government jurisdiction, enforce federal authority, suppress insurrection, and serve in the national defense
FORCE STRUCTURE
Major command assignments
- Air Combat Command
- Air Education and Training Command
- Air Force Special Operations Command
- Air Mobility Command
- Pacific Air Forces

Twenty-four wings
Sixty-five groups
PERSONNEL

Officers	13,678
Enlisted	97,850
Civilians	1,731
Total	113,259

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY
Deny Flight and Provide Promise (Bosnia-Hercegovina), Provide Comfort II (Turkey and Middle East), Southern Watch (Middle East), Support Hope (Rwanda), Uphold/Maintain Democracy (Haiti)
Relief effort for victims of the 1994 Georgia floods, fire-fighting support in western US
NOTES
ANG serves under state government jurisdiction except in emergencies. It provides 100 percent of USAF's fighter-interceptor force, 100 percent of the RF-4C force, twenty-six percent of the tactical air support, forty-three percent of the tactical airlift, twenty-nine percent of the air-rescue capability, thirty-three percent of the tactical fighters, forty-three percent of the KC-135 air refueling capability, and eight percent of the strategic airlift capability.

Air Reserve Personnel Center

Headquarters	Denver, Colo.
Established	November 1, 1953
Commander	Col. James H. White, Jr.

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide personnel services and administrative support to members of the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard, including assignments, promotions, discharges, retirements, veterans' entitlements, and presidentially activated mobilizations
STRUCTURE
Chaplain Individual Reserve Programs Directorate
Health Services Individual Reserve Programs Directorate
Individual Reserve Programs Directorate
Information Systems Support Directorate
Personnel Directorate
Personnel Records Management and Services Directorate
Plans Directorate
Public Affairs Directorate

Resource Management and Support Services Directorate
Staff Judge Advocate
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	145
Officers	33
Enlisted	112
Reserve component	39
ANG	1
AFRES	38
Civilians	510
Total	694

Air Weather Service

Headquarters	Scott AFB, Ill.
Established	July 1, 1937
Commander	Col. Frank J. Misciasci, Jr.

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Provide centralized weather, climatological, and space support to the Air Force and Army
Render technical advice, develop procedures, and field systems for the integrated weather support system
STRUCTURE
Air Force Global Weather Central, Offutt AFB, Neb.
Air Force Environmental Technical Applications Center, Scott AFB, Ill.
Combat Weather Facility, Hurlburt Field, Fla.
PERSONNEL

Active-duty	905
Officers	261
Enlisted	644
Reserve component	8
ANG	0
AFRES	8
Civilians	245
Total	1,158

NOTE
Colonel Misciasci retires May 18, 1995. His successor as AWS commander is Col. Joseph Dushan.
Joint Services Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape (SERE) Agency

Headquarters	Fort Belvoir, Va.
Established	November 15, 1991
Commander	Col. John C. Chapman, Jr.

MISSION, PURPOSE, OPERATIONS
Serve as Office of the Secretary of Defense executive agent for DoD Code of Combat/SERE-related training and DoD POW/MIA programs
Serve as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff executive agent office of primary responsibility for Joint Evasion and Escape and POW/MIA matters
Develop area contingency guides, training programs, and SERE products for use in joint commands' regional and counterdrug operations
STRUCTURE
Operations Support Division

Training Division
Three operating locations

PERSONNEL	
Active-duty	24
Officers	8
Enlisted	16
Reserve component	7
ANG	0
AFRES	7
Civilians	49
Total	80

FACILITIES
Three buildings at Fort Belvoir, Va.
Operating locations in Virginia, Washington, and Florida
NOTES
In 1994, the Joint Services SERE Agency provided SERE information updates, through messages and mobile training teams, to all current areas of operation, including South Korea, Bosnia-Hercegovina, Haiti, and Iraq. JSSA advised DoD agencies on technical matters related to Korean War and Vietnam War MIA accountability. JSSA's Desert Storm POW Study was published by the Defense Intelligence Agency in December. A stockpile of SERE products and capabilities is available for use by the warfighting CINCs to meet contingency requirements.

Air Force Reserve Flying Wings and Assigned Units

Wing Hq.	Squadron	Aircraft	Location
4th Air Force (AMC) - Hq. McClellan AFB, Calif. - Brig. Gen. Wallace W. Whaley, Commander			
349th Air Mobility Wing	301st Airlift Squadron	C-5A/B	Travis AFB, Calif.
	312th Airlift Squadron	C-5A/B	Travis AFB, Calif.
	708th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	Travis AFB, Calif.
	710th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	Travis AFB, Calif.
	70th Air Refueling Squadron	KC-10A	Travis AFB, Calif.
433d Airlift Wing	68th Airlift Squadron	C-5A	Kelly AFB, Tex.
446th Airlift Wing	97th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	McChord AFB, Wash.
	313th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	McChord AFB, Wash.
	728th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	McChord AFB, Wash.
452d Air Mobility Wing	336th Air Refueling Squadron	KC-135E	March AFB, Calif.
	79th Air Refueling Squadron	KC-10A	March AFB, Calif.
	729th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	March AFB, Calif.
	730th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	March AFB, Calif.
507th Air Refueling Wing	465th Air Refueling Squadron	KC-135R	Tinker AFB, Okla.
932d Airlift Wing	73d Airlift Squadron	C-9A	Scott AFB, Ill.
940th Air Refueling Wing	314th Air Refueling Squadron	KC-135E	McClellan AFB, Calif.
10th Air Force (ACC) - Hq. Bergstrom ARS, Tex. - Maj. Gen. David R. Smith, Commander			
94th Airlift Wing	700th Airlift Squadron	C-130H	Dobbins ARB, Ga. n1

301st Fighter Wing	457th Fighter Squadron	F-16C/D	Carswell Field, Tex.
302d Airlift Wing	731st Airlift Squadron	C-130E/H	Peterson AFB, Ohio
403d Wing	815th Airlift Squadron	C-130E	Keesler AFB, Miss.
	53d Weather Reconnaissance Squadron	WC-130H	Keesler AFB, Miss.
419th Fighter Wing	466th Fighter Squadron	F-16C/D	Hill AFB, Utah
440th Airlift Wing	95th Airlift Squadron	C-130H	General Mitchell IAP/ARS, Wis. n1
442d Fighter Wing	303d Fighter Squadron	A/OA-10A	Whiteman AFB, Mo.
482d Fighter Wing	93d Fighter Squadron	F-16A/B	Homestead ARB, Fla. n1
908th Airlift Wing	357th Airlift Squadron	C-130H	Maxwell AFB, Ala.
910th Airlift Wing	757th Airlift Squadron	C-130H	Youngstown-Warren ARS, Ohio n1
911th Airlift Wing	758th Airlift Squadron	C-130H	Pittsburgh IAP/ARS, Pa. n1
913th Airlift Wing	327th Airlift Squadron	C-130E	Willow Grove ARS, Pa. n1
914th Airlift Wing	328th Airlift Squadron	C-130H	Niagara Falls IAP/ARS, N.Y. n1
917th Wing	47th Fighter Squadron	A/OA-10A	Barksdale AFB, La.
	93d Bomb Squadron	B-52H	Barksdale AFB, La.
919th Special Operations Wing	711th Special Operations Squadron	C-130E/H, AC-130A	Duke Field, Fla.
	5th Special Operations Squadron	HC-130N/P	Eglin AFB, Fla.
924th Fighter Wing	704th Fighter Squadron	F-16C/D	Bergstrom ARS, Tex. n1
926th Fighter Wing	706th Fighter Squadron	F-16C/D	NAS/JRB New Orleans, La.
928th Airlift Wing	64th Airlift Squadron	C-130H	O'Hare IAP/ARS, Ill. n1
934th Airlift Wing	96th Airlift Squadron	C-130H	Minneapolis-St. Paul IAP/ARS, Minn. n1
939th Rescue Wing	304th Rescue Squadron	HC-130P, HH-60G	Portland IAP, Ore.
	301st Rescue Squadron	HC-130N/O, HH-60G	Patrick AFB, Fla.
	305th Rescue Squadron	HH-60G	Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz.
944th Fighter Wing	302d Fighter Squadron	F-16C/D	Luke AFB, Ariz.

22d Air Force (AMC) - Hq. Dobbins ARB, Ga. - Maj. Gen. Joseph A. McNeil, Commander

315th Airlift Wing	300th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	Charleston AFB, S.C.
	701st Airlift Squadron	C-141B	Charleston AFB, S.C.
	707th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	Charleston AFB, S.C.
	317th Airlift Squadron	C-17A	Charleston AFB, S.C.
434th Air Refueling Wing	72d Air Refueling Squadron	KC-135R	Grissom ARB, Ind. n1

	74th Air Refueling Squadron	KC-135R	Grissom ARB, Ind. n1
439th Airlift Wing	337th Airlift Squadron	C-5A	Westover ARB, Mass. n1
445th Airlift Wing	356th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio
	89th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio
459th Airlift Wing	756th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	Andrews AFB, Md.
512th Airlift Wing	326th Airlift Squadron	C-5A/B	Dover AFB, Del.
	709th Airlift Squadron	C-5A/B	Dover AFB, Del.
514th Air Mobility Wing	335th Airlift Squadron	C-141B	McGuire AFB, N.J.
	702d Airlift Squadron	C-141B	McGuire AFB, N.J.
	732d Airlift Squadron	C-141B	McGuire AFB, N.J.
	76th Air Refueling Squadron	KC-10A	McGuire AFB, N.J.
	78th Air Refueling Squadron	KC-10A	McGuire AFB, N.J.
916th Air Refueling Wing	77th Air Refueling Squadron	KC-10A n2	Seymour Johnson AFB, N.C.
927th Air Refueling Wing	63d Air Refueling Squadron	KC-135E	Selfridge ANGB, Mich.

n1 AFRES installation

n2 ACC gained

ANGB Air National Guard Base
ARB Air Reserve Base
ARS Air Reserve Station
IAP International Airport
JRB Joint Reserve Base
NAS Naval Air Station

The Air National Guard by Major Command Assignment
(As of April 1, 1995)

Air Mobility Command

C-5A transport	
105th Airlift Group	Stewart IAP, N.Y.
C-141B transport	
164th Airlift Group	Memphis IAP, Tenn.
172d Airlift Group	Allen C. Thompson Field, Miss.
KC-135 tanker	
101st Air Refueling Wing	Bangor IAP, Me.
108th Air Refueling Wing	McGuire AFB, N.J.
117th Air Refueling Wing	Birmingham Airport, Ala.
121st Air Refueling Wing	Rickenbacker ANGB, Ohio
126th Air Refueling Wing	O'Hare IAP/ARS, Ill.
128th Air Refueling Wing	General Mitchell IAP/ARS, Wis.

134th Air Refueling Wing	McGhee Tyson Airport, Tenn.
141st Air Refueling Wing	Fairchild AFB, Wash.
151st Air Refueling Wing	Salt Lake City IAP, Utah
155th Air Refueling Wing	Lincoln MAP, Neb.
157th Air Refueling Wing	Pease ANGB, N.H.
161st Air Refueling Wing	Sky Harbor IAP, Ariz.
163d Air Refueling Wing	March AFB, Calif.
171st Air Refueling Wing	Pittsburgh IAP/ARS, Pa.
186th Air Refueling Wing	Key Field, Miss.
190th Air Refueling Wing	Forbes Field, Kan.

Air Combat Command

A/OA-10A attack aircraft	
103d Fighter Group	Bradley Iap, Conn.
104th Fighter Group	Barnes MAP, Mass.
110th Fighter Group	W. K. Kellogg Airport, Mich.
175th Fighter Group	Baltimore, Md.
B-1 bomber	
184th Bomb Group	McConnell AFB, Kan.
C-130 transport	
109th Airlift Group	Schenectady Airport, N.Y.
118th Airlift Group	Nashville MAP, Tenn.
123d Airlift Wing	Standiford Field, Ky.
130th Airlift Group	Yeager Airport, W. Va.
133d Airlift Wing	Minneapolis-St. Paul IAP/ARS, Minn.
135th Airlift Group	Baltimore, Md.
136th Airlift Wing	NAS Dallas, Tex.
137th Airlift Wing	Will Rogers World Airport, Okla.
139th Airlift Group	Rosecrans Memorial Airport, Mo.
143d Airlift Group	Quonset State Airport, R.I.
145th Airlift Group	Charlotte/Douglas IAP, N.C.

146th Airlift Wing	Channel Islands ANGB, Calif.
153d Airlift Group	Cheyenne MAP, Wyo.
165th Airlift Group	Savannah IAP, Ga.
166th Airlift Group	New Castle County Airport, Del.
167th Airlift Group	Eastern West Virginia Regional Airport/Shepherd Field, W. Va.
179th Airlift Group	Mansfield Lahm Airport, Ohio
182d Airlift Group	Greater Peoria Airport, Ill
189th Airlift Group a	Little Rock AFB, Ark.
F-4G "Wild Weasel"	
124th Fighter Group	Boise Air Terminal, Idaho
F-15A/B fighter	
116th Fighter Wing	Dobbins ARB, Ga.
131st Fighter Wing	Lambert-St. Louis IAP, Mo.
159th Fighter Group	NAS/JRB New Orleans, La.
F-15A/B fighter-air defense	
102d Fighter Wing	Otis ANGB, Mass.
142d Fighter Group	Portland IAP, Ore.
F-16A/B/C/D fighter	
113th Fighter Wing	Andrews AFB, Md.
114th Fighter Group	Joe Foss Field, S.D.
122d Fighter Wing	Fort Wayne IAP, Ind.
127th Fighter Wing	Selfridge ANGB, Mich.
128th Fighter Wing	Truax Field, Wis.
132d Fighter Wing	Des Moines IAP, Iowa
138th Fighter Group	Tulsa IAP, Okla.
140th Fighter Wing	Buckley ANGB, Colo.
149th Fighter Group	Kelly AFB, Tex.
150th Fighter Group	Kirtland AFB, N.M.
156th Fighter Group	Puerto Rico IAP, Puerto Rico
169th Fighter Group	McEntire ANGB, S.C.
174th Fighter Wing	Hancock Field, N.Y.
178th Fighter Group	Springfield-Beckley MAP, Ohio
180th Fighter Group	Toledo Express Airport, Ohio
181st Fighter Group	Hulman Regional Airport, Ind.
183d Fighter Group	Capital MAP, Ill.
185th Fighter Group	Sioux Gateway Airport, Iowa
187th Fighter Group	Dannelly Field, Ala.
188th Fighter Group	Fort Smith MAP, Ark.
192d Fighter Group	Richmond IAP, Va.
F-16A/B fighter-air defense	

107th Fighter Group	Niagara Falls IAP/ARS, N.Y.
119th Fighter Group	Hector IAP, N.D.
120th Fighter Group	Great Falls IAP, Mont.
125th Fighter Group	Homestead AFB, Fla.
144th Fighter Wing	Fresno Air Terminal, Calif.
147th Fighter Group	Ellington Field, Tex.
148th Fighter Group	Duluth IAP, Minn.
158th Fighter Group	Burlington IAP, Vt.
177th Fighter Group	Atlantic City Airport, N.J.
191st Fighter Group	Selfridge ANGB, Mich.
HC-130/HH-60G rescue aircraft	
106th Rescue Group	Francis S. Gabreski IAP, N.Y.
129th Rescue Group	NAS Moffett Field, Calif.
A/OA-10A observation aircraft	
111th Fighter Group	Willow Grove ARS, Pa.
RF-4C reconnaissance aircraft	
152d Reconnaissance Group	Reno-Cannon IAP, Nev.
Air Education and Training Command	
F-16A/B/C/D fighter	
162d Fighter Group	Tucson IAP, Ariz.
Pacific Air Forces	
C-130 transport	
154th Group (204th Airlift Sqdn.)	Hickam AFB, Hawaii
176th Group b	Anchorage, Alaska
F-15A/B fighter	
154th Group c	Hickam AFB, Hawaii
KC-135 tanker	
168th Air Refueling Group	Eielson AFB, Alaska
154th Group (203d ARS)	Hickam AFB, Hawaii
Special Operations Command	
EC-130E special operations aircraft	
193d Special Operations Group	Harrisburg IAP, Pa.

a Aircrew CCTU

b Includes 210th Air Rescue Squadron with HC-130 and HH-60G aircraft

c Includes 203d Air Refueling Squadron with KC-135 aircraft

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE-MDC: May 10, 1995

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

BASE VISIT SCHEDULE ANNOUNCED BY COMMISSION

27 Bases To Be Visited

Washington, DC, May 16, 1995 -- The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission announced its schedule for visits to bases being considered for realignment and closure as a result of the Commission's May 10 decision to add bases to the Secretary of Defense's list. All dates are subject to change.

Twenty-seven major installations proposed for closure or realignment are currently scheduled to receive a base visit by one or more Commissioners. Base visits provide an opportunity for Commissioners to view a base directly and to investigate first-hand many of the issues related to the military value of the base. The Base Public Affairs Officer should be contacted for visit specifics.

Scheduled visits as of today (a visit to Homestead AFB, Florida will be added to the schedule):

May 22 -- McClellan AFB, CA
May 23 -- San Bruno EFAW, CA
-- SUPSHIP, CA
-- NWAD Corona, CA
-- FISC, CA
-- Oakland Army Base, CA
May 24 -- Hill AFB, UT
May 26 -- McClellan AFB, CA
-- Grand Forks AFB, ND
May 30 -- General Mitchell ARS, WI
-- Minneapolis-St. Paul IAP ARS, MN
-- O'Hare IAP ARS, IL
-- NAWC Pt. Mugu, CA/China Lake, CA
May 30 -- Niagara Falls IAP ARS, NY
-- Youngtown-Warren MAP ARS, OH
June 1 -- Letterkenny Army Depot, PA
-- Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA
June 2 -- Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, ME
June 5 -- NAS Atlanta, GA
-- Robins AFB, GA
-- Carswell ARS, TX
June 6 -- Kelly AFB, TX
June 7 -- Laughlin AFB, TX
-- Tinker AFB, OK
June 8 -- Vance AFB, OK
-- Columbus AFB, MS
-- Space & Strategic Defense Command, Huntsville, AL

more

The Commission's regional hearing schedule, announced May 15, is as follows. Specific locations to be determined.

May 25	San Francisco, California	9:00 AM -- 5:30 PM
May 31	Chicago, Illinois	9:00 AM -- 1:30 PM
June 3	Boston, Massachusetts	8:30 AM -- 1:15 PM
June 9	Atlanta, Georgia	9:00 AM -- 2:45 PM
June 10	Dallas, Texas	9:00 AM -- 3:30 PM

Interested persons should contact the Commission prior to visits for confirmation of dates and the Commissioner(s) attending each visit.

###

05/16/95

Meeting: DBCRC Air Force Team – Air Force Realignment & Transition

Attendees:

Maj. Gen. Jay D. Blume
Brig. Gen. Weaver
Col. McNierney
Col. Callahan
Col. Sample
Lt. Col. B. Eckels
Lt. Col. Ray
Lt. Col. Kring
Lt. Col. L. Ekhard
Maj. Fritz Linsenmeyer

David Lyles, Staff Director
Ben Borden, Director of Review & Analysis
Frank Cirillo, Air Force Team Leader
Jim Owsley, Cross-Service Team Leader
Steve Ackerman, Air Force Team
Frank Cantwell, Air Force Team
Rick DiCamillo, Air Force Team
Craig Hall, Air Force Team
Merrill Beyer, Air Force Team
Dave Olson, Air Force Team
Mark Pross, Air Force Team
Ed Flippen, Interagency Team (FAA analyst)
Bob Bivins, Interagency Team (COBRA analyst)
Bob Cook, Interagency Team Leader

REGIONAL HEARING LOCATIONS
1995

SAN FRANCISCO, CA: THURSDAY, MAY 25: 9:00AM - 5:34PM

The Basilone Theater
Bldg 401
Naval Station, Treasure Island
San Francisco, CA.
(415) 395-5112
Seating Capacity: 998

CHICAGO, IL: WEDNESDAY, MAY 31: 9:00AM - 1:21PM

The O'Hare Hilton
O'Hare International Airport
Lower Level, Terminal Two
Chicago, IL.
(312) 686-8000
Seating Capacity: 300

BOSTON, MA: SATURDAY, JUNE 3: 8:30AM - 1:09PM

The John F. Kennedy Library
Columbia Point
Boston, MA.
(617) 929-4552
Seating Capacity: 500

ATLANTA, GA: FRIDAY, JUNE 9: 9:00AM - 2:46PM

The Fox Theater
660 Peach Tree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA.
(404) 881-2100
Seating Capacity: 600

FORT WORTH, TX: SATURDAY, JUNE 10: 9:00AM - 3:25PM

Fort Worth/Tarrant County Convention Center
1111 Houston Street
Fort Worth, TX.
(817) 884-2222
Seating Capacity: 1500

Merrill:
Initial and
return to me.
Steve

FXC
DRVE — all
Merrill

TO THE N1 TEAM:

Home of "Supernatural (and crazy)
Wisdom".

LET'S BAG SOME PREY!

Your friendly neighborhood
Counsel
R.K.

The San Francisco Chronicle, MAY 11, 1995

fair share of closures.''

By law, the commission must send its final recommendations to President inton and Congress by July 1. In the past, neither the executive branch nor ongress has dissented from the panel's recommendations.

In March, Perry recommended keeping open the Oakland Army Base, adjacent to the Port of Oakland, for strategic purposes. The base is the Army's only West Coast port, and Pentagon officials said it would be needed in the event of a major conflict in Korea or elsewhere in the Pacific.

In addition, they said the Oakland base, with 2,200 civilian and military employees, might be needed during a national emergency because commercial ports cannot handle ''unique cargo.''

However, commission members said the Pentagon could use other ports if necessary and that, ''other than bulk ammunition, there is no item of Army equipment that requires exclusive use of a military port.''

Only one member voted against putting the Oakland Army Base back on the list. Rebecca Cox accused her fellow commissioners of going on a ''fishing expedition'' to find bases to shut, without sufficient analysis.

''We have some recommendations here on which we don't have a lot of ackground information, and it is not clear that the military has done its omework regarding what its options are,'' Cox said.

Retired Admiral Robert Toney, president of the Oakland Metropolitan Chamber f Commerce, said he thinks the Oakland base ultimately will be spared. In 1993, e fought unsuccessfully to save Alameda Naval Air Station and was shocked when ie Navy decided to relocate two nuclear carriers to San Diego and Everett, ish.

''Having seen them do that, anything is possible, but it wouldn't make any rategic or economic sense,'' he said. ''If they close it, somebody's getting nd of crazy.''

Assemblywoman Barbara Alby, R-Fair Oaks, whose district includes McClellan, pressed amazement at the recommendation to close the base.

''The Defense Department and Air Force studied it for a full year, and they termined and swore under oath that it should stay open,'' she said. ''Now a mission decides within 45 days that the experts were all wrong. I can't see re this supernatural wisdom came from, but it must be reversed.''

Dixon rejected charges that California is being disproportionately hurt by closures and noted that there is abundant evidence that the United States more defense facilities than it needs for the post-Cold War era.

During three earlier rounds of base closures, California lost nearly 50,000 ilian jobs on the bases and perhaps four times as many jobs in surrounding unities, a hit that played an important role in driving the state into a and deep recession.

he predicted savings may be "understated."

sley said the five depots together currently are operating at 48 percent of city. The Air Force downsizing plan would increase that figure to 52 rcent. Closing one depot would further raise the capacity figure to 69 rcent. Shutting down two depots would raise it to 73 percent, he said.

He also voiced concern that the Air Force had underestimated its worker reduction rate from closed depots at 7 percent, with the rest transferring to other facilities. The Navy and Army assume a reduction rate of between 43 percent and 63 percent, he said.

It was those and other concerns that weighed on commissioners' minds.

"The Air Force data was so suspect from the beginning," said Commissioner J.B. Davis, a retired Air Force general.

Another commissioner, retired Rear Adm. Benjamin Montoya, said, "Is it wise to downsize five facilities and have excess capacity at every one of those facilities lying idle? As a businessman, I know that costs you money."

McClellan and Kelly are more at risk than the other three depots because both were separately ranked as the least valuable by the Air Force and by a Pentagon task force that studied ways to consolidate equipment repair.

Both scored low in military value. They were found to be the least costly to close, and would provide the fastest savings and inflict the least economic damage on surrounding communities.

"I would predict that probably one or both those will end up on the final list," said military analyst Taibl.

"I'm afraid that seems to be the case," said Rep. John Doolittle, R-Rocklin. 'That's because (the commission) is into the mentality of having to bag a prey ere. . . . We've got to make sure that we're not the prey that's in the bag."

Rep. Robert Matsui, D-Sacramento, said the commission should also examine the reater efficiency of McClellan's workers, while Fazio said it would be unfair o close McClellan given the cumulative economic impact from the recent closures f Mather Air Force Base in Rancho Cordova and the Sacramento Army Depot.

"The fight for McClellan is far from over," said U.S. Sen. Barbara Boxer, -Calif.

Bee staff writers Paul Schnitt and Steve Gibson contributed to this report.

What happens next

Wednesday was the last opportunity for the Base Closure and realignment mmission to add bases to the list for possible closure. This year marks the st round of Defense Department downsizing. The final list will be compiled and proved as follows:

Before June 11

TO: TEAM LEADS. - COAST GUARD IMPACTS
Ben 5/31/95 to Merrill, Mark, Dave, Fxc
(Dave pls insure Ann/Les see for "issues slide")
F

Plans, Policy and Evaluation Division
U. S. Coast Guard Headquarters
2100 2nd Street, SW
Washington, DC 20593-0001

Office Number: (202) 267-2355
Fax Number: (202) 267-4401

Date: 31 May 95

To: Mr. Ben Borden

Office/Routing Symbol:

Work Phone:

Fax Phone: 703-696-~~0504~~ 0550

From: Ms. Kathy Scott
202-267-2360

Comments: Attached is an advance draft copy of letter for Commandant's signature. Enclosure provides matrix of direct impacts on CG due to BRAC '95.

Number of pages to follow this cover sheet: 6

This fax machine is "UNATTENDED"
and receives automatically 24 hours a day.
Please let me know that you are sending a document.

U.S. Department of Transportation
United States Coast Guard

Commandant
U. S. Coast Guard

2100 Second St., S.W.
Washington, DC 20593-0001
Staff Symbol: G-CPP
Phone: (202) 267-2355

DRAFT

Honorable Alan Dixon
Chairman, Defense Base Closure
and Realignment Commission
1700 North Moore Street
Suite 1425
Arlington, VA 22209

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Coast Guard has reviewed the list of recommended base closures and realignments provided by the Secretary of Defense and the 35 recently added by the Commission. I have enclosed a matrix portraying those facilities which will have direct impacts on Coast Guard operations should they close or realign.

The eight Department of Defense facilities identified in the matrix will directly impact our operations in terms of forcing the relocation of a Coast Guard tenant command or terminating established relationships in direct support of Coast Guard field operations. We have identified numerous other facilities that will indirectly affect the Coast Guard in terms of loss of traditional military support provided among services. Examples of these indirect affects include the potential closure of Navy Public Works Center Guam which supplies shoreside services to Coast Guard vessels and waterfront maintenance; the potential closure of Navy Fleet and Industrial Supply Center which frequently provides supplies, equipment and repair parts for Coast Guard vessels; and the potential closure of Naval Shipyard Long Beach which provides direct, high quality ship repair services and family support services to the Coast Guard.

As the federal government continues to streamline operations to meet the needs of its customers, the Coast Guard's motto remains Semper Paratus, always ready. I ask that you consider the Coast Guard in your recommendations to the President. Should you have questions, my point of contact is Captain Blain Brinson, who may be reached at (202) 267-2355.

Sincerely,

Enclosure

IMPACT OF DOD FACILITY CLOSURES/REALIGNMENTS

DRAFT

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
NAVAL AIR FACILITY ADAK, AL (Closure)	LORAN STATION (LORSTA) ATTU AIR STATION (AIRSTA) KODIAK ADAK LORAN MONITOR COMMUNICATION STATION KODIAK	Closure of this facility will have a major impact on CG operations in the North Pacific. Loss of use of this facility will impair our ability to perform maritime law enforcement and safety and security missions. Adak currently provides both cutter and aircraft support for CG ops. Loss of this facility will result in decreased aircraft on-scene time and delay of medical evacuation patients. It will result in fewer on-scene cutter days for law enforcement patrols. Loss of Loran monitoring station at Adak may force a relocation of the site at great cost. CG cutters also use Adak for JP-5 refueling. They could potentially switch to diesel fuel available at Dutch Harbor, but with negative impacts. Naval Security Group Adak currently supports COMMSTA Kodiak remote MF and HF transceivers and receivers. Its closure will terminate the Inter-service Support Agreement (ISSA). Other support alternatives are being investigated.
CHARLES MELVIN PRICE SUPPORT CENTER, IL (Closure)	NAVAL ENGINEERING SUPPORT UNIT (NESU) ST. LOUIS ELECTRONICS MAINTENANCE DETACHMENT (EMD) ST. LOUIS MARINE SAFETY OFFICE (MSO) ST. LOUIS	NESU & EMD St. Louis are existing tenants of this facility. MSO St. Louis currently maintains their small boats and pollution responses equipment in a building at the Support Center. A planning proposal for a new Base St. Louis at this site has been approved. Anticipate closure will lead to a Title 10 transfer of 22 acres to the CG for the new base. Impact on NESU and EMD St. Louis is unknown. Charles Melvin Price Support Center also provides an exchange, commissary, gym, golf course and club house that are used by CG personnel. The Army Depot at Granite City will remain active, providing

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
CHARLES MELVIN PRICE SUPPORT CENTER cont.		commissary/exchange services to CG personnel. CG Auxiliary would be directly impacted by closure of this facility. The Support Center houses the Auxiliary's National Supply Center (ANSC). The ANSC is the storage and distribution center for Auxiliary pubs, awards, member course, etc. The ANSC is operated under contract, with CG managing the contract and overseeing operations. The Auxiliary may be forced to lease the same space, most likely at an increased cost, or move the location, requiring transportation of inventory and development of a new contract. The CG District 2 armory is currently in shared Army space. A new armory is included within the scope of the new Base St. Louis design. There may be an opportunity for future consolidation of the NESU, EMD, and MSO at the new base site.
SELFRIDGE ARMY GARRISON, MI (Closure)	AIRSTA DETROIT GROUP/BASE DETROIT MSO DETROIT STATION BELLE ISLAND STATION PORT HURON STATION ST. CLAIR SHORES AIDS TO NAVIGATION TEAM (ANT) DETROIT CG CUTTER (CGC) BRISTOL BAY	Airsta Detroit is a tenant command of this facility. It is unlikely that the Airsta will have to relocate as the airfield property is under the custody of the Michigan Air National Guard (ANG). Operational services are supported by an ISSA between the Air Station and Michigan ANG. With a total closure of this base, CG may lose commissary, exchange, medical, and child care services. Fire fighting services and Airfield Crash and Rescue are 50% funded by the Army and 50% by the 127th Fighter Wing of Michigan ANG. If the ANG is unable to absorb 100% funding, a significant cutback in the airfield support could occur or CG might have to provide additional funds to continue support of this service. CG occupies 116 of 745 Army housing units. The Army has no plans to continue to run this housing. Closure could mean expanding our leased housing for eligible members.

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
SENECA ARMY DEPOT, NY (Closure)	LORSTA SENECA	Staffing at LORSTA Seneca is programmed to decrease from 20 personnel to 4 with the completion of a LORAN consolidated control project 7/97. The nature of LORAN operations makes movement of the LORAN facility impossible and the option to acquire the property has been explored locally. The effect of closure of Seneca housing, 32 units, would minimally impact the CG. Additional minor concerns include the transfer of LORSTA water and sewer currently provided by Seneca Army Depot, to Seneca County. The Army also manages a profitable MWR recreational travel camp, used by Active Duty Military and retirees as vacation cottages. The depot also provides telephone services to LORSTA Seneca.
NAS SOUTH WEYMOUTH, MA (Closure)	SOUTH WEYMOUTH BUOY DEPOT STATION SCITUATE CG DISTRICT 1	South Weymouth Buoy Depot is a tenant command of this facility. The CG does not own or lease, just has use of the site. The ISSA with the Navy states that an additional 6 acres could be made available to the CG if the NAS ever closed. The NAS Fire Department provides protection and safety inspections for the Depot. We may be able to rely on the local Fire Department to provide protection services. We currently lease 50 housing units from the Navy for CG families in the Boston area. The housing is poor and considered to be a maintenance burden; however, other housing options are limited. The NAS housing may be unnecessary for Boston-area members; District 1 needs to address this in the future. The Navy exchange may close; may be feasible for CG Exchange System to take over if a CG presence remains. The CG may see a significant decrease in the established ISSA with the Navy at Airsta Cape Cod. The CG provides the Navy use of 95 units of housing at Cape Cod.

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
NAS SOUTH WEYMOUTH, MA cont.		The NAS South Weymouth closure may reduce the Navy need for housing by as much as 80 units. The CG will still own these units, but not receive maintenance funding. Loss of commissary and exchange facilities will impact drilling reservists in the area. Closure of the clinic will have a minor affect on CG personnel at Station Scituate. D1 field operations will be impacted to a limited degree if the NAS closes: D1 provides semi-annual intelligence briefings to the P-3 squadron at South Weymouth, who in turn provide Target of Interest information to the district during/after flights. The squadron has also been an additional reconaissance asset during AMIO operations.
NAS CORPUS CHRISTI, TX (Realignment)	AIRSTA CORPUS CHRISTI	AIRSTA Corpus Christi is a tenant command of this facility. The Navy may desire to relocate several tenants to maximize space utilization. At one time, NAS expressed an intent to use the CG hangar for the USN minesweeper helos. If that occured, the Navy has indicated they would provide CG with another location on base and would attempt to assist with move/remodeling costs. The latest BRAC developments/ recommendations make it likely that CG will retain its current location in Hangar 41.
MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (Closure)	AIRSTA SACRAMENTO	AIRSTA Sacramento is a tenant command of this facility. Closure of the AFB would force relocation of CG airsta. The CG does not desire to become an airfield landlord. The Air Force currently provides interservice support such as airfield, control tower, crash and fire, weather office, and civil engineering support. They also provide family support services such as housing, medical, dental, exchange, commissary, etc. Airsta Sacramento also receives courier service, communications support and is a local user of the Air Force Classified Material System account. The CG has

XSVC

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
		local radio transceivers and antennae installed in the Air Force hangar, such as VHF and HF.
NAS POINT MUGU, CA	CG DISTRICT 11	The CG has a National Distress System VHF-FM High Level Site at Point Mugu. The Navy provides the control circuits, power and emergency power to the site.
BAYONNE MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL, NJ (Closure)		This site is being considered as a proposed location for several NY area commands. Closure of this facility will probably make Army barracks unavailable for CG cutters tentatively planned to homeport there as part of the Streamlining proposals.
FORT DIX, NJ (Realignment)	ATLANTIC STRIKE TEAM	Atlantic Strike Team is a tenant command of this facility. FY95 AC&I project to construct equipment facility with construction award anticipated 3/30/95. No impact anticipated.

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
EGLIN AFB, FL (Realignment)	LORAN MONITORING SITE STA DESTIN FT WALTON NATIONAL DISTRESS SYSTEM CAPE SAN BLAS NATIONAL DISTRESS SYSTEM	STA Destin, FT Walton NDS, Cape San Blas NDS all located on Army property but managed by Eglin (utilities, tower, equipment hut, etc) Impact unknown.
NSWC CRANE DIVISION DETACHMENT, KY (Closure)	CGYD MLCLANT MLCPAC	This closure will have a major impact on field support of the MK75 gun, MK15 CIWS and MK36 SRBOC. This center provides technical and parts assistance, overhauls and defines maintenance procedures for these weapon systems. The Navy may continue to support the MK15 CIWS and MK36 SRBOC, but is removing the MK75 from its inventory. CG YARD may be able to fill this gap.
NUWC NEWPORT DIVISION NEW LONDON DETACHMENT NEW LONDON, CT (Closure)	CGC EAGLE CGC REDWOOD STA NEW LONDON	CGC EAGLE currently moors at Pier 7 when in homeport. SECDOD recommendation is for Pier 7 to remain open. This pier also provides a homeport for the CGC REDWOOD. Anticipate STA New London will acquire its current site and will retain access to Pier 7.
NAVAL COMMAND, CONTROL AND OCEAN SURVEILLANCE CENTER, IN-SERVICE ENGINEERING CENTER EAST COAST DETACHMENT, NORFOLK, VA (Realignment)	G-T MLCLANT MLCPAC	Headquarters, Headquarters units, and MLCs contract with NISE East for electronics engineering support. Unclear from the recommendations as to what functions may be deleted. Major moves of personnel/equipment may result in project elimination or delays.
FORT HAMILTON, NY (Realignment)		May affect USCG personnel remaining in NY area if GI relocates and commissary/exchange close. Other potential impacts unknown.

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
NAVAL SHIPYARD LONG BEACH, CA (Closure)	SUPRTCEN SAN PEDRO	The shipyard and SIMA provide direct, high quality ship repair services to local CG. Service connectivity for the RAPIDS program and the Defense Switched Network at CGD11 are provided by the Naval Shipyard. Alternate service points will have to be identified. This closure will also impact support services for the CG, i.e., a Family Support Center, commissary, exchange, barber shop, pharmacy, medical services, child care. CGD11 Response Advisory Team houses our Vessel of Opportunity Skilling System at the Shipyard. SUPRTCEN San Pedro uses the Navy clinic for some x-ray and laboratory services. Because of the distance of San Pedro from any other federal direct care inpatient or specialty service provider, the CG may have to contract for or obtain an MOU with the Dept. of Veterans Affairs for many of these services. Closure may also eliminate berthing/ messing opportunities for reservists augmenting CG commands in the area. PSU 311 is in the process of being established using a warehouse on the shipyard. They are currently setting up temporary storage facilities and will probably require additional warehouse cost if they have to relocate.
MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (Realignment)	AIRSTA SACRAMENTO See Previous Impact on McClellan	McClellan is slated for realignment. Currently 29 CG families reside there in Air Force housing. If the realignment results in more AF families at McClellan, the CG may see a reduction in government owned housing opportunities. Consolidation of workloads at McClellan should not impact CG operations at Airsta Sacramento as long as the runway remains operational and the current support provided by the Air Force continues.

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
EAST FORT BAKER, CA (Closure)	STA GOLDEN GATE	The Fort has some limited housing, currently used by a few CG families. Recent degradation in maintenance has already influenced a decision to vacate.
RIO VISTA ARMY RESERVE (Closure)	STA RIO VISTA	This facility is adjacent to Station Rio Vista. Do not anticipate any impact due to closure.
MOFFET FEDERAL AIRFIELD AGS, CA (Closure)	AIRSTA SACRAMENTO	The 129th Air National Guard Air Rescue Squadron is located at this facility. Occasionally, this squadron flies long range SAR for the CG and maintains long range SAR guard when CG C-130's are down. SECDOD recommendation is for Squadron to relocate to McClellan AFB which should facilitate an improved working relationship between Airsta Sacramento and the Squadron.
NAVAL COMMAND, CONTROL AND OCEAN SURVEILLANCE CENTER, IN-SERVICE ENGINEERING WEST COAST DIVISION, SAN DIEGO, CA (Closure)	G-T MLCLANT MLCPAC	Headquarters, Headquarters units, and MLCs contract with NISE West for electronics engineering support. Unclear from the recommendations as to what functions may be deleted. Major moves of personnel/equipment may result in project elimination or delays.
ROBINS AFB, GA ~~(Realignment)~~ XSVS	AR&SC ELIZABETH CITY	AR&SC receives complete Air Force support for repair of CG C-130's through ISSA agreements. AR&SC does not have the facilities to repair C-130's. Impact on ISSA's unknown.
the XSVS		
KELLY AFB, TX (Realignment) XSVS	AR&SC ELIZABETH CITY	AR&SC receives complete Air Force support for repair of CG C-130's through ISSA agreements. ARSC does not have the facilities to repair the C-130's. Impact on ISSA's unknown.
HILL AFB, UT (Realignment) AVIATION TROOP COMMAND, MO	AR&SC ELIZABETH CITY (Closure)	These facilities provide ISSA support to AR&SC. They do depot level preventive maintenance on our C-130's and H60s.

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
NAVAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS SUPPORT OFFICE, CHESAPEAKE, VA (Closure)		This facility provides In-Service Engineering Agent (ISEA) services for the Microcomputer Organizational Maintenance Management Systems. This system allows for an electronic link to the USN Maintenance Data System. We currently have a MIPR in place with them to perform this function for us.
NAVAL SEA SYSTEM COMMAND, ARLINGTON, VA (Realignment)	G-ODO	All NAVORD equipment program managers are located here. We deal directly with all applicable program managers on ordnance matters. Impact unknown.
BROOKS AFB, TX (Closure)	GRU GALVESTON GRU CORPUS CHRISTI AIRSTA CORPUS CHRISTI	Loss of commissary/exchange facilities will impact active duty and reserve personnel in CGD8.
BERGSTROM AFB, TX (Closure)	GRU GALVESTON GRU CORPUS CHRISTI AIRSTA CORPUS CHRISTI	Loss of commissary/exchange facilities will impact active duty and reserve personnel in CGD8.
DEFENSE DISTRIBUTION DEPOT RED RIVER, TX (Closure)	GRU GALVESTON GRU CORPUS CHRISTI AIRSTA CORPUS CHRISTI	Loss of support services will impact reserve personnel in CGD8.
RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT, TX (Closure)	GRU GALVESTON GRU CORPUS CHRISTI AIRSTA CORPUS CHRISTI	Loss of support services will impact reserve personnel in CGD8.
NAS BARBERS POINT, HI (Change to previous BRAC)	CGAS BARBERS POINT	Navy housing may continue to be available to the CG; the BRAC '95 SECDOD recommendation retains it for multi-service use. Positive impact to CG.

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
FORT GREELY, AL (Realignment)	LORSTA TOK	LORSTA Tok personnel use the commissary and exchange at Ft Greely. Ft Greely closure will not impair LORAN operations. The Army metrology lab at Greeley repairs and calibrates all electronics equipment on inventory at LORSTA TOK. If the lab were to close as part of this realignment, the CG would have to pay for this service or purchase $25K worth of calibrating equipment.
SHIP REPAIR FACILITY, GUAM (Closure)	MARSEC MSO GUAM CGC BASSWOOD CGC GALVESTON ISLAND	Closure of this facility could lead to eventual closure of the naval station clinic and hospital, the primary source of medical care for the 116 CG personnel and their dependents in Naval housing. Vessel maintenance and repair assistance has been provided at this facility, as well as dry dock capability. Additional cutter transit time will be required for this type of maintenance. In addition, the Navy metrology lab repairs and calibrates all electronics equipment on inventory at MARSEC Guam. If the lab closes, the cost for this work would increase by an estimated $5K per year.
NAVAL ACTIVITIES GUAM (Realignment)	MARSEC MSO GUAM CGC GALVESTON ISLAND CGC BASSWOOD	Naval Activities Guam supports active duty and reserve CG on Guam in many ways as tenant activities. ISSA's are in place with the Navy Public Works Center for general, electrical, water/sewer and housing support, as well as telephone services for our buildings, offices and grounds on NAVACT. MARSEC, MSO and the 2 cutters are located on CG property within NAVACTS. CG units are directly supported by almost every department of NAVACTS. The Navy provides security, training spaces, MWR services, food services, consolidated bachelor quarters, portion operations, commercial travel, fire department response, legal services, etc.

DOD INSTALLATION	AFFECTED CG UNITS	IMPACT
GREATER PITTSBURGH IAP AIR RESERVE STATION, PA (Closure)	MSO PITTSBURGH	Closure of this facility will impact Reserve personnel who stay at this facility when drilling. Costs of Reserve drills will escalate in the Pittsburgh area because of high costs associated with temporary lodging.
SPACE AND NAVAL WARFARE SYSTEMS COMMAND ARLINGTON, VA (Change to previous BRAC)		Relocation of this command to San Diego will make it difficult to participate in Navy electronic systems programs affecting CG, e.g. Defense Message System, high speed fleet broadcast, NTCS-A/JMCIS, NAVMAC-II.
FITZSIMONS ARMY MEDICAL CENTER, CO (Closure)		Primary impact on health care services will be the relocation of the Optical Fabrication Laboratory to Ft Sam Houston, TX. This laboratory provides military eyeware support to CG personnel west of the Mississippi River. Loss of service may only be temporary during transfer to Texas.
FORT BUCHANAN, PR (Realignment)	CG BASE SAN JUAN	Closure of the family housing units and conversion to a primary reserve unit will affect health care provided by the Army clinic primarily for CG dependents.
NAVAL AIR STATION ALAMEDA, CA (Change to previous BRAC)	PACAREA	PACAREA (Pi) presently picks up Defense Courier Service material at NAS Alameda. A new delivery system will need to be developed to take care of delivery of classified material in a timely manner. PACAREA (Pi) provides over the counter Sensitive Compartmented Information traffic service to local Navy ships and CG units. When NAS closes, PACAREA anticipates losing the assigned Navy billets that assist the staffing for this service.
OAKLAND ARMY BASE, CA	CG PACIFIC AREA	Anticipate telephone circuit (secure and non-secure impacts.

13TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright 1995 The Buffalo News
The Buffalo News

May 15, 1995, Monday, City Edition

SECTION: LOCAL; Pg. 4

LENGTH: 520 words

Steve I do not know how accurate these news releases are as far as the reporting but they do have some misconceptions in the eye of the public - Frank

HEADLINE: LAFALCE, OFFICIALS START MAPPING PLAN TO PERSUADE PANEL TO RETAIN FALLS BASE

BYLINE: By HENRY L. DAVIS, News Staff Reporter

BODY:

Facing hearings less than a month away, local officials will begin today to plan a strategy to thwart a proposal to close the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Base.

Rep. John J. LaFalce, whose district includes the base, said he arranged a meeting of local officials in his Niagara Falls office to prepare a response for public hearings June 12-13 in Washington on the base-closing proposal. — These are the DC hearings where members of Cong testify no more than 5 min each (sound bites)

"It's a preliminary gathering to consider what to do and how to do it," he said.

The Defense Base Reduction and Closure Commission agreed last week to add the Niagara Falls base and five other bases in Chicago, Minneapolis, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh and Youngstown, Ohio, to the federal government's latest round of base closings. Actually - "Add for further consideration as an addition to or replacement of other facilities on the DoD list

A commission official said he believes that one or two of the six facilities will be closed. The commission will decide which bases to close at a meeting June 22. — Actually the final deliberation hearings are scheduled for June 22, 23, 24 & 26 (spill) with the actual sequence not yet set

"This came like a thunderbolt. We have to move fast," said LaFalce, D-Town of Tonawanda, who lobbied to get $ 25 million in federal funding in the last five years for improvements at the base.

LaFalce suggested that officials prepare for the June hearings by devising an argument for each of the eight criteria the commission will use to make its decision. — The June Hearings are; 12-13 - Cong 5 min statements, 14th DoD testifies before the Commission, 22, 23, 24, 26 - Final deliberation - Akin to a mark-up. Staff testifies

For instance, he said, ~~the Niagara~~ Falls economy would suffer disproportionate financial damage compared with those of such larger cities as Chicago.

He also said the commission must take into account the $ 70 million invested at the base over the last 10 years. — Although a minor factor - past capital investment is considered sunk costs as far as the decision

On the issue of manpower, LaFalce said four of the six facilities suggested for closing are near another C-130 base, making shutdowns there less painful for reservists, while Niagara Falls is not within commuting distance of another C-130 base.

The Buffalo News, May 15, 1995

Two years ago, the base closing commission voted to shut Plattsburgh Air Force Base and most of Griffiss Air Force Base in Rome. The current round of base closings includes the Air Force's Rome Laboratory.

The Niagara Falls facility includes eight new C-130 Hercules transport planes and a fleet of 10 midair tankers. About 2,500 Reserve members from Western New York report to the base, which employs about 800 civilians and has an annual Air Force payroll of $ 56 million, according to base officials.

—this analysis only considers the Reserve unit - C-130 not ANG

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE-MDC: May 17, 1995

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

ALAN J. DIXON, CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONERS:
AL CORNELLA
REBECCA COX
GEN J. B. DAVIS, USAF (RET)
S. LEE KLING
RADM BENJAMIN F. MONTOYA, USN (RET)
MG JOSUE ROBLES, JR., USA (RET)
WENDI LOUISE STEELE

For Immediate Release

Contact: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

BASE CLOSURE COMMISSION ANNOUNCES CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

Over 200 Members of Congress to testify on June 12 and June 13

WASHINGTON, DC, JUNE 5, 1995 -- The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission today announced it schedule for two days of Congressional hearings to be held on Capitol Hill. The purpose of these hearings is to receive testimony from Members of Congress who have requested to speak on behalf of their installations which face realignment or closure.

The June 12 hearing will begin at 8:30 am in room 345 of the Cannon House Office Building. The June 13 hearing will begin at 8:30 am in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

Department of Defense officials will testify before the Commission regarding the Secretary of Defense's list and on additions by the Commission to his list on June 14 in room 216 of the Hart Senate Office Building. Further information on this hearing will be released this week.

A list of the Members scheduled to testify on June 12 and June 13 follows:
(Schedule is subject to change).

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY
JUNE 12, 1995
345 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

8:30-8:35 Opening remarks

NEW MEXICO
8:35-8:40 Sen. Pete Domenici
8:40-8:45 Sen. Jeff Bingaman
8:45-8:50 Rep. Joe Skeen
8:50-8:55 Rep. Bill Richardson
8:55-9:00 Rep. Steve Schiff

SOUTH CAROLINA
9:03-9:08 Sen. Strom Thurmond
9:08-9:13 Sen. Ernest Hollings
9:13-9:18 Rep. Mark Sanford
9:18-9:23 Rep. James Clyburn

MASSACHUSETTS
4:51-4:56 Sen. Ted Kennedy
4:56-5:01 Rep. Gerry Studds

MICHIGAN
5:04-5:09 Sen. Carl Levin
5:09-5:14 Rep. David Bonior
5:14-5:19 Rep. Sander Levin

MINNESOTA
5:22-5:27 Rep. Martin Sabo
5:27-5:32 Rep. Bruce Vento

5:35-5:40 Rep. Steve Horn
5:40-5:45 Rep. Elton Gallegly
5:45-5:50 Rep. Eva Clayton

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY
JUNE 13, 1995
216 HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

8:30-8:35 Opening remarks

MISSISSIPPI
8:35-8:40 Sen. Thad Cochran
8:40-8:45 Sen. Trent Lott
8:45-8:50 Rep. Sonny Montgomery

MISSOURI
8:53-8:58 Sen. Kit Bond
8:58-9:03 Sen. John Ashcroft
9:03-9:08 Rep. Dick Gephardt
9:08-9:13 Rep. William Clay
9:13-9:18 Rep. James Talent
9:18-9:23 Rep. Ike Skelton

MONTANA
9:26-9:31 Sen. Max Baucus
9:31-9:36 Sen. Conrad Burns
9:36-9:41 Rep. Pat Williams

NEW JERSEY
9:44-9:49 Sen. Bill Bradley
9:49-9:54 Sen. Frank Lautenberg
9:54-9:59 Rep. Jim Saxton
9:59-10:04 Rep. Chris Smith
10:04-10:09 Rep. Frank Pallone
10:09-10:14 Rep. Robert Menendez

NEW YORK
10:17-10:22 Sen. Pat Moynihan
10:22-10:27 Sen. Al D'Amato
10:27-10:32 Rep. Gary Ackerman
10:32-10:37 Rep. Susan Molinari
10:37-10:42 Rep. Sherwood Boehlert
10:42-10:47 Rep. Jack Quinn
10:47-10:52 Rep. John LaFalce

NORTH CAROLINA
10:55-11:00 Sen. Lauch Faircloth
11:00-11:05 Rep. Walter Jones

NORTH DAKOTA
11:08-11:13 Sen. Kent Conrad
11:13-11:18 Sen. Byron Dorgan
11:18-11:23 Rep. Earl Pomeroy

OHIO
11:26-11:31 Sen. John Glenn
11:31-11:36 Sen. Mike Dewine
11:36-11:41 Rep. Tony Hall
11:41-11:46 Rep. David Hobson
11:46-11:51 Rep. Jim Traficant
11:51-11:56 Rep. Rob Portman
11:56-12:01 Rep. John Kasich

OKLAHOMA
12:04-12:09 Sen. Don Nickles
12:09-12:14 Sen. Jim Inhofe
12:14-12:19 Rep. Bill Brewster
12:19-12:24 Rep. J.C. Watts
12:24-12:29 Rep. Ernest Istook
12:29-12:34 Rep. Frank Lucas

PENNSYLVANIA
12:37-12:42 Sen. Arlen Specter
12:42-12:47 Sen. Rick Santorum
12:47-12:52 Rep. Tom Foglietta
12:52-12:57 Rep. Robert Borski
12:57-1:02 Rep. Ron Klink
1:02-1:07 Rep. Tim Holden
1:07-1:12 Rep. Curt Weldon
1:12-1:17 Rep. James Greenwood
1:17-1:22 Rep. Bud Shuster
1:22-1:27 Rep. Jon Fox

ALABAMA
9:26-9:31 Sen. Howell Heflin
9:31-9:36 Rep. Glen Browder
9:36-9:41 Rep. Tom Bevill

ALASKA
9:44-9:49 Sen. Ted Stevens
9:49-9:54 Sen. Frank Murkowski
9:54-9:59 Rep. Don Young

ARKANSAS
10:02-10:07 Sen. Dale Bumpers
10:07-10:12 Sen. David Pryor
10:12-10:17 Rep. Jay Dickey

CALIFORNIA
10:20-10:25 Sen. Dianne Feinstein
10:25-10:30 Sen. Barbara Boxer
10:30-10:35 Rep. Vic Fazio
10:35-10:40 Rep. Wally Herger
10:40-10:45 Rep. John Doolittle
10:45-10:50 Rep. Robert Matsui
10:50-10:55 Rep. Richard Pombo
10:55-11:00 Rep. Anna Eshoo
11:00-11:05 Rep. Sam Farr
11:05-11:10 Rep. Andrea Seastrand
11:10-11:15 Rep. Tony Beilenson
11:15-11:20 Rep. Walter Tucker
11:20-11:25 Rep. Julian Dixon
11:25-11:30 Rep. Esteban Torres
11:30-11:35 Rep. Dana Rohrabacher
11:35-11:40 Rep. Ken Calvert
11:40-11:45 Rep. George Brown

COLORADO
11:48-11:53 Sen. Hank Brown
11:53-11:58 Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell
11:58-12:03 Rep. Pat Schroeder
12:03-12:08 Rep. Dan Schaefer
12:08-12:13 Rep. David Skaggs

CONNECTICUT
12:16-12:21 Sen. Chris Dodd
12:21-12:26 Sen. Joe Lieberman
12:26-12:31 Rep. Chris Shays

FLORIDA
12:34-12:39 Sen. Bob Graham
12:39-12:44 Rep. Joe Scarborough
12:44-12:49 Rep. Bill McCollum
12:49-12:54 Rep. Bill Young
12:54-12:59 Rep. Dave Weldon
12:59-1:04 Rep. Carrie Meek

GEORGIA
1:07-1:12 Sen. Sam Nunn
1:12-1:17 Sen. Paul Coverdell
1:17-1:22 Rep. Newt Gingrich
1:22-1:27 Rep. Bob Barr
1:27-1:32 Rep. Mac Collins
1:32-1:37 Rep. Saxby Chambliss
1:37-1:42 Rep. Sanford Bishop
1:42-1:47 Rep. Cynthia McKinney

GUAM
1:50-1:55 Del. Robert Underwood

ILLINOIS
1:58-2:03 Sen. Carol Moseley-Braun
2:03-2:08 Rep. Richard Durbin
2:08-2:13 Rep. Jerry Costello
2:13-2:18 Rep. Don Manzullo
2:18-2:23 Rep. Lane Evans
2:23-2:28 Sen. Paul Simon

INDIANA
2:31-2:36 Sen. Dan Coats
2:36-2:41 Rep. Dan Burton
2:41-2:46 Rep. John Hostettler
2:46-2:51 Rep. Lee Hamilton

KENTUCKY
2:54-2:59 Sen. Wendell Ford
2:59-3:04 Sen. Mitch McConnell
3:04-3:09 Rep. Mike Ward
3:09-3:14 Rep. Ron Lewis

MAINE
3:17-3:22 Sen. Bill Cohen
3:22-3:27 Sen. Olympia Snowe
3:27-3:32 Rep. James Longley
3:32-3:37 Rep. John Baldacci

NEW HAMPSHIRE
3:40-3:45 Sen. Bob Smith
3:45-3:50 Sen. Judd Gregg
3:50-3:55 Rep. Bill Zeliff
3:55-4:00 Rep. Charlie Bass

MARYLAND
4:03-4:08 Sen. Paul Sarbanes
4:08-4:13 Sen. Barbara Mikulski
4:13-4:18 Rep. Wayne Gilchrest
4:18-4:23 Rep. Robert Ehrlich
4:23-4:28 Rep. Kweisi Mfume
4:28-4:33 Rep. Al Wynn
4:33-4:38 Rep. Steny Hoyer
4:38-4:43 Rep. Roscoe Bartlett
4:43-4:48 Rep. Benjamin Cardin

(Pennsylvania continued)
1:27-1:32 Rep. William Coyne
1:32-1:37 Rep. Mike Doyle
1:37-1:42 Rep. Frank Mascara
1:42-1:47 Rep. Phil English

PUERTO RICO
1:50-1:55 Rep. Carlos Romero-Barcelo

RHODE ISLAND
1:58-2:03 Sen. Claiborne Pell
2:03-2:08 Sen. John Chafee
2:08-2:13 Rep. Jack Reed

TENNESSEE
2:16-2:21 Sen. Bill Frist
2:21-2:26 Sen. Fred Thompson
2:26-2:31 Rep. Bart Gordon
2:31-2:36 Rep. Harold Ford
2:36-2:41 Rep. Ed Bryant

TEXAS
2:44-2:49 Sen. Phil Gramm
2:49-2:54 Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison
2:54-2:59 Rep. Jim Chapman
2:59-3:04 Rep. Joe Barton
3:04-3:09 Rep. Lloyd Doggett
3:09-3:14 Rep. Pete Geren
3:14-3:19 Rep. Charles Stenholm
3:19-3:24 Rep. Larry Combest
3:24-3:29 Rep. Henry Gonzalez
3:29-3:34 Rep. Lamar Smith
3:34-3:39 Rep. Henry Bonilla
3:39-3:44 Rep. Martin Frost
3:44-3:49 Rep. Frank Tejeda
3:49-3:54 Rep. Greg Laughlin

UTAH
3:57-4:02 Sen. Orrin Hatch
4:02-4:07 Sen. Bob Bennett
4:07-4:12 Rep. Jim Hansen
4:12-4:17 Rep. Enid Waldholtz

VIRGINIA
4:20-4:25 Sen. John Warner
4:25-4:30 Sen. Chuck Robb
4:30-4:35 Rep. Owen Pickett
4:35-4:40 Rep. Bobby Scott
4:40-4:45 Rep. Norm Sisisky
4:45-4:50 Rep. Jim Moran
4:50-4:55 Rep. Frank Wolf

WISCONSIN
4:58-5:03 Sen. Herb Kohl
5:03-5:08 Rep. Gerald Kleczka
5:08-5:13 Rep. Thomas Barrett

5:16-5:21 Sen. Richard Shelby
5:21-5:26 Rep. Bud Cramer
5:26-5:31 Rep. Tom Lantos
5:31-5:36 Rep. Maxine Waters
5:36-5:41 Rep. Lucille Roybal-Allard
5:41-5:46 Rep. Jane Harman
5:46-5:51 Rep. Sam Gejdenson
5:51-5:56 Rep. Rosa DeLauro
5:56-6:01 Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
6:01-6:06 Rep. Charles Canady
6:06-6:11 Rep. Andy Jacobs
6:11-6:16 Sen. John Kerry
6:16-6:21 Rep. Tim Hutchinson

OTHER MEMBERS OFFERING TESTIMONY:

Sen. Connie Mack
Sen. Russ Feingold
Rep. Sonny Bono
Rep. George Gekas
Rep. Sam Gibbons
Rep. Dick Zimmer

Individuals needing special assistance should contact the Commission in advance of each event to facilitate their requirements.

###

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

ALAN J. DIXON, CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONERS:
AL CORNELLA
REBECCA COX
GEN J. B. DAVIS, USAF (RET)
S. LEE KLING
RADM BENJAMIN F. MONTOYA, USN (RET)
MG JOSUE ROBLES, JR., USA (RET)
WENDI LOUISE STEELE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

COMMISSION CLOSES OR REALIGNS 26 BASES IN FIRST DAY OF DELIBERATIONS

WASHINGTON, DC, June 22, 1995 -- The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (DBCRC) voted to recommend closure of 20 military bases and the realignment of 6 others on the first day of its final deliberations.

The Commission also voted to recommend keeping open 7 bases that had been recommended for closure by the Department of Defense. The recommendations must be accepted or rejected in full by the President and Congress.

The Commission recommended significant cuts in the Air Force's Air Logistics Center category, voting to close McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, and to close the ALC located at Kelly Air Force Base San Antonio.

Commission Chairman Alan J. Dixon called the closure of the two depots the "greatest single deviation from the recommendation of the Secretary of the Defense in the history of the base closure process."

Here is a list of the Commission's actions of June 22, in the order in which they were taken:

Following is the list of the recommendations the Commission made today (in chronological order):

Vote Legend (nay votes will be noted, recusals will be in **bold**):
In the event of a tie vote, the Secretary of Defense's recommendation is adopted.
AD - Alan J. Dixon; **AC** - Al Cornella; **RC** - Rebecca Cox; **JD** - James B. Davis;
LK - S. Lee Kling; **BM** - Benjamin Montoya; **JR** - Josue Robles; **WS** - Wendi L. Steele

1--Rome Laboratory, New York
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Rome Laboratory, Rome, New York. Rome Laboratory activities will relocate to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, and Hanscom AFB, Massachusetts.
Commission Recommendation: Reject DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0. Rome lab remains open.

2--Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Kirtland AFB. The 58th Special Operations Wing will relocate to Holloman AFB, New Mexico. The AF Operational Test and Evaluation Center (AFOTEC) will relocate to Eglin AFB, Florida. The AF Office of Security Police (AFOSP) will relocate to Lackland AFB, Texas. The AF Inspection Agency and the AF Safety Agency will relocate to Kelly AFB, Texas. The Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) will relocate to Kelly AFB, Texas (Field Command) and Nellis AFB, Nevada (High Explosive Testing). Some DNA personnel (Radiation Simulator operations) will remain in place. The Phillips Laboratory and the 898th Munitions Squadron will remain in cantonment. The AFRES and ANG activities will remain in existing facilities. The 377th ABW inactivates and all other activities and facilities at Kirtland AFB, including family housing will close. Air Force medical activities located in the Veterans Administration Hospital will terminate.
Commission Recommendation: Reject DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0. Kirtland remains open.

3--Brooks Air Force Base, Texas
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Brooks AFB. The Human Systems Center, including the School of Aerospace Medicine and Armstrong Laboratory, will relocate to Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, however, some portion of the Manpower and Personnel function, and the Air Force Drug Test laboratory, may relocate to other locations. The 68th Intelligence Squadron will relocate to Kelly AFB, Texas. The Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence will relocate to Tyndall AFB, Florida. The 710th Intelligence Flight (AFRES) will relocate to Lackland AFB, Texas. The hyperbaric chamber operation, including associated personnel, will relocate to Lackland AFB, Texas. All activities and facilities at the base including family housing and the medical facility will close.
Commission Recommendation: Reject DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0. Brooks remains open.

4--Air Logistics Centers

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign the Air Logistics Centers (ALC) at Hill AFB, Utah; Kelly AFB, Texas; McClellan AFB, California; Robins AFB, Georgia; and Tinker AFB, Oklahoma. Consolidate the followings workloads at the designated receiver locations:

Commodity/Workload	Receiving Locations
Composites and plastics	SM-ALC, McClellan AFB
Hydraulics	SM-ALC, McClellan AFB
Tubing manufacturing	WR-ALC, Robins AFB
Airborne electronic automatic equipment software	WR-ALC, Robins AFB, OC-ALC, Tinker AFB, OO-ALC, Hill AFB
Sheet metal repair and manufacturing	OO-ALC, Hill AFB, WR-ALC, Robins AFB
Machining manufacturing	OC-ALC, Tinker AFB, WR-ALC, Robins AFB
Foundry operations	SA-ALC, Kelly AFB, OO-ALC, Hill AFB
Instruments/displays	SM-ALC, McClellan AFB (some unique work remains at OO-ALC, Hill AFB and WR-ALC, Robins AFB)
Airborne electronics	WR-ALC, Robins AFB, OC-ALC, Tinker AFB, OO-ALC, Hill AFB
Electronic manufacturing (printed wire boards)	WR-ALC, Robins AFB
Electrical/mechanical support equipment	SM-ALC, McClellan AFB
Injection molding	SM-ALC, McClellan AFB
Industrial plant equipment software	SA-ALC, Kelly AFB
Plating	OC-ALC, Tinker AFB, OO-ALC, Hill AFB, SA-ALC, Kelly AFB, WR-ALC, Robins AFB

Move the required equipment and any required personnel to the receiving location. These actions will create or strengthen Technical Repair Centers at the receiving locations in the respective commodities. Minimal workload in each of the commodities may continue to be performed at the other ALCs as required.

Commission Recommendation: Reject DoD Proposal. Close McClellan ALC. Realign Kelly AFB by closing ALC.
Vote: **6-2** (RC, BM) on McClellan. **6-2** (JR, JD) on Kelly.

5--Kelly Air Force Base, Texas
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission Action. Recommend Realignment of Kelly by closing ALC.
Vote: 6-2. JR, JD.

6--McClellan Air Force Base, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission Action: Close.
Vote: 6-2. RC, BM.

7--Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Letterkenny Army Depot by transferring the towed and self-propelled combat vehicle mission to Anniston Army Depot. Retain an enclave for conventional ammunition storage and tactical missile disassembly and storage. Change the 1993 Commission's decision regarding the consolidating of tactical missile maintenance at Letterkenny by transferring missile guidance system workload to Tobyhanna Army Depot.
Note: The Commission voted that Letterkenny Army Depot, Pa, currently on the list of bases recommended by the Secretary of Defense for realignment, be considered by the Commission for closure or to increase the extent of the realignment.
Commission Recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Approve same language as SECDEF motion, with addition of language encouraging and permitting private sector use.
Vote: 5-3 (AC, RC, JD)

8--Red River Army Depot, Texas
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Red River Army Depot. Transfer the ammunition storage mission, intern training center, and civilian training education to Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant. Transfer the light combat vehicle maintenance mission to Anniston Army Depot. Transfer the Rubber Production Facility to Lone Star.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD Proposal. Realign downward; Bradley and other missions stay. 113 line moves to Anniston.
Vote: 7-1. AD.

9--Defense Distribution Depot Red River, Texarkana, Texas (DDRT)
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Defense Distribution Depot Red River, Texas. Material remaining at DDRT at the time of disestablishment will be relocated to the Defense Distribution Depot Anniston, Alabama, (DDAA) and to optimum storage space within the DoD Distribution System.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD Proposal.
Vote: 7-1. AD.

10--Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division Detachment, Louisville, Kentucky

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division Detachment, Louisville, Kentucky. Relocate appropriate functions, personnel, equipment, and support to other naval activities, primarily the Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia; the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Port Hueneme, California; and the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane, Indiana.

Commission action: Reject DoD proposal; Close, but add language to encourage privitization of functions to the extent practical.

Vote: 8-0.

11--Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis, Indiana

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC), Aircraft Division, Indianapolis, Indiana. Relocate necessary functions along with associated personnel, equipment and support to other naval technical activities, primarily Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane, Indiana; Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Patuxent River, Maryland; and Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, China Lake, California.

Commission action: Reject DoD proposal; Close, but add language to encourage privitization of functions to the extent practical.

Vote: 8-0.

12--Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Lakehurst, New Jersey

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Lakehurst, New Jersey, except transfer in place certain facilities and equipment to the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Patuxent River, Maryland. Relocate other functions and associated personnel and equipment to the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Patuxent River, Maryland, and the Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville, Florida. Relocate the Naval Air Technical Training Center Detachment, Lakehurst, to Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida. Relocate Naval Mobile Construction Battalion 21, the U.S. Army CECOM Airborne Engineering Evaluation Support Activity, and the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office to other government-owned spaces.

Commission Action: Reject DoD proposal. Lakehurst remains open.

Vote: 7-1. AD.

13--Eglin Air Force Base, Florida

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Eglin AFB, Florida. The Electromagnetic Test Environment (EMTE), consisting of eight Electronic Combat (EC) threat simulator systems and two EC pod systems will relocate to the Nellis AFB Complex, Nevada. Those emitter-only systems at the Air Force Development Test Center (AFDTC) at Eglin AFB necessary to support Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC), the USAF Air Warfare Center, and Air Force Materiel Command Armaments/Weapons Test and Evaluation activities will be retained. All other activities and facilities associated with Eglin will remain open.

Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.

Vote: 7-1. RC.

14--Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor Activity, Buffalo, New York

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor activity (REDCAP) at Buffalo, New York. Required test activities and necessary support equipment will be relocated to the Air Force Flight Test Center (AFFTC) at Edwards AFB, California. Any remaining equipment will be disposed of.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-1. RC.

15--Air Force Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator Activity, Fort Worth, Texas

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Air Force Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator (AFEWES) activity in Fort Worth. Essential AFEWES capabilities and the required test activities will relocate to the Air Force Flight Test Center (AFFTC), Edwards AFB, California. Workload and selected equipment from AFEWES will be transferred to AFFTC. AFEWES will be disestablished and any remaining equipment will be disposed of.
Commission Action: Reject DoD proposal. Activity remains open.
Vote: 7-1. AD.

15--Hill Air Force Base, Utah

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Hill AFB, Utah. The permanent Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) test range activity at Utah Test and Training Range (UTTR) will be disestablished. Management responsibility for operation of the UTTR will transfer from AFMC to Air Combat Command (ACC). Personnel, equipment and systems required for use by ACC to support the training range will be transferred to ACC. Additional AFMC manpower associated with operation of the range will be eliminated. Some armament/weapons Test and Evaluation (T& E) workload will transfer to the Air Force Development Test Center (AFDTC), Eglin AFB, Florida, and the Air Force Flight Test Center (AFFTC), Edwards AFB, California. **Note:** The Commission voted that Hill Air Force Base, UT, currently on the list of bases recommended by the Secretary of Defense for realignment, be considered by the Commission for closure or to increase the extent of the realignment.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0,

16--Williams Air Force Base, Arizona

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding the relocation of Williams AFB's Armstrong Laboratory Aircrew Training Research Facility to Orlando, Florida, as follows: The Armstrong Laboratory Aircrew Training Research Facility at Mesa, Arizona, will remain at its present location as a stand-alone activity.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

17--Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, Point Mugu, CA

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission Action: Point Mugu remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

18--Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Warminster, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Warminster, Pennsylvania. Relocate appropriate functions, personnel, equipment, and support to other technical activities, primarily the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Patuxent River, Maryland.
Commission Action: Accept DoD Proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

19--Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, RDT&E Division Detachment, Warminster, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, RDT&E Division Detachment, Warminster, Pennsylvania. Relocate appropriate functions, personnel, equipment, and support to other technical activities, primarily the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, RDT&E Division, San Diego, California; and the Naval Oceanographic Office, Bay St. Louis, Mississippi.
Commission Action: Accept DoD Proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

20--Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Open Water Test Facility, Oreland, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Open Water Test Facility, Oreland, Pennsylvania.
Commission Action: Accept DoD Proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

21--Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Newport Division, New London Detachment, New London, Connecticut
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Newport Division, New London Detachment, New London, Connecticut, and relocate necessary functions with associated personnel, equipment, and support to Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Newport Division, Newport, Rhode Island. Close the NUWC New London facility, except retain Pier 7 which is transferred to the Navy Submarine Base New London. The site presently occupied by the U.S. Coast Guard Station, New London, will be transferred to the U.S. Coast Guard. The Navy Submarine Base, New London, Magnetic Silencing Facility will remain in its present location as a tenant of the U.S. Coast Guard. Naval reserve units will relocate to other naval activities, primarily NUWC Newport, Rhode Island, and Navy Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **JD.**

22--Naval Biodynamics Laboratory, New Orleans, Louisiana
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Biodynamics Laboratory, New Orleans, Louisiana, and relocate necessary personnel to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, and Naval Aeromedical Research Laboratory, Pensacola, Florida.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

23--Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Medical Research Institute (NMRI), Bethesda, Maryland. Consolidate the personnel of the Diving Medicine Program with the Experimental Diving Unit, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division, Coastal Systems Station, Panama City, Florida. Relocate the Infectious Diseases, Combat Casualty Care and Operational Medicine programs along with necessary personnel and equipment to the Walter Reed Army Institute for Research at Forest Glen, Maryland.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

24--Naval Research Laboratory, Underwater Sound Reference Detachment, Orlando, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Naval Research Laboratory, Underwater Sound Reference Detachment (NRL UWSRD), Orlando, Florida. Relocate the calibration and standards function with associated personnel, equipment, and support to the Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Newport Division, Newport, Rhode Island, except for the Anechoic Tank Facility I, which will be excessed.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

25--Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering East Coast Detachment, Norfolk, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the In-Service Engineering East Coast Detachment, St. Juliens Creek Annex, Norfolk, Virginia, of the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, except retain in place the transmit and receive equipment and antennas currently at the St. Juliens Creek Annex. Relocate functions, necessary personnel and equipment to Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

26-- Dugway Proving Ground, Utah
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Dugway Proving Ground by relocating the smoke and obscurant mission to Yuma Proving Ground, AZ, and some elements of chemical/biological research to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Dispose of English Village and retain test and experimentation facilities necessary to support Army and DoD missions.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Dugway remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

27--Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Grand Forks AFB. The 321st Missile Group will inactivate, unless prior to December 1996, the Secretary of Defense determines that the need to retain ballistic missile defense (BMD) options effectively precludes this action. If the Secretary of Defense makes such a determination, Minot AFB, North Dakota, will be realigned and the 91st Missile Group will inactivate.

If Grand Forks AFB is realigned, the 321st Missile Group will inactivate. Minuteman III missiles will relocate to Malmstrom AFB, Montana, be maintained at depot facilities, or be retired. A small number of silo launchers at Grand Forks may be retained if required. The 319th Air Refueling Wing will remain in place. All activities and facilities at the base associated with

the 319th Air Refueling Wing, including family housing, the hospital, commissary, and base exchange will remain open.

If Minot AFB is realigned, the 91st Missile Group will inactivate. Minuteman III missiles will relocate to Malmstrom AFB, Montana, be maintained at depot facilities, or be retired. The 5th Bomb Wing will remain in place. All activities and facilities at the base associated with the 5th Bomb Wing, including family housing, the hospital, commissary, and base exchange will remain open.

Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.

Vote: 7-0-1. **AC.**

28--Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Malmstrom AFB. The 43rd Air Refueling Group and its KC-135 aircraft will relocate to MacDill AFB, Florida. All fixed-wing aircraft flying operations at Malmstrom AFB will cease and the airfield will be closed. A small airfield operational area will continue to be available to support the helicopter operations of the 40th Rescue Flight which will remain to support missile wing operations. All base activities and facilities associated with the 341st Missile Wing will remain.

Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.

Vote: 7-0-1. **AC.**

29--MacDill Air Force Base, Florida

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendations of the 1991 and 1993 Commissions regarding the closure and transfer of the MacDill AFB airfield to the Department of Commerce (DoC) as follows: Redirect the retention of the MacDill airfield as part of MacDill AFB. The Air Force will continue to operate the runway and its associated activities. DoC will remain as a tenant.

Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.

Vote: 7-0-1. **AC.**

30--Reese Air Force Base, Texas

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Reese AFB. The 64th Flying Training Wing will inactivate and its assigned aircraft will be redistributed or retired. All activities and facilities at the base including family housing and the hospital will close.

Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.

Vote: 6-2. AC, RC.

31--Onizuka Air Station, California

Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Onizuka AS. The 750th Space Group will inactivate and its functions will relocate to Falcon AFB, Colorado. Detachment 2, Space and Missile Systems Center (AFMC) will relocate to Falcon AFB, Colorado. Some tenants will remain in existing facilities. All activities and facilities associated with the 750th Space Group including family housing and the clinic will close.

Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.

Vote: 5-3. RC, BM, WS.

32--Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding the cantonment of the 1001st Space Support Squadron at the Lowry Support Center as follows: Inactivate the 1001st Space Systems Squadron, now designated Detachment 1, Space Systems Support Group (SSSG). Some Detachment 1 personnel and equipment will relocate to Peterson AFB, Colorado, under the Space Systems Support Group while the remainder of the positions will be eliminated.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

33--Bergstrom Air Reserve Base, Texas
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Bergstrom ARB. The 924th Fighter Wing (AFRES) will inactivate. The Wing's F-16 aircraft will be redistributed or retire. Headquarters, 10th Air Force (AFRES), will relocate to Naval Air Station Fort Worth, Joint Reserve Base, Texas.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 4-4. AD, AC, JD, BM.

34--Carswell Air Reserve Station, Texas
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission Action: Remove Carswell from further consideration. Carswell remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

35--Homestead Air Force Base , Florida
301st Rescue Squadron (AFRES)
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission regarding Homestead AFB as follows: Redirect the 301st Rescue Squadron (AFRES) with its associated aircraft to relocate to Patrick AFB, Florida.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

36--Homestead Air Force Base , Florida
726th Air Control Squadron
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission regarding the relocation of the 726th Air Control Squadron (ACS) from Homestead AFB to Shaw AFB, South Carolina, as follows: Redirect the 726th ACS to Mountain Home AFB, Idaho.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

37--Greater Pittsburgh IAP Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Greater Pittsburgh IAP Air Reserve Station (ARS). The 911th Airlift Wing will inactivate and its C-130 aircraft will be distributed to Air Force Reserve C-130 units at Dobbins ARB, Georgia, and Peterson AFB, Colorado.
Commission Action: Reject DoD proposal. Pittsburgh remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

38--Chicago O'Hare IAP Air Reserve Station, Illinois
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense
Commission Action: Close O'Hare IAP Air Reserve Station. Relocate 126th Air Refueling Wing to Scott AFB, Illinois, if City of Chicago covers cost.
Vote: 7-0-1. **AD.**

39--Moffett Federal Airfield Air Guard Station, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Moffett Federal Airfield Air Guard Station. Relocate the 129th Rescue Group and associated aircraft to McClellan AFB, California.
Commission Action: Reject DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

40--North Highlands Air Guard Station, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close North Highlands Air Guard Station (AGS) and relocate the 162nd Combat Communications Group (CCG) and the 149th Combat Communications Squadron (CCS) to McClellan AFB, California.
Commission Action: Reject DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

41--Ontario International Airport Air Guard Station, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Ontario International Airport Air Guard Station (AGS) and relocate the 148th Combat Communications Squadron (CCS) and the 210th Weather Flight to March ARB, California.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

42--Roslyn Air Guard Station, New York
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Roslyn Air Guard Station (AGS) and relocate the 213th Electronic Installation Squadron (ANG) and the 274th Combat Communications Group (ANG) to Stewart International Airport AGS, Newburg, New York. The 722nd Aeromedical Staging Squadron (AFRES) will relocate to suitable leased space within the current recruiting area.
Commission Action: Reject DoD proposal. Same as SECDEF recommendation with provision on sale of land.
Vote: 8-0

43--Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport
Air Guard Station, Ohio
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station (AGS) and relocate the 178th Fighter Group (ANG), the 251st Combat Communications Group (ANG), and the 269th Combat Communications Squadron (ANG) to Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio.
Commission Action: Reject DoD proposal. Springfield-Beckley remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

44--Griffiss Air Force Base, New York
Airfield Support for 10th Infantry (Light) Division
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission regarding support of the 10th Infantry (Light) Division, Fort Drum, New York, at Griffiss AFB, as follows: Close the minimum essential airfield that was to be maintained by a contractor at Griffiss AFB and provide the mobility/contingency/training support to the 10th Infantry (Light) Division from the Fort Drum airfield. Mission essential equipment from the minimum essential airfield at Griffiss AFB will transfer to Fort Drum.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

45--Griffiss Air Force Base, New York
485th Engineering Installation Group
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission regarding the transfer of the 485th Engineering Installation Group (EIG) from Griffiss AFB, New York, to Hill AFB, Utah, as follows: Inactivate the 485th EIG. Transfer its engineering functions to the 38th EIG at Tinker AFB, Oklahoma. Transfer its installation function to the 838th Electronic Installation Squadron (EIS) at Kelly AFB, Texas, and to the 938th EIS, McClellan AFB, California.
Commission Action: Reject DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

#30#30#30#

Following is the list of the recommendations the Commission made June 23 (in chronological order):

Vote Legend (nay votes will be noted, recusals will be in **bold**):
In the event of a tie vote, the Secretary of Defense's recommendation is adopted.
AD - Alan J. Dixon; **AC** - Al Cornella; **RC** - Rebecca Cox; **JD** - James B. Davis;
LK - S. Lee Kling; **BM** - Benjamin Montoya; **JR** - Josue Robles; **WS** - Wendi L. Steele

---

46--Naval Activities, Guam
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Naval Activities Guam. Relocate all ammunition vessels and associated personnel and support to Naval Magazine, Lualualei, Hawaii. Relocate all other combat logistics force ships and associated personnel and support to Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Relocate Military Sealift Command personnel and Diego Garcia support functions to Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Disestablish the Naval Pacific Meteorology and Oceanographic Center-WESTPAC, except for the Joint Typhoon Warning Center, which relocates to the Naval Pacific Meteorology and Oceanographic Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Disestablish the Afloat Training Group-WESTPAC. All other Department of Defense activities that are presently on Guam may remain either as a tenant of Naval Activities, Guam or other appropriate naval activity. Retain waterfront assets for support, mobilization, and contingencies and to support the afloat tender.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Dispose of property owned by Naval Activities declared releasable under the 1994 Guam Land Use Plan (GLUP) with appropriate restrictions. Locate MSC ships as operationally required.
Vote: 7-0-1. **RC**

47--Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-21) for "the aircraft, personnel, and associated equipment" from the closing Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam from "Andersen AFB, Guam" to "other naval or DoD air stations in the Continental United States and Hawaii."
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Allows colocation of HC-5s with MSC ships.
Vote: 7-0-1. **RC**

48--Ship Repair Facility, GUAM
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Ship Repair Facility (SRF), Guam, except transfer appropriate assets, including the piers, the floating drydock, its typhoon basin anchorage, the recompression chamber, and the floating crane, to Naval Activities, Guam.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **RC**

49--Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Guam
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Guam.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Disestablish, except for fuel farm and appropriate assets.
Vote: 7-0-1. **RC**

50--Public Works Center, GUAM
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission recommendation: Realign PWC to match assigned workload. Close officer housing at NAS Agana.
Vote: 7-0-1. **RC**

51--Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts. Relocate its aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine. Relocate the Marine Corps Reserve support squadrons to another facility in the local area or to NAS Brunswick. Reestablish Naval Reserve Center, Quincy, Massachusetts, and change the receiving site specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-64) for consolidation of Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Lawrence, Massachusetts; Naval Reserve Center, Chicopee, Massachusetts; and Naval Reserve Center, Quincy, Massachusetts, from "NAS South Weymouth, Massachusetts" to "Naval Reserve Center, Quincy, Massachusetts."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

52--Naval Air Facility, Detroit, Michigan
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-25) for the Mt. Clemons, Michigan Marine Corps Reserve Center, including MWSG-47 and supporting units, from "Marine Corps Reserve Center, Twin Cities, Minnesota" to "Air National Guard Base, Selfridge, Michigan."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

53--Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, except retain the Regional Counterdrug Training Academy facilities which are transferred to the Academy. Relocate the undergraduate strike pilot training function and associated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas. Its major tenant, the Naval Technical Training Center, will close, and its training functions will be relocated to other training activities, primarily the Navy Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia, and Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Meridian remains open.
Vote: 7-1 AD.

54-- Naval Technical Training Center, Meridian, Mississippi
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Technical Training Center, Meridian, Mississippi, and relocate the training functions to other training activities, primarily the Navy Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia, and Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. NTTC remains open.
Vote: 5-3. WS, JD, AD.

55--Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, as a Naval Air Facility, and relocate the undergraduate pilot training function and associated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, and Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Remain open and realign as necessary.
Vote: 7-1 AD.

56--Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, and
Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving sites for "squadrons and related activities at NAS Miramar" specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-18) from "NAS Lemoore and NAS Fallon" to "other naval air stations, primarily NAS Oceana, Virginia, NAS North Island, California, and NAS Fallon, Nevada." Change the receiving sites for MCAS Tustin, California, specified by the 1993 Commission from "NAS North Island, NAS Miramar, or MCAS Camp Pendleton" to "other naval air stations, primarily MCAS New River, North Carolina; MCB Hawaii (MCAF Kaneohe Bay); MCAS Camp Pendleton, California; and NAS Miramar, California."
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Change is that possible Tustin receiving sites are to be "consistent with operational requirements."
Vote: 8-0.

57-Naval Air Station, Alameda, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving sites specified by the 1993 Commission for the closure of Naval Air Station, Alameda, California (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-35) for "aircraft along with the dedicated personnel, equipment and support" and "reserve aviation assets" from "NAS North Island" and "NASA Ames/Moffett Field," respectively, to "other naval air stations, primarily the Naval Air Facility, Corpus Christi, Texas, to support the Mine Warfare Center of Excellence, Naval Station, Ingleside, Texas."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal. Change language to Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas.
Vote: 8-0.

58--Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving sites specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-20) from "Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina; Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia; and Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina" to "other naval air stations, primarily Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia; Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina; Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida; and Naval Air Station, Atlanta, Georgia; or other Navy or Marine Corps Air Stations with the necessary capacity and support infrastructure." In addition, add the following: "To support Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, retain OLF Whitehouse, the Pinecastle target complex, and the Yellow Water family housing area."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

59– Naval Air Facility, Adak, Alaska
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Naval Air Facility, Adak, Alaska.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

60–Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida, to a Naval Air Facility and dispose of certain portions of Truman Annex and Trumbo Point (including piers, wharfs and buildings).
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Realign as per DoD request but change language to include "dispose of all property not required to support operational commitments, including Truman Annex and Trumbo Point."
Vote: 8-0.

61–Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission regarding items excepted from the closure of Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii (1993 Commission, at page 1-19) from "Retain the family housing as needed for multi-service use" to "Retain the family housing as needed for multi-service use, including the following family housing support facilities: commissary facilities, Public Works Center compound with its sanitary landfill, and beach recreational areas, known as Nimitz Beach and White Plains Beach."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

62–Navy Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center,
Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-38) for the "Nuclear Power School" (or the Navy Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center) from "the Submarine School at the Naval Submarine Base (NSB), New London" to "Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **JD.**

63– Naval Training Centers
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-38) concerning the closure of Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, by deleting all references to Service School Command from the list of major tenants. Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-39) concerning the closure of Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, by deleting all references to Service School Command, including Service School Command (Electronic Warfare) and Service School Command (Surface), from the list of major tenants.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **AD.**

64-- Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Shipyard Long Beach, California, except retain the sonar dome government-owned, contractor-operated facility and those family housing units needed to fulfill Department of the Navy requirements, particularly those at Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California. Relocate necessary personnel to other naval activities as appropriate, primarily Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach and naval activities in the San Diego, California, area.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 6-2. BM, RC

65--Naval Shipyard, Norfolk Detachment, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendations: Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission relating to the closure of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard (1991 Commission Report, at page 5-28) to delete "and preservation" (line 5) and "for emergent requirements"(lines 6-7).
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

66--Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Keyport, Washington
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Keyport, Washington, by moving its ships' combat systems console refurbishment depot maintenance and general industrial workload to Naval Shipyard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Washington.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

67--Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN, Long Beach, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN, Long Beach, California. Relocate certain functions, personnel and equipment to Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN, San Diego, California.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

68--Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Oakland, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission recommendation: Close FISC Oakland, move DFAS and MSC to government owned space. Close Pt. Molate Naval Refueling Station, Richmond, CA. Close Navy Supply Annex, Alameda, CA.
Vote: 8-0.

69--Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

70--Naval Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish Naval Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California, and relocate its functions, and appropriate personnel, equipment, and support to the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Memphis, Tennessee, and Naval Air Warfare Center, Training Systems Division, Orlando, Florida.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

71--Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Naval Health Research Center (NHRC), San Diego, California, and relocate necessary functions, personnel and equipment to the Bureau of Naval Personnel (BUPERS) at Memphis, Tennessee.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. NHRC remains open in San Diego.
Vote: 8-0.

72--Office of Naval Research, Arlington, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at pages 1-59/60) by deleting the Office of Naval Research from the list of National Capital Region activities to relocate from leased space to Government-owned space within the NCR.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

73-- Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division Detachment, White Oak, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division Detachment, White Oak, Maryland. Relocate the functions, personnel and equipment associated with Ship Magnetic Signature Control R&D Complex to the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock, Maryland, and the functions and personnel associated with reentry body dynamics research and development to the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren, Virginia.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 5-3. RC, JD, JR.

74--Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Detachment, Annapolis, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Detachment, Annapolis, Maryland, including the NIKE Site, Bayhead Road, Annapolis, except transfer the fuel storage/refueling sites and the water treatment facilities to Naval Station, Annapolis to support the U.S. Naval Academy and Navy housing. Relocate appropriate functions, personnel, equipment and support to other technical activities, primarily Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Detachment, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Naval Surface Weapons Center, Carderock Division, Carderock, Maryland; and the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C. The Joint Spectrum Center, a DoD cross-service tenant, will be relocated with other components of the Center in the local area as appropriate.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-1. RC.

75--Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Air Technical Services Facility (NATSF), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and consolidate necessary functions, personnel, and equipment with the Naval Aviation Depot, North Island, California.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

76--Naval Aviation Engineering Service Unit, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Aviation Engineering Service Unit (NAESU), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and consolidate necessary functions, personnel, and equipment with the Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), North Island, California.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

77--Naval Management Systems Support Office, Chesapeake, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Naval Management Systems Support Office (NAVMASSO), Chesapeake, Virginia, and relocate its functions and necessary personnel and equipment as a detachment of Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, San Diego, California, in government-owned spaces in Norfolk, Virginia.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Modify receiving sites to Tidewater, VA area.
Vote: 8-0.

78--Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering West Coast Division, San Diego, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the In-Service Engineering West Coast Division (NISE West), San Diego, California, of the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center (NCCOSC), including the Taylor Street Special Use Area, and consolidate necessary functions and personnel with the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, RDT&E Division, either in the NCCOSC RDT&E Division spaces at Point Loma, California, or in current NISE West spaces in San Diego, California.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

79--Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation for the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia, specified by the 1993 Commission (Commission Report, at page 1-59) from "[r]elocate...from leased space to Government-owned space within the NCR, to include the Navy Annex, Arlington, Virginia; Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.; 3801 Nebraska Avenue, Washington, D.C.; Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia; or the White Oak facility, Silver Spring, Maryland" to "Relocate...from leased space to Government-owned space in San Diego, California, to allow consolidation of the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, with the Space and Naval Warfare Command headquarters. This relocation does not include SPAWAR Code 40, which is located at NRL, or the Program Executive Officer for Space Communication

Create two ICPs for the management of weapon system-related FSCs at the Defense Construction Supply Center (DCSC), Columbus, OH and the Defense General Supply Center (DGSC), Richmond, VA.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

134-- Defense Contract Management District South (DCMD), Marietta, Georgia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish DCMD South and relocate missions to DCMD Northeast and DCMD West.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

135-- Defense Contract Management District West (DCMD), El Segundo, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: This is a redirect of the following BRAC 93 Commission recommendation: "Relocate the Defense Contract Management District, El Segundo, California, to Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Los Angeles, California, or space obtained from exchange of land for space between the Navy and the Port Authority/City of Long Beach." The current recommendation is expanded to read: Relocate the DCMD, El Segundo, CA, (a) to Government property in the Los Angeles/Long Beach area, or, (b) to space obtained from exchange of land between the Navy and Port Authority/City of Long Beach. or (c) to a purchased office building, whichever is the most cost-effective for DoD.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

136-- Defense Contract Management Command International (DCMCI), Dayton, Ohio
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign the DCMCI (Gentile AFS), Dayton, Ohio, and merge its mission into the Defense Contract Management Command Headquarters (DCMC HQ), Ft. Belvoir, Virginia.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

137--Investigations Control and Automation Directorate, Fort Holabird, Baltimore, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Relocate the Defense Investigative Service (DIS), Investigations Control and Automation Directorate (IC&AD) from Fort Holabird, Maryland, to a new facility to be built on Fort Meade, Maryland. This proposal is a revision to the 1988 Base Closure Commission's recommendation to retain the Defense Investigative Service at Fort Holabird. Once DIS vacates the building on Fort Holabird, the base will be vacant.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

138-- Fort Holabird, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure or realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission action: Close Fort Holabird.
Vote: 8-0.

###

127-- Sudbury Training Annex, Massachusetts
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Sudbury Training Annex.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

128-- Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, Lompoc, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks (USDB), Lompoc, CA.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

129-- Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity, West Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA). Relocate reserve activity to the Kelly Support Center, PA, provided the recommendation to realign Kelly Support Center is approved.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Valley Grove remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

130-- Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, Columbus, Ohio (DDCO)
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign the Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, Ohio, and designate it as a storage site for slow moving/war reserve material. Active material remaining at DDCO at the time of realignment will be attrited. Stock replenishment will be stored in optimum space within the distribution system.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

131-- Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, Tennessee (DDMT)
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, Tennessee. Material remaining at DDMT at the time of closure will be relocated to optimum storage space within the DoD Distribution System. As a result of the closure of DDMT, all DLA activity will cease at this location and DDMT will be excess to DLA needs.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-1. JR.

132-- Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Utah (DDOU)
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Utah, except for a 36,000 square foot cantonment for Army Reserve personnel. Material remaining at DDOU at the time of closure will be relocated to optimum storage space within the DoD Distribution System. As a result of the closure of DDOU, all DLA activity will cease at this location and DDOU will be excess to DLA needs.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Modify closure proposal to enlarge cantonment area. Ogden closes.
Vote: 8-0.

133-- Defense Industrial Supply Center (DISC), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: The Defense Industrial Supply Center is disestablished. Distribute the management of Federal Supply Classes (FSC) within the remaining DLA Inventory Control Points (ICP). Create one ICP for the management of troop and general support items at the Defense Personnel Support Center (DPSC) in Philadelphia, PA.

119-- Camp Kilmer, New Jersey
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Camp Kilmer, except an enclave for minimum necessary facilities to support the Reserve Components.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

120-- Camp Pedricktown, New Jersey
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Camp Pedricktown, except the Sievers-Sandberg Reserve Center.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

121-- Caven Point Army Reserve Center, New Jersey
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Caven Point U. S. Army Reserve Center. Relocate its reserve activities to the Fort Hamilton, NY, provided the recommendation to realign Fort Hamilton is approved.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Caven Point remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

122-- East Fort Baker, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close East Fort Baker. Relocate all tenants to other installations that meet mission requirements. Return all real property to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

123--Fort Missoula, Montana
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Missoula, except an enclave for minimum essential land and facilities to support the Reserve Component units.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

124-- Hingham Cohasset, Massachusetts
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Hingham Cohasset.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

125-- Recreation Center #2, North Carolina
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Recreation Center #2, Fayetteville, NC.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

126-- Rio Vista Army Reserve Center, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Rio Vista Army Reserve Center.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

- Relocate functions related to soldier systems to Natick Research, Development, Engineering Center, MA, to align with the Soldier Systems Command.

- Relocate functions related to materiel management of communications-electronics to Fort Monmouth, NJ, to align with Communications-Electronics Command.
- Relocate automotive materiel management functions to Detroit Arsenal, MI, to align with Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command.

Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 5-1-2. LK, **JD, AD**.

113– Concepts Analysis Agency, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close by relocating Concepts Analysis Agency to Fort Belvoir, VA.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

114– Information Systems Software Command (ISSC), Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close by relocating Information Systems Software Command to Fort Meade, MD.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

115– Publications Distribution Center Baltimore, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close by relocating the U.S. Army Publications Distribution Center, Baltimore to the U.S. Army Publications Center St. Louis, Missouri.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 6-2. AC, RC.

116–Bellmore Logistics Activity, New York
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Bellmore Logistics Activity.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

117– Big Coppett Key, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Big Coppett Key.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

118– Camp Bonneville, Washington
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Camp Bonneville.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

107-- Savanna Army Depot Activity, Illinois
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Savanna Army Depot Activity (ADA). Relocate the United States Army Defense Ammunition Center and School (USADACS) to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, Oklahoma.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **AD**.

108-- Stratford Army Engine Plant, Connecticut
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Stratford Army Engine Plant.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

109-- Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal. Relocate the Military Transportation Management Command (MTMC) Eastern Area Command Headquarters and the traffic management portion of the 1301st Major Port Command to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. Retain an enclave for the Navy Military Sealift Command, Atlantic, and Navy Resale and Fashion Distribution Center.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Close Bayonne, move all tenants to receiving locations to be determined.
Vote: 6-2. RC, AC.

110--Oakland Army Base, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission recommendation: Close Oakland Army Base.
Vote: 5-3. AC, RC, BM.

111-- Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fitzsimons Army Medical Center (FAMC), except for Edgar J. McWhethy Army Reserve Center. Relocate the Medical Equipment and Optical School and Optical Fabrication Laboratory to Fort Sam Houston, TX. Relocate Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) activities to Denver leased space. Relocate other tenants to other installations.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Close with modification to the Secretary's proposal. Tenants relocate to location to be determined by Dept. of Army.
Vote: 6-2. AC, JD.

112--Aviation-Troop Command, Missouri
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish Aviation-Troop Command (ATCOM), and close by relocating its missions/functions as follows:

- Relocate Aviation Research, Development & Engineering Center; Aviation Management; and Aviation Program Executive Offices to Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, AL, to form the Aviation & Missile Command.

101– Fort Hamilton, New York
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Hamilton. Dispose of all family housing. Retain minimum essential land and facilities for existing Army units and activities. Relocate all Army Reserve units from Caven Point, New Jersey, to Fort Hamilton.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Ft. Hamilton remains open. (See also vote #119, Caven Point.)
Vote: 8-0.

102– Fort Totten, New York
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Totten, except an enclave for the U. S. Army Reserve. Dispose of family housing.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

103– Detroit Arsenal, Michigan
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Detroit Arsenal by closing and disposing of the Detroit Army Tank Plant.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **AD.**

104– Tri-Service Project Reliance, Fort Detrick, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding Tri-Service Project Reliance. Upon disestablishment of the U.S. Army Biomedical Research Development Laboratory (USABRDL) at Fort Detrick, MD, do not collocate environmental and occupational toxicology research with the Armstrong Laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. Instead relocate the health advisories environmental fate research and military criteria research functions of the Environmental Quality Research Branch to the U.S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency (AEHA), Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and maintain the remaining functions of conducting non-mammalian toxicity assessment models and on-site biomonitoring research of the Research Methods Branch at Fort Detrick as part of Headquarters, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

105–Sierra Army Depot, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Sierra Army Depot by eliminating the conventional ammunition mission and reducing it to a depot activity. Retain an enclave for the Operational Project Stock mission and the static storage of ores.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Modify DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0

106–Seneca Army Depot, New York
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Seneca Army Depot, except an enclave to store hazardous material and ores.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

95– Fort Meade, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Meade by reducing Kimbrough Army Community Hospital to a clinic. Eliminate inpatient services.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 6-2. JR, AC.

96– Fort Ritchie, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Ritchie. Relocate the 1111th Signal Battalion and 1108th Signal Brigade to Fort Detrick, MD. Relocate Information Systems Engineering Command elements to Fort Huachuca, AZ.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Ft. Ritchie closes but preserves a National Guard enclave.
Vote: 8-0.

97– Selfridge Army Garrison, Michigan
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close U.S. Army Garrison, Selfridge.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Selfridge remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

98– Price Support Center, Illinois
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Charles Melvin Price Support Center, except a small reserve enclave and a storage area.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Price Support Center remains open.
Vote: 6-0-2. AD, JD.

99– Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Buchanan by reducing garrison management functions and disposing of family housing. Retain an enclave for the reserve components, Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) and the Antilles Consolidated School.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Fort Buchanan closes but retains mobilization mission.
Vote: 7-1. AD.

100– Kelly Support Center, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign the Kelly Support Center by consolidating Army Reserve units onto three of its five parcels. Dispose of the remaining two parcels. Relocate the Army Reserve's leased maintenance activity in Valley Grove, WV, to the Kelly Support Center.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Kelly is realigned. Nothing is moved from Valley Grove.
Vote: 8-0.

89--Fort Hunter Liggett, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Hunter Liggett by relocating the U.S. Army Test and Experimentation Center (TEC) missions and functions to Fort Bliss, Texas. Eliminate the Active Component mission. Retain minimum essential facilities and training area as an enclave to support the Reserve Components (RC).
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

90-- Fort Pickett, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Pickett, except minimum essential training areas and facilities as an enclave for the Reserve Components. Relocate the Petroleum Training Facility to Fort Dix, NJ.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Close with amendment to ensure preservation of Reserve Component training.
Vote: 7-1. RC.

91-- Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Indiantown Gap, except minimum essential facilities as a Reserve Component enclave.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Close with amendment to ensure preservation of Reserve Component training.
Vote: 7-1. RC.

92--Fort Chaffee, Arkansas
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Chaffee, except minimum essential buildings, and ranges for Reserve Component (RC) training as an enclave.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Close with amendment to ensure preservation of Reserve Component training.
Vote: 7-1. RC.

93-- Fort McClellan, Alabama
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort McClellan, except minimum essential land and facilities for a Reserve Component enclave and minimum essential facilities, as necessary, to provide auxiliary support to the chemical demilitarization operation at Anniston Army Depot. Relocate the U. S. Army Chemical and Military Police Schools to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, upon receipt of the required permits. Relocate the Defense Polygraph Institute (DODPI) to Fort Jackson, South Carolina. License Pelham Range and current Guard facilities to the Alabama Army National Guard.
Commission action: Reject DoD Proposal. Ft. McClellan closes but CDTF remains in Alabama until a new one is operable in Missouri.
Vote: 8-0.

94-- Fort Lee, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Lee, by reducing Kenner Army Community Hospital to a clinic. Eliminate inpatient services.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-1. JR.

85– Reserve Centers/Commands
Recommendation:
Close the following Naval Reserve Centers:
Stockton, California
Pomona, California
Santa Ana, Irvine, California
Laredo, Texas
Sheboygan, Wisconsin
Cadillac, Michigan
Staten Island, New York
Huntsville, Alabama
Close the following Naval Air Reserve Center:
Olathe, Kansas
Close the following Naval Reserve Readiness Commands:
Region Seven - Charleston, South Carolina
Region Ten - New Orleans, Louisiana
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

86–Naval Aviation Depot, Pensacola, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at pages 1–42/43) by striking the following: "In addition, the Commission recommends that the whirl tower and dynamic components facility be moved to Cherry Point Navy or Corpus Christi Army Depots or the private sector, in lieu of the Navy's plan to retain these operations in a stand-alone facility at NADEP Pensacola."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **JD.**

87– Fort Dix, New Jersey
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Dix by replacing the Active Component garrison with a U.S. Army Reserve garrison. Retain minimum essential ranges, facilities, and training areas required for Reserve Component (RC) training as an enclave.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

88– Fort Greely, Alaska
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Greely by relocating the Cold Region Test Activity (CRTA) and Northern Warfare Training Center (NWTC) to Fort Wainwright, Alaska.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Realign Ft. Greely in accordance with SecDef recommendation, but amend to "not move facilities until July, 1997."
Vote: 8-0.

Sensors and his immediate staff who will remain in Navy-owned space in the National Capital Region."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

80--Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving sites specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-59) for the relocation of the Naval Sea Systems Command, including the Nuclear Propulsion Directorate (SEA 08), the Human Resources Office supporting the Naval Sea Systems Command, and associated PEOs and DRPMs, from "the Navy Annex, Arlington, Virginia; Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.; 3801 Nebraska Avenue, Washington, D.C.; Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia; or the White Oak facility, Silver Spring, Maryland" to "the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C. or other government-owned property in the metropolitan Washington, D.C. area."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 5-3. RC, WS, AC.

81--Naval Information Systems Management Center, Arlington, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Relocate the Naval Information Systems Management Center from leased space in Arlington, Virginia, to the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

82--Naval Recruiting Command, Washington, D.C.
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site for the Naval Recruiting Command, Washington, D.C., specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-59) from "Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois" to "Naval Support Activity, Memphis, Tennessee."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **AD.**

83--Naval Recruiting District, San Diego, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site for the Naval Recruiting District, San Diego, California, specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-39) from "Naval Air Station North Island" to "other government-owned space in San Diego, California."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

84--Naval Security Group Command Detachment Potomac, Washington, D.C.
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site for the Naval Security Group Command Detachment Potomac, Washington, D.C., from "National Security Agency, Ft. Meade, Maryland" specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-59) to "Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

ALAN J. DIXON, CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONERS:
AL CORNELLA
REBECCA COX
GEN J. B. DAVIS, USAF (RET)
S. LEE KLING
RADM BENJAMIN F. MONTOYA, USN (RET)
MG JOSUE ROBLES, JR., USA (RET)
WENDI LOUISE STEELE

MEDIA PACKET

FOR

CHAIRMAN ALAN DIXON'S

NEWS CONFERENCE

JUNE 30, 1995

1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Recommendations

Part I: Major Base Closures -- (28)

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

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

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

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

Part II: Major Base Realignments -- (21)

Department of the Army
Fort Greely, AK
Fort Hunter Liggett, CA
Sierra Army Depot, CA
Fort Meade, MD
Detroit Arsenal, MI
Fort Dix, NJ
Charles E. Kelly Support Center, PA
Letterkenny Army Depot, PA
Fort Buchanan, PR
Red River Army Depot, TX
Fort Lee, VA

Department of the Navy
Naval Air Station, Key West, FL
Naval Activities, GU
Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, TX
Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Keyport, WA

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

Part III: Smaller Base or Activity Closures, Realignments, Disestablishments or Relocations -- (56)

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

Department of the Navy
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center Oakland, CA
Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering West Coast Division, San Diego, CA
Naval Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, CA
Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN, Long Beach, CA
Naval Undersea Warfare Center-Newport Division, New London Detachment, New London, CT
Naval Research Laboratory, Underwater Sound Reference Detachment, Orlando, FL
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, GU
Public Works Center, GU
Naval Biodynamics Laboratory, New Orleans, LA
Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, MD
Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Detachment, Annapolis, MD
Naval Aviation Engineering Support Unit, Philadelphia, PA
Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, PA
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Open Water Test Facility, Oreland, PA
Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, RDT&E Division Detachment, Warminster, PA
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Charleston, SC

Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering East Coast Detachment, Norfolk, VA
Naval Information Systems Management Center, Arlington, VA
Naval Management Systems Support Office, Chesapeake, VA

Navy/Marine Reserve Activities

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

Naval Air Reserve Center at:
- Olathe, KS

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

Department of the Air Force
Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor Activity, Buffalo, NY

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

Defense Investigative Service
Investigations Control and Automation Directorate, Fort Holabird, MD

Part IV: Changes to Previously Approved BRAC Recommendations -- (27)

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

Department of the Navy
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, CA
Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, CA
Naval Air Station Alameda, CA
Naval Recruiting District, San Diego, CA
Naval Training Center, San Diego, CA
Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, FL
Naval Aviation Depot, Pensacola, FL
Navy Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center, Naval Training Center, Orlando, FL
Naval Training Center, Orlando, FL
Naval Air Station, Agana, GU
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, HI
Naval Air Facility, Detroit, MI
Naval Shipyard, Norfolk Detachment, Philadelphia, PA
Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington, VA

Office of Naval Research, Arlington, VA
Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Arlington, VA
Naval Recruiting Command, Washington, DC
Naval Security Group Command Detachment Potomac, Washington, DC

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

Defense Logistics Agency
Defense Contract Management District West, El Segundo, CA

Part V: DoD Recommendations Rejected by the Commission -- (22)

***Proposed Closures Rejected by the Commission* -- (14)**
Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, CA
Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, CA
North Highlands Air Guard Station, CA
Price Support Center, IL
Selfridge Army Garrison, MI
Naval Air Station, Meridian, MS
Naval Technical Training Center, Meridian, MS
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Lakehurst, NJ
Rome Laboratory, Rome, NY
Springfield-Beckley MAP, Air Guard Station, OH
Greater Pittsburgh IAP Air Reserve Station, PA
Air Force Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator Activity, Fort Worth, TX
Brooks Air Force Base, TX
Defense Distribution Depot Red River, TX

***Proposed Realignments Rejected by the Commission* -- (4)**
Robins Air Force Base, GA
Fort Hamilton, NY
Tinker Air Force Base, OK
Hill Air Force Base, UT

***Proposed Recommendations Rejected by the Commission at the Request of the Secretary of Defense* -- (4)**
Caven Point Reserve Center, NJ
Kirtland Air Force Base, NM
Dugway Proving Ground, UT
Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA), WV

1995 Closure & Realignment Recommendations

($ in Millions)

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

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

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Annual Savings Achieved from Final Recommendations
($Millions)

	1991 Commission	1993 Commission	1995 Commission
Annual Savings Proposed by DoD	1,619	3,083	1,569*
Annual Savings Achieved by Commission	1,488	2,197	1,606
Difference	- 141	- 886	+ 37

*Original March 1 estimate was $1,768 M. Current estimate of $1,569 M reflects revisions in savings estimates submitted to the Commission by DoD, as well as the removal of the following installations from the list of closures and realignments as requested by the Secretary of Defense: Kirtland Air Force Base, NM; Dugway Proving Ground, UT; Caven Point Reserve Center, NJ; and Valley Grove Maintenance Support Activity, WV.

1995 Base Closures and Realignments

	DoD Original Recommendation	Commission Approved	Commission Added	Commission's Final Recommendation	Difference
Major Closures	33	23	5	28	5
Major Realignments	26	20	1	21	5
Small Closures - Realignments	60	53	3	56	4
Redirects to Previous BRAC Recommendations	27	27	0	27	0
TOTAL	146	123	9	132	14

1995 BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS

Major Closures Rejected By Commission (10)

Brooks Air Force Base, Texas
Red River Army Depot, Texas
Price Support Center, Illinois
Rome Laboratory, Rome, New York
Selfridge Army Garrison, Michigan
Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi
North Highlands Air Guard Station, California
Springfield-Beckley MAP, Air Guard Station, Ohio
Greater Pittsburgh IAP, Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Lakehurst, New Jersey

Major Realignments Rejected By Commission (6)

Fort Hamilton, New York
Robins Air Force Base, Georgia
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico*
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma
McClellan Air Force Base, California
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah*

*Removed from list at request of the Secretary of Defense.

Small Base Closures, Realignments, Disestablishments or Relocations Rejected By Commission (7)

Caven Point Reserve Center, New Jersey*
Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA), West Virginia*
Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, California
Naval Technical Training Center, Meridian, Mississippi
Moffett Federal Airfield AGS, California
Air Force Electronic Warfare Evaluation Simulator Activity, Fort Worth, Texas
Defense Distribution Depot Red River, Texas

Installations Added by Commission (9)

McClellan Air Force Base, California (Close)
Oakland Army Base, California (Close)
Chicago O'Hare IAP, Air Reserve Station, Illinois (Close)
Defense Distribution Depot McClellan, California (Close)
Defense Distribution Depot San Antonio, California (Close)
Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Oakland, California (Close)
Fort Holabird, Maryland (Close)
Kelly Air Force Base, Texas (Realign)
Public Works Center, Guam (Realign)

*Removed from list at request of the Secretary of Defense.

BRAC 1995
Net Direct Job Change,
By State

State	Direct-95	Indirect-95	Total	% of State Jobs
Alabama	(6,372)	(1,169)	(7,541)	(0.4%)
Alaska	(1,083)	(365)	(1,448)	(0.4%)
Arizona	312	126	438	0.0%
Arkansas	(290)	(119)	(409)	0.0%
California	(19,372)	(22,898)	(42,270)	(0.3%)
Colorado	(2,607)	(1,464)	(4,071)	(0.2%)
Connecticut	(2,203)	(3,238)	(5,441)	(0.3%)
Delaware	0	0	0	0.0%
District of Columbia	(123)	(89)	(212)	0.0%
Florida	2,998	1,330	4,328	0.1%
Georgia	487	440	927	0.0%
Guam	(3,600)	(1,680)	(5,280)	(7.9%)
Hawaii	1,768	1,108	2,876	0.4%
Idaho	126	37	163	0.0%
Illinois	(1,367)	(625)	(1,992)	0.0%
Indiana	(547)	(2,177)	(2,724)	(0.1%)
Iowa	0	0	0	0.0%
Kansas	(14)	(8)	(22)	0.0%
Kentucky	(13)	(2,093)	(2,106)	(0.1%)
Louisiana	(139)	(119)	(258)	0.0%
Maine	220	77	297	0.0%
Maryland	(1,802)	(1,482)	(3,284)	(0.1%)
Massachusetts	(525)	340	(185)	0.0%
Michigan	147	70	217	0.0%
Minnesota	(54)	(27)	(81)	0.0%
Mississippi	114	57	171	0.0%
Missouri	(2,806)	(2,297)	(5,103)	(0.2%)
Montana	(740)	(223)	(963)	(0.2%)
Nebraska	356	150	506	0.1%
Nevada	25	10	35	0.0%
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0.0%
New Jersey	(2,303)	(1,209)	(3,512)	(0.1%)
New Mexico	670	936	1,606	0.2%
New York	(227)	(93)	(320)	0.0%
North Carolina	(2,709)	(853)	(3,562)	(0.1%)
North Dakota	(837)	(248)	(1,085)	(0.3%)
Ohio	(253)	(854)	(1,107)	0.0%
Oklahoma	4,081	3,391	7,472	0.4%
Oregon	0	0	0	0.0%
Pennsylvania	(3,093)	(3,736)	(6,829)	(0.1%)
Puerto Rico	(161)	(96)	(257)	0.0%
Rhode Island	572	492	1,064	0.2%
South Carolina	4,161	847	5,008	0.3%
South Dakota	0	0	0	0.0%
Tennessee	(854)	(1,807)	(2,661)	(0.1%)
Texas	(13,381)	(19,476)	(32,857)	(0.3%)
Utah	4,929	7,477	12,406	1.3%
Vermont	0	0	0	0.0%
Virginia	1,928	1,460	3,388	0.1%
Washington	852	279	1,131	0.0%
West Virginia	(7)	(3)	(10)	0.0%
Wisconsin	(6)	(2)	(8)	0.0%
Wyoming	0	0	0	0.0%
Total	(43,742)	(49,823)	(93,565)	

TESTIMONY/QUOTES ON AIR FORCE DEPOTS

General Accounting Office Report to the Congress and the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (Military Bases. Analysis of DOD's 1995 Process and Recommendations for Closure and Realignment, April, 1995) p.7:

"Even though the Air Force recognized that it had excess capacity at its five maintenance depots and was considering closing two, it opted late in the process to realign the workforce rather than close any depots. However, the Air Force based its decision on preliminary data from incomplete internal studies on the potential for consolidating and realigning workload and reducing personnel levels at the depots. Some of these studies were completed after DOD's BRAC report was published and do not fully support the BRAC-recommended consolidations. These recommended consolidations appear to expand the workload at some depots that are in the process of downsizing. Thus, the Air Force's recommendation may not be cost-effective and does not solve the problem of excess depot capacity."

Secretary of the Army Togo West, Testimony before the commission on June 14, 1995:

"I think, frankly, that our analysis tells us that the Department of Defense is bleeding depot money. We are just spending money on capacity that we simply do not need now."

"We have concluded that that [downsizing rather than closing depots] is not the way to go and that those who may be going that way are not making as good judgments as we are."

Report of the Commission on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces, May 24, 1995 (Chaired by Dr. John white, currently Deputy Secretary of Defense), p. 3-7:

"With proper oversight, private contractors could provide essentially all of the depot-level maintenance services now conducted in government facilities within the United States...."

"We recommend that the Department make the transition to a depot maintenance system relying mostly on the private sector. DOD should retain organic depot capability only where private-sector alternatives are not available and cannot be developed reasonably."

1995 Defense Base Closure & Realignment Commission Actions



1995 Defense Base Closure & Realignment Commission Actions - Northeast Region



List of 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Actions

Number	Name
1	Army Bio-Medical Research Lab, Fort Detrick, MD
2	Aviation-Troop Command (ATCOM), MO
3	Bellmore Logistics Activity, NY
4	Bergstrom AFB, TX
5	Big Coppett Key, FL
6	Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, Lompoc, CA
7	Camp Bonneville, WA
8	Camp Kilmer, NJ
9	Camp Pedricktown, NJ
10	Chicago O'Hare IAP ARS, IL
11	Concepts Analysis Agency, Bethesda, MD
12	DCMC International, Dayton, OH
13	DCMD South, Marietta, GA
14	DCMD West, El Segundo, CA
15	Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, OH
16	Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny, PA
17	Defense Distribution Depot McClellan, CA
18	Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, TN
19	Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, UT
20	Defense Distribution Depot San Antonio, TX
21	Defense Industrial Supply Center, Philadelphia, PA
22	Detroit Arsenal, MI
23	East Fort Baker, CA
24	Eglin AFB, FL
25	Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, CO
26	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Guam
27	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Charleston, SC
28	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Oakland, CA
29	Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico
30	Fort Chaffee, AR
31	Fort Dix, NJ
32	Fort Greely, AK
33	Fort Holabird, MD
34	Fort Hunter Liggett, CA

35 Fort Indiantown Gap, PA
36 Fort Lee, VA
37 Fort McClellan, AL
38 Fort Meade, MD
39 Fort Missoula, MT
40 Fort Pickett, VA
41 Fort Ritchie, MD
42 Fort Totten, NY
43 Grand Forks AFB, ND
44 Griffiss AFB, 10th Infantry Airfield Support, NY
45 Griffiss AFB, 485th Engineering Installation Group, NY
46 Hill AFB, UT
47 Hingham Cohasset, MA
48 Homestead ARB, 301st Rescue Squadron, FL
49 Homestead ARB, 726th Air Control Squadron, FL
50 Information Systems Software Center, VA
51 Investigations Control & Automation Directorate, MD
52 Kelly AFB, TX
53 Kelly Support Center, PA
54 Letterkenny Army Depot, PA
55 Long Beach Naval Shipyard, CA
56 Lowry AFB, CO
57 MacDill AFB, FL
58 Malmstrom AFB, MT
59 MCAS, El Toro, CA
60 MCAS, Tustin, CA
61 McClellan AFB, CA
62 Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, NJ
63 NAS, Agana, Guam
64 NAS, Alameda, CA
65 NAS, Barbers Point, HI
66 NAS, Cecil Field, FL
67 NAS, Corpus Christi, TX
68 NAS, Key West, FL
69 NAS, South Weymouth, MA
70 Nav. CC & Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service, East Coast Det., Norfolk, VA

71 Naval Research Laboratory, Underwater Sound Reference Det., Orlando, FL
72 Naval Security Group Command Detachment, Washington, DC
73 Naval Activities, Guam
74 Naval Air Facility, Adak, AK
75 Naval Air Facility, Detroit, MI
76 Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, PA
77 Naval Aviation Depot, Pensacola, FL
78 Naval Aviation Engineering Services Unit, Philadelphia, PA
79 Naval Biodynamics Laboratory, New Orleans, LA
80 Naval CC & Ocean Surveillance Center, San Diego, CA
81 Naval CC & Ocean Surveillance Center, Warminster, PA
82 Naval Information Systems Management Center, Arlington, VA
83 Naval Medical Research Institute, Bethesda, MD
84 Naval Management System Support Office, Chesapeake, VA
85 Naval Personnel Research & Development Center, San Diego, CA
86 Naval Recruiting Command, Washington, DC
87 Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington, VA
88 Naval Training Center, Orlando, FL
89 Naval Training Center, San Diego, CA
90 NAWC, Aircraft Division, Open Water Test Facility, Oreland, PA
91 NAWC, Aircraft Division, Indianapolis, IN
92 NAWC, Aircraft Division, Warminster, PA
93 Naval Shipyard, Norfolk Detachment, Philadelphia, PA
94 NSWC, Louisville, KY
95 NSWC, Carderock Detachment, Annapolis, MD
96 NSWC, Dahlgren Division Detachment, White Oak, MD
97 Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center, Orlando, FL
98 NUWC, Keyport, WA
99 NUWC, Newport Division, New London, CT
100 Oakland Army Base, CA
101 Office of Naval Research, Arlington, VA
102 Onizuka AGS, CA
103 Ontario IAP AGS, CA
104 Public Works Center, Guam
105 Publications Distribution Center, Baltimore, MD
106 Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor Activity, Buffalo, NY

107 Recreation Center #2, Fayetteville, NC
108 Red River Army Depot, TX
109 Reese AFB, TX
110 Reserve Center Santa Ana, Irvine, CA
111 Reserve Center, Cadillac, MI
112 Readiness Command Region 7, Charleston, SC
113 Reserve Center, Huntsville, AL
114 Reserve Center, Laredo, TX
115 Readiness Command Region 10, New Orleans, LA
116 Air Reserve Center, Olathe, KS
117 Reserve Center, Pomona, CA
118 Reserve Center, Sheboygan, WI
119 Reserve Center, Staten Island, NY
120 Reserve Center, Stockton, CA
121 Rio Vista Army Reserve Center, CA
122 Roslyn AGS, NY
123 Naval Recruiting District, San Diego, CA
124 Savanna Army Depot Activity, IL
125 Seneca Army Depot, NY
126 Ship Repair Facility, Guam
127 Sierra Army Depot, CA
128 Space & Naval Warfare Systems Command, Arlington, VA
129 Stratford Army Engine Plant, CT
130 Sudbury Training Annex, MA
131 Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Long Beach, CA
132 Williams AFB, AZ

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

ALAN J. DIXON, CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONERS:
AL CORNELLA
REBECCA COX
GEN J. B. DAVIS, USAF (RET)
S. LEE KLING
RADM BENJAMIN F. MONTOYA, USN (RET)
MG JOSUE ROBLES, JR., USA (RET)
WENDI LOUISE STEELE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Wade Nelson
Chuck Pizer
John Earnhardt

TO: DBCRC MEDIA LIST

RE: COMMISSION ACTIONS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 23, 1995

DATE: JUNE 24, 1995

Following is a chronological list of actions taken Friday, June 23, 1995 by the Defense Base Closure and realignment Commission.

The Commission staff is in the process of compiling numbers of bases closed and realigned and the expected savings from those actions, but that information will not be available until later this week.

Following is the list of the recommendations the Commission made June 23 (in chronological order):

Vote Legend (nay votes will be noted, recusals will be in **bold**):
In the event of a tie vote, the Secretary of Defense's recommendation is adopted.
AD - Alan J. Dixon; **AC** - Al Cornella; **RC** - Rebecca Cox; **JD** - James B. Davis;
LK - S. Lee Kling; **BM** - Benjamin Montoya; **JR** - Josue Robles; **WS** - Wendi L. Steele

---

46--Naval Activities, Guam
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Naval Activities Guam. Relocate all ammunition vessels and associated personnel and support to Naval Magazine, Lualualei, Hawaii. Relocate all other combat logistics force ships and associated personnel and support to Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Relocate Military Sealift Command personnel and Diego Garcia support functions to Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Disestablish the Naval Pacific Meteorology and Oceanographic Center-WESTPAC, except for the Joint Typhoon Warning Center, which relocates to the Naval Pacific Meteorology and Oceanographic Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Disestablish the Afloat Training Group-WESTPAC. All other Department of Defense activities that are presently on Guam may remain either as a tenant of Naval Activities, Guam or other appropriate naval activity. Retain waterfront assets for support, mobilization, and contingencies and to support the afloat tender.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Dispose of property owned by Naval Activities declared releasable under the 1994 Guam Land Use Plan (GLUP) with appropriate restrictions. Locate MSC ships as operationally required.
Vote: 7-0-1. **RC**

47--Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-21) for "the aircraft, personnel, and associated equipment" from the closing Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam from "Andersen AFB, Guam" to "other naval or DoD air stations in the Continental United States and Hawaii."
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Allows colocation of HC-5s with MSC ships.
Vote: 7-0-1. **RC**

48--Ship Repair Facility, GUAM
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Ship Repair Facility (SRF), Guam, except transfer appropriate assets, including the piers, the floating drydock, its typhoon basin anchorage, the recompression chamber, and the floating crane, to Naval Activities, Guam.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **RC**

49--Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Guam
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Guam.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Disestablish, except for fuel farm and appropriate assets.
Vote: 7-0-1. **RC**

50--Public Works Center, GUAM
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission recommendation: Realign PWC to match assigned workload. Close officer housing at NAS Agana.
Vote: 7-0-1. **RC**

51--Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts. Relocate its aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine. Relocate the Marine Corps Reserve support squadrons to another facility in the local area or to NAS Brunswick. Reestablish Naval Reserve Center, Quincy, Massachusetts, and change the receiving site specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-64) for consolidation of Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Lawrence, Massachusetts; Naval Reserve Center, Chicopee, Massachusetts; and Naval Reserve Center, Quincy, Massachusetts, from "NAS South Weymouth, Massachusetts" to "Naval Reserve Center, Quincy, Massachusetts."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

52--Naval Air Facility, Detroit, Michigan
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-25) for the Mt. Clemons, Michigan Marine Corps Reserve Center, including MWSG-47 and supporting units, from "Marine Corps Reserve Center, Twin Cities, Minnesota" to "Air National Guard Base, Selfridge, Michigan."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

53--Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, except retain the Regional Counterdrug Training Academy facilities which are transferred to the Academy. Relocate the undergraduate strike pilot training function and associated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas. Its major tenant, the Naval Technical Training Center, will close, and its training functions will be relocated to other training activities, primarily the Navy Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia, and Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Meridian remains open.
Vote: 7-1 AD.

54-- Naval Technical Training Center, Meridian, Mississippi
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Technical Training Center, Meridian, Mississippi, and relocate the training functions to other training activities, primarily the Navy Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia, and Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. NTTC remains open.
Vote: 5-3. WS, JD, AD.

55--Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, as a Naval Air Facility, and relocate the undergraduate pilot training function and associated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, and Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Remain open and realign as necessary.
Vote: 7-1 AD.

56--Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, and
Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving sites for "squadrons and related activities at NAS Miramar" specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-18) from "NAS Lemoore and NAS Fallon" to "other naval air stations, primarily NAS Oceana, Virginia, NAS North Island, California, and NAS Fallon, Nevada." Change the receiving sites for MCAS Tustin, California, specified by the 1993 Commission from "NAS North Island, NAS Miramar, or MCAS Camp Pendleton" to "other naval air stations, primarily MCAS New River, North Carolina; MCB Hawaii (MCAF Kaneohe Bay); MCAS Camp Pendleton, California; and NAS Miramar, California."
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Change is that possible Tustin receiving sites are to be "consistent with operational requirements."
Vote: 8-0.

57-Naval Air Station, Alameda, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving sites specified by the 1993 Commission for the closure of Naval Air Station, Alameda, California (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-35) for "aircraft along with the dedicated personnel, equipment and support" and "reserve aviation assets" from "NAS North Island" and "NASA Ames/Moffett Field," respectively, to "other naval air stations, primarily the Naval Air Facility, Corpus Christi, Texas, to support the Mine Warfare Center of Excellence, Naval Station, Ingleside, Texas."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal. Change language to Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas.
Vote: 8-0.

58--Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving sites specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-20) from "Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina; Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia; and Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina" to "other naval air stations, primarily Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia; Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina; Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida; and Naval Air Station, Atlanta, Georgia; or other Navy or Marine Corps Air Stations with the necessary capacity and support infrastructure." In addition, add the following: "To support Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, retain OLF Whitehouse, the Pinecastle target complex, and the Yellow Water family housing area."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

59-- Naval Air Facility, Adak, Alaska
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Naval Air Facility, Adak, Alaska.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

60--Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida, to a Naval Air Facility and dispose of certain portions of Truman Annex and Trumbo Point (including piers, wharfs and buildings).
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Realign as per DoD request but change language to include "dispose of all property not required to support operational commitments, including Truman Annex and Trumbo Point."
Vote: 8-0.

61--Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission regarding items excepted from the closure of Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii (1993 Commission, at page 1-19) from "Retain the family housing as needed for multi-service use" to "Retain the family housing as needed for multi-service use, including the following family housing support facilities: commissary facilities, Public Works Center compound with its sanitary landfill, and beach recreational areas, known as Nimitz Beach and White Plains Beach."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

62--Navy Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center,
Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-38) for the "Nuclear Power School" (or the Navy Nuclear Power Propulsion Training Center) from "the Submarine School at the Naval Submarine Base (NSB), New London" to "Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **JD.**

63-- Naval Training Centers
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-38) concerning the closure of Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, by deleting all references to Service School Command from the list of major tenants. Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-39) concerning the closure of Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, by deleting all references to Service School Command, including Service School Command (Electronic Warfare) and Service School Command (Surface), from the list of major tenants.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **AD.**

64-- Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Shipyard Long Beach, California, except retain the sonar dome government-owned, contractor-operated facility and those family housing units needed to fulfill Department of the Navy requirements, particularly those at Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California. Relocate necessary personnel to other naval activities as appropriate, primarily Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach and naval activities in the San Diego, California, area.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 6-2. BM, RC

65--Naval Shipyard, Norfolk Detachment, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendations: Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission relating to the closure of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard (1991 Commission Report, at page 5-28) to delete "and preservation" (line 5) and "for emergent requirements"(lines 6-7).
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

66--Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Keyport, Washington
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Keyport, Washington, by moving its ships' combat systems console refurbishment depot maintenance and general industrial workload to Naval Shipyard, Puget Sound, Bremerton, Washington.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

67--Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN, Long Beach, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN, Long Beach, California. Relocate certain functions, personnel and equipment to Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN, San Diego, California.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

68--Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Oakland, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission recommendation: Close FISC Oakland, move DFAS and MSC to government owned space. Close Pt. Molate Naval Refueling Station, Richmond, CA. Close Navy Supply Annex, Alameda, CA.
Vote: 8-0.

69--Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

70--Naval Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish Naval Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, California, and relocate its functions, and appropriate personnel, equipment, and support to the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Memphis, Tennessee, and Naval Air Warfare Center, Training Systems Division, Orlando, Florida.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

71--Naval Health Research Center, San Diego, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Naval Health Research Center (NHRC), San Diego, California, and relocate necessary functions, personnel and equipment to the Bureau of Naval Personnel (BUPERS) at Memphis, Tennessee.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. NHRC remains open in San Diego.
Vote: 8-0.

72--Office of Naval Research, Arlington, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at pages 1-59/60) by deleting the Office of Naval Research from the list of National Capital Region activities to relocate from leased space to Government-owned space within the NCR.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

73-- Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division Detachment, White Oak, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division Detachment, White Oak, Maryland. Relocate the functions, personnel and equipment associated with Ship Magnetic Signature Control R&D Complex to the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock, Maryland, and the functions and personnel associated with reentry body dynamics research and development to the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren, Virginia.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 5-3. RC, JD, JR.

74--Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Detachment, Annapolis, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Detachment, Annapolis, Maryland, including the NIKE Site, Bayhead Road, Annapolis, except transfer the fuel storage/refueling sites and the water treatment facilities to Naval Station, Annapolis to support the U.S. Naval Academy and Navy housing. Relocate appropriate functions, personnel, equipment and support to other technical activities, primarily Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock Division Detachment, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Naval Surface Weapons Center, Carderock Division, Carderock, Maryland; and the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C. The Joint Spectrum Center, a DoD cross-service tenant, will be relocated with other components of the Center in the local area as appropriate.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-1. RC.

75--Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Air Technical Services Facility (NATSF), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and consolidate necessary functions, personnel, and equipment with the Naval Aviation Depot, North Island, California.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

76--Naval Aviation Engineering Service Unit, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close the Naval Aviation Engineering Service Unit (NAESU), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and consolidate necessary functions, personnel, and equipment with the Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), North Island, California.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

77--Naval Management Systems Support Office, Chesapeake, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the Naval Management Systems Support Office (NAVMASSO), Chesapeake, Virginia, and relocate its functions and necessary personnel and equipment as a detachment of Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, San Diego, California, in government-owned spaces in Norfolk, Virginia.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Modify receiving sites to Tidewater, VA area.
Vote: 8-0.

78--Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, In-Service Engineering West Coast Division, San Diego, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish the In-Service Engineering West Coast Division (NISE West), San Diego, California, of the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center (NCCOSC), including the Taylor Street Special Use Area, and consolidate necessary functions and personnel with the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, RDT&E Division, either in the NCCOSC RDT&E Division spaces at Point Loma, California, or in current NISE West spaces in San Diego, California.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

79--Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation for the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia, specified by the 1993 Commission (Commission Report, at page 1-59) from "[r]elocate...from leased space to Government-owned space within the NCR, to include the Navy Annex, Arlington, Virginia; Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.; 3801 Nebraska Avenue, Washington, D.C.; Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia; or the White Oak facility, Silver Spring, Maryland" to "Relocate...from leased space to Government-owned space in San Diego, California, to allow consolidation of the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, with the Space and Naval Warfare Command headquarters. This relocation does not include SPAWAR Code 40, which is located at NRL, or the Program Executive Officer for Space Communication

Sensors and his immediate staff who will remain in Navy-owned space in the National Capital Region."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

80--Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving sites specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-59) for the relocation of the Naval Sea Systems Command, including the Nuclear Propulsion Directorate (SEA 08), the Human Resources Office supporting the Naval Sea Systems Command, and associated PEOs and DRPMs, from "the Navy Annex, Arlington, Virginia; Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.; 3801 Nebraska Avenue, Washington, D.C.; Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia; or the White Oak facility, Silver Spring, Maryland" to "the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C. or other government-owned property in the metropolitan Washington, D.C. area."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 5-3. RC, WS, AC.

81--Naval Information Systems Management Center, Arlington, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Relocate the Naval Information Systems Management Center from leased space in Arlington, Virginia, to the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

82--Naval Recruiting Command, Washington, D.C.
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site for the Naval Recruiting Command, Washington, D.C., specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-59) from "Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois" to "Naval Support Activity, Memphis, Tennessee."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. AD.

83--Naval Recruiting District, San Diego, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site for the Naval Recruiting District, San Diego, California, specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-39) from "Naval Air Station North Island" to "other government-owned space in San Diego, California."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

84--Naval Security Group Command Detachment Potomac, Washington, D.C.
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the receiving site for the Naval Security Group Command Detachment Potomac, Washington, D.C., from "National Security Agency, Ft. Meade, Maryland" specified by the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at page 1-59) to "Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

85-- Reserve Centers/Commands
Recommendation:
Close the following Naval Reserve Centers:
Stockton, California
Pomona, California
Santa Ana, Irvine, California
Laredo, Texas
Sheboygan, Wisconsin
Cadillac, Michigan
Staten Island, New York
Huntsville, Alabama
Close the following Naval Air Reserve Center:
Olathe, Kansas
Close the following Naval Reserve Readiness Commands:
Region Seven - Charleston, South Carolina
Region Ten - New Orleans, Louisiana
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

86--Naval Aviation Depot, Pensacola, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1993 Commission (1993 Commission Report, at pages 1-42/43) by striking the following: "In addition, the Commission recommends that the whirl tower and dynamic components facility be moved to Cherry Point Navy or Corpus Christi Army Depots or the private sector, in lieu of the Navy's plan to retain these operations in a stand-alone facility at NADEP Pensacola."
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **JD.**

87-- Fort Dix, New Jersey
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Dix by replacing the Active Component garrison with a U.S. Army Reserve garrison. Retain minimum essential ranges, facilities, and training areas required for Reserve Component (RC) training as an enclave.
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

88-- Fort Greely, Alaska
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Greely by relocating the Cold Region Test Activity (CRTA) and Northern Warfare Training Center (NWTC) to Fort Wainwright, Alaska.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Realign Ft. Greely in accordance with SecDef recommendation, but amend to "not move facilities until July, 1997."
Vote: 8-0.

89--Fort Hunter Liggett, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Hunter Liggett by relocating the U.S. Army Test and Experimentation Center (TEC) missions and functions to Fort Bliss, Texas. Eliminate the Active Component mission. Retain minimum essential facilities and training area as an enclave to support the Reserve Components (RC).
Commission recommendation: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

90-- Fort Pickett, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Pickett, except minimum essential training areas and facilities as an enclave for the Reserve Components. Relocate the Petroleum Training Facility to Fort Dix, NJ.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Close with amendment to ensure preservation of Reserve Component training.
Vote: 7-1. RC.

91-- Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Indiantown Gap, except minimum essential facilities as a Reserve Component enclave.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Close with amendment to ensure preservation of Reserve Component training.
Vote: 7-1. RC.

92--Fort Chaffee, Arkansas
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Chaffee, except minimum essential buildings, and ranges for Reserve Component (RC) training as an enclave.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Close with amendment to ensure preservation of Reserve Component training.
Vote: 7-1. RC.

93-- Fort McClellan, Alabama
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort McClellan, except minimum essential land and facilities for a Reserve Component enclave and minimum essential facilities, as necessary, to provide auxiliary support to the chemical demilitarization operation at Anniston Army Depot. Relocate the U. S. Army Chemical and Military Police Schools to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, upon receipt of the required permits. Relocate the Defense Polygraph Institute (DODPI) to Fort Jackson, South Carolina. License Pelham Range and current Guard facilities to the Alabama Army National Guard.
Commission action: Reject DoD Proposal. Ft. McClellan closes but CDTF remains in Alabama until a new one is operable in Missouri.
Vote: 8-0.

94-- Fort Lee, Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Lee, by reducing Kenner Army Community Hospital to a clinic. Eliminate inpatient services.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-1. JR.

95-- Fort Meade, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Meade by reducing Kimbrough Army Community Hospital to a clinic. Eliminate inpatient services.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 6-2. JR, AC.

96-- Fort Ritchie, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Ritchie. Relocate the 1111th Signal Battalion and 1108th Signal Brigade to Fort Detrick, MD. Relocate Information Systems Engineering Command elements to Fort Huachuca, AZ.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Ft. Ritchie closes but preserves a National Guard enclave.
Vote: 8-0.

97-- Selfridge Army Garrison, Michigan
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close U.S. Army Garrison, Selfridge.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Selfridge remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

98-- Price Support Center, Illinois
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Charles Melvin Price Support Center, except a small reserve enclave and a storage area.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Price Support Center remains open.
Vote: 6-0-2. **AD, JD.**

99-- Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Buchanan by reducing garrison management functions and disposing of family housing. Retain an enclave for the reserve components, Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES) and the Antilles Consolidated School.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Fort Buchanan realigns but retains mobilization mission.
Vote: 7-1. AD.

100-- Kelly Support Center, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign the Kelly Support Center by consolidating Army Reserve units onto three of its five parcels. Dispose of the remaining two parcels. Relocate the Army Reserve's leased maintenance activity in Valley Grove, WV, to the Kelly Support Center.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Kelly is realigned. Nothing is moved from Valley Grove.
Vote: 8-0.

101-- Fort Hamilton, New York
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Fort Hamilton. Dispose of all family housing. Retain minimum essential land and facilities for existing Army units and activities. Relocate all Army Reserve units from Caven Point, New Jersey, to Fort Hamilton.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Ft. Hamilton remains open. (See also vote #119, Caven Point.)
Vote: 8-0.

102-- Fort Totten, New York
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Totten, except an enclave for the U. S. Army Reserve. Dispose of family housing.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

103-- Detroit Arsenal, Michigan
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Detroit Arsenal by closing and disposing of the Detroit Army Tank Plant.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **AD.**

104-- Tri-Service Project Reliance, Fort Detrick, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding Tri-Service Project Reliance. Upon disestablishment of the U.S. Army Biomedical Research Development Laboratory (USABRDL) at Fort Detrick, MD, do not collocate environmental and occupational toxicology research with the Armstrong Laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. Instead relocate the health advisories environmental fate research and military criteria research functions of the Environmental Quality Research Branch to the U.S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency (AEHA), Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and maintain the remaining functions of conducting non-mammalian toxicity assessment models and on-site biomonitoring research of the Research Methods Branch at Fort Detrick as part of Headquarters, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

105--Sierra Army Depot, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign Sierra Army Depot by eliminating the conventional ammunition mission and reducing it to a depot activity. Retain an enclave for the Operational Project Stock mission and the static storage of ores.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Modify DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0

106--Seneca Army Depot, New York
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Seneca Army Depot, except an enclave to store hazardous material and ores.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

107-- -- Savanna Army Depot Activity, Illinois
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Savanna Army Depot Activity (ADA). Relocate the United States Army Defense Ammunition Center and School (USADACS) to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, Oklahoma.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-0-1. **AD**.

108-- Stratford Army Engine Plant, Connecticut
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Stratford Army Engine Plant.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

109-- Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal. Relocate the Military Transportation Management Command (MTMC) Eastern Area Command Headquarters and the traffic management portion of the 1301st Major Port Command to Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. Retain an enclave for the Navy Military Sealift Command, Atlantic, and Navy Resale and Fashion Distribution Center.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Close Bayonne, move all tenants to receiving locations to be determined.
Vote: **6-2.** RC, AC.

110--Oakland Army Base, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure and realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission recommendation: Close Oakland Army Base.
Vote: 5-3. AC, RC, BM.

111-- Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, Colorado
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fitzsimons Army Medical Center (FAMC), except for Edgar J. McWhethy Army Reserve Center. Relocate the Medical Equipment and Optical School and Optical Fabrication Laboratory to Fort Sam Houston, TX. Relocate Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) activities to Denver leased space. Relocate other tenants to other installations.
Commission recommendation: Reject DoD proposal. Close with modification to the Secretary's proposal. Tenants relocate to location to be determined by Dept. of Army.
Vote: 6-2. AC, JD.

112--Aviation-Troop Command, Missouri
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish Aviation-Troop Command (ATCOM), and close by relocating its missions/functions as follows:

- Relocate Aviation Research, Development & Engineering Center; Aviation Management; and Aviation Program Executive Offices to Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, AL, to form the Aviation & Missile Command.

- Relocate functions related to soldier systems to Natick Research, Development, Engineering Center, MA, to align with the Soldier Systems Command.

- Relocate functions related to materiel management of communications-electronics to Fort Monmouth, NJ, to align with Communications-Electronics Command.
- Relocate automotive materiel management functions to Detroit Arsenal, MI, to align with Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command.

Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 5-1-2. LK, **JD, AD**.

113-- Concepts Analysis Agency, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close by relocating Concepts Analysis Agency to Fort Belvoir, VA.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

114-- Information Systems Software Command (ISSC), Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close by relocating Information Systems Software Command to Fort Meade, MD.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

115-- Publications Distribution Center Baltimore, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close by relocating the U.S. Army Publications Distribution Center, Baltimore to the U.S. Army Publications Center St. Louis, Missouri.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 6-2. AC, RC.

116--Bellmore Logistics Activity, New York
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Bellmore Logistics Activity.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

117-- Big Coppett Key, Florida
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Big Coppett Key.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

118-- Camp Bonneville, Washington
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Camp Bonneville.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

119-- Camp Kilmer, New Jersey
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Camp Kilmer, except an enclave for minimum necessary facilities to support the Reserve Components.
Commission Action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

120-- Camp Pedricktown, New Jersey
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Camp Pedricktown, except the Sievers-Sandberg Reserve Center.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

121-- Caven Point Army Reserve Center, New Jersey
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Caven Point U. S. Army Reserve Center. Relocate its reserve activities to the Fort Hamilton, NY, provided the recommendation to realign Fort Hamilton is approved.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Caven Point remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

122-- East Fort Baker, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close East Fort Baker. Relocate all tenants to other installations that meet mission requirements. Return all real property to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

123--Fort Missoula, Montana
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Fort Missoula, except an enclave for minimum essential land and facilities to support the Reserve Component units.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

124-- Hingham Cohasset, Massachusetts
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Hingham Cohasset.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

125-- Recreation Center #2, North Carolina
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Recreation Center #2, Fayetteville, NC.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

126-- Rio Vista Army Reserve Center, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Rio Vista Army Reserve Center.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

127-- Sudbury Training Annex, Massachusetts
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Sudbury Training Annex.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

128-- Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks, Lompoc, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Branch U.S. Disciplinary Barracks (USDB), Lompoc, CA.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

129-- Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity, West Virginia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Valley Grove Area Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA). Relocate reserve activity to the Kelly Support Center, PA, provided the recommendation to realign Kelly Support Center is approved.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Valley Grove remains open.
Vote: 8-0.

130-- Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, Columbus, Ohio (DDCO)
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign the Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, Ohio, and designate it as a storage site for slow moving/war reserve material. Active material remaining at DDCO at the time of realignment will be attrited. Stock replenishment will be stored in optimum space within the distribution system.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

131-- Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, Tennessee (DDMT)
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, Tennessee. Material remaining at DDMT at the time of closure will be relocated to optimum storage space within the DoD Distribution System. As a result of the closure of DDMT, all DLA activity will cease at this location and DDMT will be excess to DLA needs.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 7-1. JR.

132-- Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Utah (DDOU)
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Close Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Utah, except for a 36,000 square foot cantonment for Army Reserve personnel. Material remaining at DDOU at the time of closure will be relocated to optimum storage space within the DoD Distribution System. As a result of the closure of DDOU, all DLA activity will cease at this location and DDOU will be excess to DLA needs.
Commission action: Reject DoD proposal. Modify closure proposal to enlarge cantonment area. Ogden closes.
Vote: 8-0.

133-- Defense Industrial Supply Center (DISC), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: The Defense Industrial Supply Center is disestablished. Distribute the management of Federal Supply Classes (FSC) within the remaining DLA Inventory Control Points (ICP). Create one ICP for the management of troop and general support items at the Defense Personnel Support Center (DPSC) in Philadelphia, PA.

Create two ICPs for the management of weapon system-related FSCs at the Defense Construction Supply Center (DCSC), Columbus, OH and the Defense General Supply Center (DGSC), Richmond, VA.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

134-- Defense Contract Management District South (DCMD), Marietta, Georgia
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Disestablish DCMD South and relocate missions to DCMD Northeast and DCMD West.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

135-- Defense Contract Management District West (DCMD), El Segundo, California
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: This is a redirect of the following BRAC 93 Commission recommendation: "Relocate the Defense Contract Management District, El Segundo, California, to Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Los Angeles, California, or space obtained from exchange of land for space between the Navy and the Port Authority/City of Long Beach." The current recommendation is expanded to read: Relocate the DCMD, El Segundo, CA, (a) to Government property in the Los Angeles/Long Beach area, or, (b) to space obtained from exchange of land between the Navy and Port Authority/City of Long Beach, or (c) to a purchased office building, whichever is the most cost-effective for DoD.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

136-- Defense Contract Management Command International (DCMCI), Dayton, Ohio
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Realign the DCMCI (Gentile AFS), Dayton, Ohio, and merge its mission into the Defense Contract Management Command Headquarters (DCMC HQ), Ft. Belvoir, Virginia.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

137--Investigations Control and Automation Directorate, Fort Holabird, Baltimore, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: Relocate the Defense Investigative Service (DIS), Investigations Control and Automation Directorate (IC&AD) from Fort Holabird, Maryland, to a new facility to be built on Fort Meade, Maryland. This proposal is a revision to the 1988 Base Closure Commission's recommendation to retain the Defense Investigative Service at Fort Holabird. Once DIS vacates the building on Fort Holabird, the base will be vacant.
Commission action: Accept DoD proposal.
Vote: 8-0.

138-- Fort Holabird, Maryland
Secretary of Defense Recommendation: None. The Commission added this military installation to the list of bases to be considered by the Commission for closure or realignment as a proposed change to the list of recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense.
Commission action: Close Fort Holabird.
Vote: 8-0.

###

THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

ALAN J. DIXON, CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONERS:
AL CORNELLA
REBECCA COX
GEN J. B. DAVIS, USAF (RET)
S. LEE KLING
RADM BENJAMIN F. MONTOYA, USN (RET)
MG JOSUE ROBLES, JR., USA (RET)
WENDI LOUISE STEELE

July 1, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMISSIONERS

From: David S. Lyles, Staff Director

Subj: Letters from the Public

****

As of July 1, 1995 the Commission has received and responded to 8,648 pieces of public correspondence for the 1995 round of Base Closures and Realignments. 2,437 pieces are from Congressional members, senior military leaders, and state and local leaders, and 6,211 are from the general public. Additionally, we have received over 215,000 petitions/mass mailings.

The following 20 installations account for the highest volume of mail received from the general public between January 1 and July 1, 1995:

Installation	# of Correspondence As Of: 6/29	As Of: 5/23	As Of: 4/26
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center	1263	563	417
McClellan AFB	1172	1048	58
Red River Army Depot	704	659	615
Tobyhanna Army Depot	605	582	25
Letterkenny Army Depot	355	348	282
Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, UT	281	281	172
Long Beach Naval Shipyard	380	260	112
Plattsburgh AFB	205	192	141
NAS Glenview, IL	150		
Point Mugu, CA	120		
Ft. Huachuca(For Closure)	113	108	79
Naval Surface Warfare Centers	94	83	66
Scott AFB	82	82	81
Brooks AFB	63	59	52
Ft. Pickett	62	59	49
Navy's ELF Program(For Closure)	60	56	54
March AFB	57	51	42
Reese AFB	50	47	41
DISC, PA	44	42	30
Kirtland AFB	62	40	36

The following list accounts for all petitions/mass mailings received between January 1 and July 1, 1995:

Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA	62,405	Form Letters
McClellan AFB, CA	47,600	Form Letters
Fort Indiantown Gap, PA	40,775	Petition signatures
Fitzsimons Army Medical Center, CO	21,000	Post Cards
Naval Air Station S. Weymouth, MA	16,106	Petition signatures
NSWC Lakehurst, NJ	8,500	Petition signatures
Niagara Air Reserve Station, NY	8,000	Petition signatures
Vance AFB, OK	5,000	Faxes/Form Letters
Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, UT	3,000	Form Letters
NSWC White Oak, MD	1,500	Petition signatures
Stratford Army Engine Plant, CT	1,500	Petition signatures

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

SCHEDULE FOR REGIONAL HEARING

BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

April 4, 1995

8:30-8:40 a.m.	Opening remarks by Chairman Dixon	
8:40-9:45 a.m.	Alabama	65 minutes
9:50-10:35 a.m.	Mississippi	45 minutes
10:40-11:25 a.m.	Tennessee	45 minutes
11:30-Noon	Public comment: Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee	
Noon- 1 p.m.	break	
1-1:40 p.m.	Florida	40 minutes
1:45-2:20 p.m.	Georgia	35 minutes
2:25-2:40 p.m.	Louisiana	15 minutes
2:45-2:55 p.m.	Puerto Rico	10 minutes
3:00-3:10 p.m.	South Carolina	10 minutes
3:15-3:45 p.m.	Public comment: Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, South Carolina	

(AS OF 3/21/95)

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

Hearing, Testimony, and Site Visit Procedures

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission is committed to providing elected officials and the public every opportunity to present their cases before the Commission. The following procedures are designed to facilitate interaction between the Commission, elected officals and the public.

Press inquiries should be directed to Wade Nelson, Director of Communications. All other inquiries should be directed to Cece Carman, Director of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs.

REGIONAL HEARINGS

Based on the list of recommendations for closures and realignments received from the Secretary of Defense, the Commission has developed a schedule of 11 regional Commission hearings (attached). All facilities recommended for closure or realignment have been assigned to a regional hearing site. The purpose of these hearings is to allow affected communities an opportunity to testify before the Commission.

In 1993, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act was amended to require that all testimony before the Commission at a public hearing must be presented under oath.

Testimony and Time Allocation

For oral tesimony at regional hearings, each state will be given a block of time in which to make a presentation for **all** installations affected in that state. The overall time is determined by the Commission on the basis of the number of affected installations and the direct military and civilian personnel lost in each state. The

time alloted for a state represents the total time available for all Commission discussion at the regional hearing. It has been the Commission's experience that the Commissioners' ability to ask questions of and to seek clarification from the witnesses is mutually beneficial. It is highly recommended that presentations reserve time for Commissioners to ask questions of the witnesses. **Time allocations will be strictly enforced.**

The Commission will notify the two Senators, affected Congressional Members and Governor of each facility in a state under consideration. To facilitate an effective presentation, these officials are STRONGLY encouraged to work together to organize their constituents and develop a presentation to be given before the Commission.

Written testimony may also be submitted to the Commission at regional hearings.

Public Comment Period

During each regional hearing, time will be set aside for individuals who wish to express their views on the closure or realignment recommendations under consideration at that hearing. This will be done on a first-come, first-serve basis. A sign-up sheet will be available one hour before the start of each hearing.

SITE VISITS

All major installations recommended by the Secretary of Defense for closure or realignment are scheduled for a site visit by at least one Commissioner. Elected officials and communities will be notified in advance of the scheduled site visit. These site visits enable Commissioners to conduct a fact-finding tour of the facility. Press availability will be coordinated by the installation's Public Affairs Officer. These site visits are not official hearings. Any written material provided to Commissionersduring a site visit, however, will be included in the Commission's permanent record.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Members of Congress will have the opportunity to testify before the Commission in Washington, D.C. Members are encouraged to present formal oral testimony and comments for the record at the Congressional hearings in Washington, D.C., June 12-13. Written testimony of any length may be submitted to the Commission for the record.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission accepts written material including letters, deliberations, studies, testimony, etc. for the record. All such material will be catalogued and put in the Commission's library, which is open to the public. Items may be presented to the Commission at Commission hearings or site visits. Materials may also be delivered or mailed to: The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, 1700 North Moore Street, Suite 1425, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

Eglin AFB

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950320-11 (I, O)
Originated: 03/17/95 Received: 03/20/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 03/27/95 Closed: 03/29/95 COMPLETE.
From: CONNELL, JACK (EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at IWV 2000 PARTNERSHIP FOR).
To: DAVIS, GEN J.B. (COMMISSIONER at DBCRC).
Installation(s): NAVAL WEAPONS CTR, CHINA LAKE, CA (N-60530).
Contents: SUPPORTING ALTERNATIVE PLAN TO RELOCATE EC THREAT SUMLATORS TO CHINA LAKE FROM EGLIN.

950410-6 (O, O)
Originated: 04/08/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/10/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): MALMSTROM AFB, MT (F-NZAS), and EGLIN AFB,FL (F-FTFA).
Contents: FORWARDING COPIES OF: 1) " DEFENSE SUPPORT INITIATIVE " BY EGLIN AFB, 2) " REDCAP REALIGNMENT: THE FACTS " AND " AMERICA, MONTANA, OUR HERITAGE, OUR FUTURE: MALMSTROM AND REQUESTING WRITTEN COMMENTS.

950503-9 (I, O)
Originated: 05/02/95 Received: 05/03/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/10/95 COMPLETE.
From: HARRISON, JOE J. (at).
To: OWSLEY, JAMES (CROSS SERVICE TEAM LEADER at DBCRC).
Installation(s): EGLIN AFB, FL (F-FTFA).
Contents: EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER RECOMMENDATION TO REMOVE EC TESTING FROM EGLIN AFB.

950509-28 (I, O)
Originated: 05/09/95 Received: 05/09/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/22/95 COMPLETE.
From: GRAHAM, BOB (SEN. (FL) at U.S. SENATE).
To: DAVIS, GEN J.B. (COMMISSIONER at DBCRC).
Installation(s): EGLIN AFB, FL (F-FTFA).
Contents: ISSUE PAPER SUPPORTING NAS WHITING FIELD, NADEP JACKSONVILLE AND EGLIN AFB.

950515-4 (I, O)
Originated: 05/09/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/15/95 NONE REQ.
From: GRAHAM, BOB (SEN. (FL) at U.S. SENATE).
To: DAVIS, GEN J.B. (COMMISSIONER at DBCRC).
Installation(s): EGLIN AFB, FL (F-FTFA).
Contents: FORWARDING ISSUE PAPER REGARDING NAS WHITING FIELD, NADEP JACKSONVILLE AND EGLING AFB.

NOTE: 5 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Griffiss AFB

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

940405-4 (I, O)
Originated: 03/18/94 Received: 03/25/94 Referred to: LEGAL Due: 04/19/94 Closed: 04/22/94 COMPLETE.
From: BOEHLERT, SHERWOOD L (REP. (NY) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: HOOK, MARY ANN (DEPGENCNSL at 1993 DBCRC).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ON THE INTENT/INTERPRETATION OF THE 1993 DBCRC RECOMMENDATION TP REALIGN GRIFFISS AFB, NY. (FUTUR TENANTS)

940405-4R1 (O, R)
Originated: 04/18/94 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/22/94 COMPLETE.
From: COURTER, JIM (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
To: BOEHLERT, SHERWOOD L (REP. (NY) at U.S. CONGRESS).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: RESPONSE TO LETTER REGARDING FUTURE TENANTS AT GRIFFISS AFB, NY, SPECIFICALLY DEALING WITH DBCRC RECOMMENDATION LANGUAGE.

950303-7 (I, O)
Originated: 03/01/95 Received: 03/03/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 03/07/95 Closed: 03/23/95 COMPLETE.
From: D'AMATO, ALFONSE (SEN. (NY) at U.S. SENATE).
To: CARMAN, CECE (DIR, CONG. LIASON at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FORWARDING CONSTITUENT CONCERN REGARDING GRIFFISS AFB.

950410-5 (O, O)
Originated: 04/08/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/10/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ), and DRUM, FORT,NY (A-36205).
Contents: REQUESTING AF REVIEW THE COBRA RUN REDIRECTING GRIFFISS ANG OPERATIONS SUPPORT FOR THE 10 INFANTRY DIVISION AT FORT DRUM INTEAD OF GRIFFISS.

950412-12 (O, O)
Originated: 04/12/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/12/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: REQUESTING INFO CONCERNING GRIFFISS AFB.

NOTE: 5 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

REDCAP, Buffalo, NY

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950331-16 (I, O)
Originated: 03/30/95 Received: 03/31/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 04/24/95 COMPLETE.
From: D'AMATO, ALFONSE (SEN. (NY) at U.S. SENATE), and MOYNIHAN, DANIEL (SENATOR (NY) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: REQUESTING COMMISSION VISIT REDCAP.

950405-6 (O, O)
Originated: 04/03/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/05/95 COMPLETE.
From: CREEDON, MADELYN R. (GENERAL COUNSEL at DBCRC).
To: CHESTON, SHELIA (GENERAL COUNSEL at USAF).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FORWARDING LETTER FROM NEW YORK DELEGATION, WHICH QUESTIONS THE LEGAL AUTHORITY OF DBCRC TO CONSIDER THE RECOMMENDATION, AND REQUESTING THEIR VIEWS. (REDCAP)

950405-6R1 (I, R)
Originated: 06/20/95 Received: 06/20/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/20/95 COMPLETE.
From: CHESTON, SHELIA (GENERAL COUNSEL at USAF).
To: CREEDON, MADELYN R. (GENERAL COUNSEL at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: STATING AIR FORCE PROPERLY PLACED REDCAP ACTIVITY ON LIST FOR CLOSURE

950410-6 (O, O)
Originated: 04/08/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/10/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): MALMSTROM AFB, MT (F-NZAS), and EGLIN AFB,FL (F-FTFA).
Contents: FORWARDING COPIES OF: 1) " DEFENSE SUPPORT INITIATIVE " BY EGLIN AFB, 2) " REDCAP REALIGNMENT: THE FACTS " AND " AMERICA, MONTANA, OUR HERITAGE, OUR FUTURE: MALMSTROM AND REQUESTING WRITTEN COMMENTS.

950510-7 (I, O)
Originated: / / Received: 05/10/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/10/95 NONE REQ.
From: HEIDENREICH, WES (ELECTRONIC WARFARE DIRECT at EDWARDS AFB).
To: ACKERMAN, STEVE (ASSOCIATE ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): EGLIN AFB, FL (F-FTFA), and EDWARDS AFB,CA (F-FSPM).
Contents: RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS REGARDING MOVE OF REDCAP TO EDWARDS AND AFEWES TO PATUXENT RIVER.

950511-14 (I, O)
Originated: 05/08/95 Received: 05/11/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/22/95 COMPLETE.
From: QUINN, JACK (REP. (NY) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR REDCAP.

950531-8 (I, O)
Originated: 05/19/95 Received: 05/31/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 06/05/95 COMPLETE.
From: GORSKI, DENNIS T. (COUNTY EXECUTIVE at ERIE CO., NEW YORK).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR REDCAP.

NOTE: 12 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950605-23 (I, O)
Originated: 05/25/95 Received: 06/05/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/07/95 Closed: 06/08/95 COMPLETE.
From: TOKASZ, PAUL A (ASSEMBLYMAN at STATE OF NY).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR REDCAP.

950606-20 (I, O)
Originated: 06/06/95 Received: 06/06/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/08/95 Closed: 06/15/95 COMPLETE.
From: QUINN, JACK (REP. (NY) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FORWARDING DOCUMENTS REGARDING REDCAP
1) COST OF REALIGNMENT
2) REDCAP UTILIZATION INFO

950607-8 (O, O)
Originated: 06/07/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/07/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: REQUESTING CLASSIFIED BRIEFING ON REDCAP - SCOPE AND NATURE OF ACTIVITIES

950614-4 (I, O)
Originated: 06/09/95 Received: 06/14/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/16/95 Closed: 06/16/95 COMPLETE.
From: LAFALCE, JOHN (REP. (NY) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR REDCAP

950621-13 (I, O)
Originated: 06/20/95 Received: 06/20/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/21/95 NONE REQ.
From: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
To: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FORWARDING COPY OF ELECTRONIC COMBAT CONSOLIDATION MASTER PLAN - REDCAP, AFEWES, EMTE

NOTE: 12 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Kirtland AFB

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950303-4 (I, O)
Originated: 03/02/95 Received: 03/03/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 04/03/95 COMPLETE.
From: DOMENICI, PETE (SENATOR at US CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR KIRTLAND AFB. ALSO, REQUESTING THAT A REGIONAL HEARING BE HELD IN ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXIXO.

950313-13 (I, O)
Originated: 03/07/95 Received: 03/13/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 03/15/95 Closed: 03/22/95 COMPLETE.
From: CHAVEZ, MARTIN J. (MAYOR at ALBUQUERQUE).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: LETTER REQUESTING THAT A REGIONAL HEARING BE HELD IN ALBUQUERQUE. ALSO, LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR KIRTLAND AFB.

950315-4 (I, O)
Originated: 03/10/95 Received: 03/15/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 03/29/95 COMPLETE.
From: SERINO, JANET (NATIONAL BOARD MEMBER at MANA).
To: GENERAL, (at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: CONCERNED THAT NUMBER OF EEO COMPLAINTS FILED WITH AIR FORCE WAS A FACTOR IN DECISION TO CLOSE KIRTLAND AFB.

950320-2 (I, O)
Originated: / / Received: 03/20/95 Referred to: AIR FORCE Due: / / Closed: 03/20/95 NONE REQ.
From: LANDRY, ROBERT L. (LT. COL, DEPUTY CARE TEAM at DEPT OF THE AIR FORCE).
To: CANTWELL, FRANK (AF SR. ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: FORWARDING COPIES OF: (REGARDING KIRTLAND AFB)
1) LOCAL NEWS ARTICLES ON AIR QUALITY ISSUE
2) DRAFT BRAC COSTING SITE SURVEY INFO
3) MAR 95 ENVIRONMENTAL COMFORMITY ANALYSIS
COPY IN LIBRARY

950321-7 (I, O)
Originated: 03/17/95 Received: 03/21/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 03/23/95 Closed: 03/29/95 COMPLETE.
From: FEINSTEIN, DIANNE (SEN. (CA) at U.S. SENATE), and WILSON, PETE (GOVERNOR at CALIFORNIA).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): LOS ANGELES AFB, CA (F-ACJP).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR LOS ANGELES AFB STATING IT SHOULD NOT BE COMPARED WITH KIRTLAND AFB.
SEN BOXER AND 15 CONGRESSMEN ALSO SIGNED.

950331-4 (I, O)
Originated: 03/29/95 Received: 03/31/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/31/95 NONE REQ.
From: DOMENICI, PETE (SENATOR at US CONGRESS), and BINGAMAN, JEFF (SEN. (NM) at U.S. SENATE).
To: WIDNALL, SHEILA E. (SEC OF THE AIR FORCE at DEPT OF THE AIR FORCE).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: REQUESTING COPY OF THE BCEG OR AIR FORCE REQUEST FOR AN AFAA AUDIT OF KIRTLAND AFB FACILITY CONDITION CODES.

950411-18 (I, O)
Originated: 04/11/95 Received: 04/11/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/11/95 NONE REQ.
From: DOMENICI, PETE (SENATOR at US CONGRESS).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: STATING THAT THE APRIL 7 AIR FORCE RESPONSE TO THEIR REQUEST FOR REVISED COST DATA REGARDING KIRTLAND AFB IS

NOTE: 11 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

UNACCEPTTABE. REQUESTING NEW DATA BY APRIL 13.

950412-13 (O, O)
Originated: 04/12/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/12/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: REQUESTING INFORMATION CONCERNING KIRTLAND AFB.

950417-3 (I, O)
Originated: 04/15/95 Received: 04/17/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 04/24/95 COMPLETE.
From: JOHNSON, GARY E. (GOVERNOR at DBCRC).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: SENDING COPY OF KIRTLAND AFB PRESENTATION IN DEFENSE OF BASE.

950510-10 (I, O)
Originated: 05/02/95 Received: 05/10/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/15/95 COMPLETE.
From: POWELL, RAY (COMM OF PUBLIC LANDS at STATE OF NEW MEXICO).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: STATING THE STATE WILL LEASE PART OF MESA DEL SOL TO KIRTLAND AFB TO HELP PRESERVE OR EXPAND ITS MISSIONS.

950609-19 (I, O)
Originated: 06/09/95 Received: 06/09/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/12/95 Closed: 06/09/95 NONE REQ.
From: PERRY, WILLIAM (SECRETARY OF DEFENSE at DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: RECOMMENDING THE REMOVAL OF KIRTLAND AFB FOR THE DOD LIST.

NOTE: 11 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

07/20/95 at 12:45:41

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950223-3 (I, O) Received: 02/23/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 02/23/95 COMPLETE.
Originated: 02/23/95
From: BILBRAY, BRIAN (US REP at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: PERRY, WILLIAM (SECRETARY OF DEFENSE at DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: LETTER REQUESTING THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO MOVING ROME LAB TO NCCOSC IN SAN DIEGO. (REPORT IN LIBRARY; EXTRA COPY GIVEN TO ALEX Y.)

950317-1 (I, O) Received: 03/17/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 04/03/95 COMPLETE.
Originated: 03/14/95
From: GRIFFO, JOSEPH (MAYOR at), and MEIER, RAYMOND (COUNTY EXECUTIVE at GRIFFISS LOCAL DEV CORP).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: FORWARDING INITIAL INFORMATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE RECORD OF "FACTS FOR CONSIDERATION" HANDBOOK CONCERNING ROME LABORATORY. NOTEBOOK SENT TO ALL COMMISSIONERS AND SELECTIVE STAFF -- COPY IN LIBRARY.

950404-10 (I, O) Received: 04/04/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 04/10/95 COM
Originated: 03/31/95
From: ENTZMINGER, JOHN N. (CHIEF, ADVANCED TECHNOLOG at ARPA).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: CONCERNED WITH CLOSING OF ROME LAB.

950404-5 (I, O) Received: 04/04/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 04/11 ETE.
Originated: 03/29/95
From: HOFFMANN, LARRAINE (STATE SENATOR at STATE OF NEW YORK).
To: WALGREN, CHIP (CITY AND STATE LIAISON at DBCRC).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: THANK YOU FOR ASSISTANCE IN SETTING UP MEETING. ALSO, EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER ROME LAB BE TE.

950405-15 (I, O) Received: 04/05/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Q.
Originated: 04/04/95
From: CONNOR, MARTIN (MINORITY LEADER at NY STATE SENATE).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR ROME LAB.

950412-11 (O, O) Received: / / Referred to: Due:
Originated: 04/12/95
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: REQUESTING BACK UP DATA FOR THE AIRFORCE COBRA ON THE ROME LA

950417-17 (O, O) Received: / / Referred to:
Originated: 04/17/95
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS U
Installation(s): HANSCOM AFB, MA (F-MXRD).
Contents: REQUESTING COMMENTS ON MA. PLAN TO SPEND $100 MILL.

Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950417-18 (O, O)
Originated: 04/17/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/17/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: REQUESTING BRIEFING ON ROME LAB'S CLASSIFIED WORK.

950418-14 (O, O)
Originated: 04/18/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/18/95 NONE REQ.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): MONMOUTH, FORT, NJ (A-34555).
Contents: FORWARDING QUESTION REGARDING REALIGNING ROME LAB TO FORT.

950427-11 (I, O)
Originated: 04/26/95 Received: 04/27/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/01/95 COMPLETE.
From: KESOLITS, THOMAS J. (at).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MONMOUTH, FORT, NJ (A-34555).
Contents: PROVIDING PAPER WHICH SUPPORTS AIR FORCE'S DECISION TO MOVE PARTS OF ROME LAB TO FORT MONMOUTH.

950501-5 (I, O)
Originated: 04/28/95 Received: 05/01/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/09/95 COMPLETE.
From: SILVER, SHELDON (SPEAKER at NY STATE ASSEMBLY).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: FORWARDING LETTER SENT TO PRESIDENT CLINTON FROM THE MAJORITY MEMBERS OF THE NY STATE ASSEMBLY, WHICH SUPPORTS ROME LAB.

950502-8 (I, O)
Originated: 04/25/95 Received: 05/02/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/12/95 COMPLETE.
From: SHAW, KENNETH A. (CHANCELLOR AND PRESIDENT at SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT TO KEEP ROME LAB IN CENTRAL NY.

950511-9 (I, O)
Originated: 05/05/95 Received: 05/11/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/19/95 COMPLETE.
From: CAYAN, PETER (PRESIDENT at SUNY INSTITUTE OF TECH).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR ROME LAB.

950514-12 (I, O)
Originated: 05/09/95 Received: 05/14/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/22/95 COMPLETE.
From: BARTLETT, THOMAS A. (CHANCELLOR at STATE UNIV. OF NY).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR ROME LAB.

NOTE: 30 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950515-2 (I, O)
Originated: 05/09/95 Received: 05/15/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/22/95 COMPLETE.
From: DESTITO, ROANN M. (MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY at STATE OF NEW YORK).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: REQUESTING COMM KLING AND COMM CORNELLA VISIT ROME LAB

950517-19 (I, O)
Originated: 05/09/95 Received: 05/17/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/22/95 COMPLETE.
From: DESTITO, ROANN M. (MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY at STATE OF NEW YORK).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FORWARDING COPY OF LTG, CHARLES E. FRANKLIN'S TESTIMONY AT A PUBLIC HEARING HELD IN ALBANY, NY BY THE STATE ASSEMBLY SUPPORTING ROME LAB

950525-7 (I, O)
Originated: 05/19/95 Received: 05/25/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/25/95 NONE REQ.
From: DIMEO, STEVEN J. (EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at GRIFFISS LOCAL DEV CORP).
To: HELMER, DICK (CROSS SERVICE GAO ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: FORWARDING NEWS ARTICLES REGARDING ROME LAB.

950526-10 (I, O)
Originated: 05/26/95 Received: / / Referred to: AIR FORCE Due: / / Closed: 05/26/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL BACKUP INFORMATION TO THE CHANGED COBRA (ROME LAB).

950526-23 (I, O)
Originated: 05/26/95 Received: 05/26/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 06/05/95 COMPLETE.
From: D'AMATO, ALFONSE (SEN. (NY) at U.S. SENATE), and MOYNIHAN, DANIEL (SENATOR (NY) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: IN SUPPORT OF ROME LAB. MAY 7 BOATWRIGHT LETTER ATTACHED.

950531-23 (I, O)
Originated: 05/26/95 Received: 05/31/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 06/05/95 COMPLETE.
From: MOYNIHAN, DANIEL (SENATOR (NY) at U.S. CONGRESS), and D'AMATO, ALFONSE (SEN. (NY) at U.S. SENATE).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FORWARDING LETTER FROM JAMES F. BOATRIGHT STATING AIR FORCE HAS NO PLANS OF CLOSING ROME LAB.

950531-32 (I, O)
Originated: 05/30/95 Received: 05/31/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/03/95 Closed: 06/07/95 COMPLETE.
From: DESTITO, ROANN M. (MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY at STATE OF NEW YORK).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: INFORMING THAT IF COMM KLING AND COMM CORNELL CANNOT VISIT ROME LAB, THEY WOULD LIKE TO MEET WITH THEM IN WASHINGTON

NOTE: 30 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950606-12 (I, O)
Originated: 06/06/95 Received: 06/06/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/06/95 NONE REQ.
From: FERLISE, VICTOR J. (DEP TO THE COMMANDING GEN at FORT MONMOUTH).
To: HELMER, DICK (CROSS SERVICE GAO ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MONMOUTH, FORT, NJ (A-34555).
Contents: REPORT DISCUSSING THE FOUR FUNCTIONS PROPOSED TO TRANSFER FROM ROME LAB TO FORT MONMOUTH.

950607-3 (I, O)
Originated: 06/06/95 Received: 06/07/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/07/95 NONE REQ.
From: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
To: FRANCO, (at ROME LAB COMM TASK FORCE).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: LETTER CLARIFYING THE ROME LAB CLOSURE ACTION

950613-27 (I, O)
Originated: 06/06/95 Received: 06/13/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/13/95 NONE REQ.
From: DIMEO, STEVEN J. (EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at GRIFFISS LOCAL DEV CORP).
To: HELMER, DICK (CROSS SERVICE GAO ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: STATING AIR FORCE IS STANDING BEHIND RECOMMENDATION FOR ROME LAB

950614-17 (I, O)
Originated: 06/14/95 Received: 06/14/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/14/95 NONE REQ.
From: FERLISE, VICTOR J. (DEP TO THE COMMANDING GEN at FORT MONMOUTH).
To: HELMER, DICK (CROSS SERVICE GAO ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MONMOUTH, FORT, NJ (A-34555).
Contents: DISCUSSING AVAILABILITY OF FACILITIES AT FORT MONMOUTH TO ACCEPT TRANSFERS FROM ROME LAB

950615-21 (I, O)
Originated: 06/15/95 Received: 06/15/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/19/95 Closed: 06/22/95 COMPLETE.
From: BOEHLERT, SHERWOOD L (REP. (NY) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: OWSLEY, JAMES (CROSS SERVICE TEAM LEADER at DBCRC).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: PROVIDING ANALYSIS OF THE FINAL AIR FORCE COBRA ESTIMATES FOR RELOCATION OF ROME LAB

950615-25 (I, O)
Originated: 06/15/95 Received: 06/15/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/19/95 Closed: 06/22/95 COMPLETE.
From: DESTITO, ROANN M. (MEMBER OF ASSEMBLY at STATE OF NEW YORK).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FORWARDING LETTER FROM JAMES L. GRAY, PRESIDENT OF MANUFACTURERS ASSOC OF CENTRAL NEW YORK, IN SUPPORT OF ROME LAB

950617-12 (I, O)
Originated: 06/14/95 Received: 06/17/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/17/95 NONE REQ.
From: METOXEN, LORETTA (VICE-CHAIRWOMAN at ONEIDA TRIBE OF INDIANS).
To: OLSEN, ALAN K. (BASE DISPOSAL AGENCY,USAF at DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: INFORMING THAT THEY PLAN TO FILE APPLICATIONS FOR ACQUIRING GRIFFIS AND ROME LAB

NOTE: 30 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950620-2 (I, O)
Originated: 06/19/95 Received: 06/20/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/20/95 NONE REQ.
From: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
To: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: MEMO REGARDING COSTS FOR ROME LAB CLOSURE

950621-23 (I, O)
Originated: 06/21/95 Received: 06/21/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/28/95 Closed: 06/26/95 NONE REQ.
From: GOODFRIEND, DAVE (at WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER).
To: CREEDON, MADELYN R. (GENERAL COUNSEL at DBCRC).
Installation(s): GRIFFISS AFB, NY (F-JREZ).
Contents: SUGGESTED LANGUAGE OF MOTION TO REMOVE ROME LAB FROM THE LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

NOTE: 30 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Williams AFB

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

941207-7 (I, O)
Originated: 12/07/94 Received: 12/07/94 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 12/28/94 COMPLETE.
From: MCNAMARA, LARRY W. (CHIEF at RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISP.).
To: LYLES, DAVID (STAFF DIRECTOR at DBCRC).
Installation(s): ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL, IL (A-17775).
Contents: JAN 25-26 MEETING IN WILLIAMSBURG, VA; ISSUES RELATED TO LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE; AGENDA FOR MEETING ATTACHED.

950310-6 (I, O)
Originated: / / Received: 03/10/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/10/95 COMPLETE.
From: , (at WILLIAMS ERT CONSORTIUM).
To: GENERAL, (at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FACTS CONCERNING KEEPING THE AIRCREW TRAINING RESEARCH DIVISION OF THE ARMSTRONG LABORATORY AT WILLIAMS GATEWAY AIRPORT , MESA, ARIZONA. (INFO PACK IN LIBRARY)

950324-1 (O, O)
Originated: 03/15/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/24/95 NONE REQ.
From: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
To: BURNS, CONRAD (SENATOR (MON) at U.S. CONGRESS) and BAUCUS, MAX (SENATOR (MON) at U.S. CONGRESS).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: INFORMATION REGARDING MARCH 31 HEARING IN GREAT FALLS, MONTANA. ALSO, SENT TO CONG PAT WILLIAMS AND GOVERNOR MARC RACICOT.

950504-4 (O, O)
Originated: 05/04/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/04/95 COMPLETE.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: REQUESTING COBRA RUNS ON WILLIAMS -MESA REDIRECT USING ALTERNATIVE ASSUMPTIONS.

950522-4 (I, O)
Originated: 05/09/95 Received: 05/22/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 05/24/95 Closed: 06/05/95 COMPLETE.
From: SYMINGTON, FIFE (GOVERNOR at STATE OF ARIZONA).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): WILLIAMS AFB, AZ (F-YZJU).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR LEAVING ARMSTRONG LAB AT WILLIAMS AFB.

950605-21 (I, O)
Originated: 06/05/95 Received: 06/05/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/07/95 Closed: 06/08/95 COMPLETE.
From: DLY, JON (SENATOR (AZ) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: REQUESTING DBCRC CONSIDER REDIRECTING 1991 DECISION AND LEAVING ARMSTRONG LAB AT WILLIAMS GATEWAY AIRPORT.

950607-4 (I, O)
Originated: 06/06/95 Received: 06/07/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/09/95 Closed: 06/13/95 COMPLETE.
From: MCCAIN, JOHN (SEN. (AZ) at U.S. SENATE).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): WILLIAMS AFB, AZ (F-YZJU).
Contents: STATING THAT AFTER ADDITIONAL REVIEWS THE AIR FORCE MATERIAL COMMAND AND THE DEPT OF AIR FORCE AND DEFENSE ARE RECOMMENDING RETAINING THE AIRCREW RESEARCH DIVISION OF ARMSTRONG LAB AT WILLIAMS.

NOTE: 8 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950706-5 (I, O)
Originated: 06/30/95 Received: 07/06/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 07/10/95 Closed: 07/10/95 COMPLETE.
From: MICA, JOHN (US REP (FL) at US CONGRESS), and YOUNG, C.W. BILL (US REP at US CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: REQUESTING DBCRC RELOCATE WILLIAMS ARMSTRONG LAB TO ORLANDO

NOTE: 8 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

AFEWES

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950420-21 (I, O)
Originated: 04/11/95 Received: 04/20/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/08/95 COMPLETE.
From: DICKMARK, ANDERS (HEAD OF EW SECTION at SWEDISH AIR FORCE).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: CONCERNED WITH PLANNED MOVE OF AFEWES TO ANOTHER LOCATION.

950510-7 (I, O)
Originated: / / Received: 05/10/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/10/95 NONE REQ.
From: HEIDENREICH, WES (ELECTRONIC WARFARE DIRECT at EDWARDS AFB).
To: ACKERMAN, STEVE (ASSOCIATE ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): EGLIN AFB, FL (F-FTFA), and EDWARDS AFB,CA (F-FSPM).
Contents: RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS REGARDING MOVE OF REDCAP TO EDWARDS AND AFEWES TO PATUXENT RIVER.

950607-11 (I, O)
Originated: 06/06/95 Received: 06/06/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/07/95 NONE REQ.
From: TIPTON, DEWEY R. (MANAGER, EC PROGRAMS at LOCKHEED FORT WORHT).
To: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FORWARDING INFORMATION REGARDING AFEWES

950620-54 (I, O)
Originated: 06/20/95 Received: 06/20/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/22/95 Closed: 06/23/95 COMPLETE.
From: GRAMM, PHIL (SEN. (TX) at U.S. SENATE), and HUTCHISON, KAY BAILEY (SENATOR (TX) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: WRITING TO CALL ATTENTION TO A "CLEAR FLAW" IN AIR FORCE RECOMMEDNATIONS FOR REALIZING COMBAT TEST FACILITIES; URGE TO REJECT REALIGNMENT PROPOSAL; AFEWES (FT. WORTH)

950621-13 (I, O)
Originated: 06/20/95 Received: 06/20/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/21/95 NONE REQ.
From: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
To: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FORWARDING COPY OF ELECTRONIC COMBAT CONSOLIDATION MASTER PLAN - REDCAP, AFEWES, EMTE

NOTE: 5 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Hill AFB

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

941114-2 (I, O)
Originated: 11/10/94 Received: 11/14/94 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 11/14/94 Closed: 11/16/94 COMPLETE.
From: NICKLES, DON (SENATOR at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC) and ET AL., (at).
Installation(s): VANCE AFB, OK (F-XTLF).
Contents: INVITATION TO RECEPTION ON THE HILL FOR VANCE AFB.

950410-19 (O, O)
Originated: 04/10/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/10/95 NONE REQ.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): A.P. HILL, FORT, VA (A-51290), and MCCOY, FORT,WI (A-55425).
Contents: REQUESTING COBRA RUNS CONDUCTED ON FT A.P. HILL AND FT MCCOY.

950414-15 (I, O)
Originated: 04/14/95 Received: 04/14/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/08/95 COMPLETE.
From: HANSEN, JAMES V. (REP. (UT) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): DUGWAY PROVING GROUND, UT (A-49295).
Contents: SUBMITTING QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED BY DR. PHILLIP COYLE AT APRIL 17 HEARING REGARDING DUGWAY .

950428-12 (I, O)
Originated: 04/25/95 Received: 04/28/95 Referred to: UNKNOWN Due: / / Closed: 04/28/95 NONE REQ.
From: PARKINSON, SCOTT (PRESIDENT AND CEO at OGDEN AND WEBER CHAMBER).
To: CORNELLA, AL (COMMISSIONER at DBCRC).
Installation(s): DEFENSE DEPOT, OGDEN, UT (D-49855), and HILL AFB,UT (F-KRSM).
Contents: THANK YOU FOR ALLOWING HILL DDO 95 TIME AT ALBUQUERQUE REGIONAL HEARING.

950509-6 (I, O)
Originated: 05/08/95 Received: 05/09/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/09/95 NONE REQ.
From: HEATHENBRUCK, JEANNIE (CHIEF LOG OPER ARMA DIV at HILL AFB, UT).
To: BORDEN, BEN (DIRECTOR-REVIEW/ANALYSIS at DBCRC, R&A).
Installation(s): HILL AFB, UT (F-KRSM).
Contents: PROVIDING COMMENTS ON HILL'S ABILITY TO ACCEPT THE TACTICAL MISSILE WORKLOAD CONSOLIDATION FOR DOD.

950515-7 (I, O)
Originated: 05/15/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/15/95 COMPLETE.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT, PA (A-42345), and HILL AFB,UT (F-KRSM).
Contents: FORWARDING ISSUE PAPER REGARDING LETTERKENNY TO HILL SCENARIO AND REQUESTING COMMENTS. ECTS #959509-6

950516-12 (I, O)
Originated: 05/12/95 Received: 05/16/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/22/95 COMPLETE.
From: HANSEN, JAMES V. (REP. (UT) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): HILL AFB, UT (F-KRSM).
Contents: FORWARDING LETTER UTAH DELEGATION SENT TO JAMES KLUGH SUPPORTING PROPOSAL TO CONSOLIDATE ALL TACTICAL MISSILE DEPOT MAINTENANCE TO HILL AFB.

NOTE: 12 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950602-6 (I, O)
Originated: 05/30/95 Received: 06/02/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/09/95 Closed: 06/08/95 COMPLETE.
From: PAVICH, MICHAEL (PRESIDENT at HILL/DDO 95).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): HILL AFB, UT (F-KRSM).
Contents: FORWARDING COPY OF THE "AFMC 21 STUDY" AND A REPORT DEALING WITH FEASIBILITY OF CLOSING HILL AFB PAPER.

950609-2 (O, O)
Originated: 06/09/95 Received: 06/09/95 Referred to: Due: 06/16/95 Closed: 06/09/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT, PA (A-42345), and HILL AFB,UT (F-KRSM).
Contents: IF THE DBCRC DECIDES TO REALIGN LETTERKENNY ARMY DEPOT DOES THE AIR FORCE SUPPORT THE HILL AFB COMMUNITY PROPOSAL TO DECENTRALIZE TACTICAL MISSLE MAINTANCE.

950612-12 (I, O)
Originated: 06/08/95 Received: 06/12/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/19/95 Closed: 06/21/95 COMPLETE.
From: MCCOY, TIDAL (GOVT RELATIONS, VICE PRES at THIOKOL).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): HILL AFB, UT (F-KRSM).
Contents: REQUESTING DBCRC CONSIDER THE ALTERNATIVE OF HILL AFB FOR ALL TACTICAL MISSILE WORKLOAD CONSOLIDATION

950615-27 (I, O)
Originated: 06/15/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/15/95 COMPLETE.
From: COOK, BOB (INTERAGENCY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BABBITT, GEORGE T. (PRINCIPAL DEPUTY DIRECTOR at DLA).
Installation(s): DEFENSE DEPOT, OGDEN, UT (D-49855).
Contents: HILL/DDO COMMUNITY STATES ONE TIME COSTS OF CLOSURE WOULD BE $409.6 MILLION AND ANNUAL SAVINGS OF $9.3 MILLION, PLEASE COMMENT

950619-8 (I, O)
Originated: 06/16/95 Received: 06/19/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/21/95 Closed: 06/29/95 COMPLETE.
From: BENNETT, ROBERT (SENATE (UT) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): HILL AFB, UT (F-KRSM).
Contents: FORWARDING POINT PAPER DISCUSSING PROPOSAL TO CONSOLIDATE TACTICAL MISSILE DEPOT WORKLOAD AT HILL AFB

NOTE: 12 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Kelly AFB

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

941228-3 (I, O)
Originated: 12/22/94 Received: 12/28/94 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 01/04/95 Closed: 02/17/95 COMPLETE.
From: HOLLIN, SHELBY W. (ATTORNEY at PRIVATE PRACTICE).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KELLY AFB, TX (F-MBPB).
Contents: IN SUPPORT OF KELLY AFB; ATTACHED IS LETTER FROM MR. HOLLIN TO DOD WITH ENCLOSURES.

950327-8 (I, O)
Originated: 03/24/95 Received: 03/27/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/27/95 NONE REQ.
From: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
To: REESE, ANN (CROSS SERVICE DOD ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KELLY AFB, TX (F-MBPB), and MCCLELLAN AFB,CA (F-PRJY).
Contents: PROVIDING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR AF COBRA RUNS ON KELLY AND MCCLELLAN AFB'S. RESPONSE TO MARCH 16 REQUEST.

950404-14 (O, O)
Originated: 04/03/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/04/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): KELLY AFB, TX (F-MBPB), and REESE AFB,TX (F-UBNY).
Contents: REQUESTING INFO TO RECONCILE DIFFERENCES IN DIRECT "OUTS" BETWEEN ECONOMIC IMPACT DATA AND COBRA FOR KELLY AFB AND REESE AFB.

950417-7 (O, O)
Originated: 04/14/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/17/95 COMPLETE.
From: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
To: HAGEMANN, KENNETH (DIRECTOR at DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY).
Installation(s): KIRTLAND AFB, NM (F-MHMV).
Contents: REQUESTING REMARKS ON DOD RECOMMENDATION TO RELOCATE FIELD COMMAND TO KELLY AFB, HIGH EXPLOSIVE TESTING TO NELLIS AF AND LEAVING RADIATION SIMULATOR AT KIRTLAND.

950426-6 (O, O)
Originated: 04/26/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/26/95 COMPLETE.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): CHARLES E.KELLY SPT FAC, PA (A-42623).
Contents: PLEASE COMMENT ON ACCURACY OF CIMMUNITY DATA REGARDING VALUES FOR INSTALLATION ASSESSMENT OF THE CHARLES KELLY SUPPORT CENTER.

950428-11 (I, O)
Originated: 04/28/95 Received: 04/28/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/17/95 COMPLETE.
From: ROCKEFELLER, JOHN D. (SENATOR (WV) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): CHARLES E.KELLY SPT FAC, PA (A-42623).
Contents: INFORMING OF POTENTIAL ECONOMIC IMPACT THE CLOSING OF THE KELLY SUPPORT FACILITY AND THE PITTSBURGH AIR RESERVE BASE WILL HAVE ON THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA.

950428-5 (O, O)
Originated: 04/27/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/28/95 COMPLETE.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): CHARLES E.KELLY SPT FAC, PA (A-42623).
Contents: FORWARDING QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE CHARLES KELLY SUPPORT FACILITY.

NOTE: 12 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950501-7 (I, O)
Originated: 05/01/95 Received: 05/01/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/01/95 NONE REQ.
From: CURTIS, LEWIS (COMMANDER (MAJGEN) at KELLY AFB).
To: REESE, ANN (CROSS SERVICE DOD ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KELLY AFB, TX (F-MBPB).
Contents: EXPLAINING REASON REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE COSTS WERE HIGH FOR KELLY AFB COMPARED TO OTHER DEPOTS.

950501-8 (I, O)
Originated: 04/28/95 Received: 05/01/95 Referred to: NAVY Due: / / Closed: 05/01/95 NONE REQ.
From: CURTIS, LEWIS (COMMANDER (MAJGEN) at KELLY AFB).
To: REESE, ANN (CROSS SERVICE DOD ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KELLY AFB, TX (F-MBPB).
Contents: FORWARDING ISSUE PAPER ON CURRENT SUPERVISOR TO EMPLOYEE RATIO AT KELLY.

950523-12 (O, O)
Originated: 05/23/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/23/95 COMPLETE.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: REQUESTING SEPARATE COBRA'S FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE KELLY SUPPORT CENTER AND VALLEY GROVE MAINTENANCE ACTIVITY.

950712-2 (I, O)
Originated: 07/12/95 Received: 07/12/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 07/14/95 Closed: / / PENDING.
From: WATTS, J.C. (REP. (OK) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (F-PRJY), and KELLY AFB,TX (F-MBPB).
Contents: STATING AIR FORCE MUST ELIMINATE EXCESS CAPACITY AT KELLY AND MCCLELLAN BEFORE PRIVATIZATING WORK

950713-2 (I, O)
Originated: 07/12/95 Received: 07/13/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 07/17/95 Closed: 07/19/95 COMPLETE.
From: HANSEN, JAMES V. (REP. (UT) at U.S. CONGRESS), and WATTS, J.C. (REP. (OK) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (F-PRJY), and KELLY AFB,TX (F-MBPB).
Contents: EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER POSSIBILITY JOBS MAY BE PRIVATIZED AT MCCLELLAN AND KELLY

NOTE: 12 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Tinker AFB

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950523-3 (I, O)
Originated: 05/22/95 Received: 05/23/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/24/95 COMPLETE.
From: NICKLES, DON (SENATOR at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): TINKER AFB, OK (F-WWYK).
Contents: INVITING COMMISSIONERS TO EITHER LUNCH OR DINNER DURING THEIR VISIT TO TINKER.

950609-4 (O, O)
Originated: 06/09/95 Received: 06/09/95 Referred to: AIR FORCE Due: 06/16/95 Closed: 06/09/95 NONE REQ.
From: LYLES, DAVID (STAFF DIRECTOR at DBCRC).
To: EICKMANN, KENNETH (COMMANDER (MGEN) at TINKER AFB).
Installation(s): TINKER AFB, OK (F-WWYK).
Contents: THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP AT TINKER AFB.

950616-11 (I, O)
Originated: 06/15/95 Received: 06/16/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/16/95 NONE REQ.
From: STEELY, PHILLIP (DIR, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT at KELLY AFB).
To: OWSLEY, JAMES (CROSS SERVICE TEAM LEADER at DBCRC).
Installation(s): TINKER AFB, OK (F-WWYK).
Contents: DISCUSSING JET ENGINE TEST CELL CAPACITY FOR TINKER

950616-24 (I, O)
Originated: 06/16/95 Received: 06/16/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/20/95 Closed: 06/20/95 COMPLETE.
From: HUTCHISON, KAY BAILEY (SENATOR (TX) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KELLY AFB, TX (F-MBPB).
Contents: RESPONDING TO TINKER COMMUNITIES PRESENTATION AT DALLAS REGIONAL HEARING - LTG BURPEE

NOTE: 4 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Robins AFB

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950130-1 (I, O)
Originated: 01/26/95 Received: 01/30/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 02/01/95 Closed: 02/08/95 COMPLETE.
From: FALLS, SHARON (U.S. REP (CA) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): ROBINS AFB, GA (F-UHHZ).
Contents: IN SUPPORT OF ROBINS AFB.

950130-1R1 (O, R)
Originated: 02/06/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 02/08/95 COMPLETE.
From: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
To: FALLS, SHARON (U.S. REP (CA) at U.S. CONGRESS).
Installation(s): ROBINS AFB, GA (F-UHHZ).
Contents: RESPONSE TO SUPPORT LETTER CONCERNING ROBINS AFB.

950503-14 (I, O)
Originated: 04/28/95 Received: 05/03/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/11/95 COMPLETE.
From: VALDEZ, ARTHUR T. (PRESIDENT, LOCAL at PROF AND TECH ENGINEERS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (F-PRJY).
Contents: REQUESTING DBCRC TO ACCEPT THE MARCH 1 1995 TRC STUDY TO REALIGN PRECISION FLIGHT INSTRUMENT AND DISPLAY WORKLOADS T MCCLLELLAN AND WARNER ROBINS.

NOTE: 3 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

McClellan AFB

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

940906-2 (I, O)
Originated: 08/31/94 Received: 09/06/94 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 09/06/94 NONE REQ.
From: LEWIS, ROBERT L. (PRIVATE CITIZEN at SACRAMENTO, CA.).
To: , (at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (F-PRJY).
Contents: "ASPIN SAVED MCCLELLAN FROM FIRST ROUND; WAS A MISTAKE; ALTERNATE AIR FORCE BASES IN LESS CONGESTED PLACES SHOULD SERIOUSLY BE CONSIDERED".

950313-5 (O, O)
Originated: 03/10/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/13/95 COMPLETE.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: QUESTIONS CONCERNING FORT MCCLELLAN ALABAMA.

950313-5R1 (I, R)
Originated: 03/24/95 Received: 03/24/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/24/95 COMPLETE.
From: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
To: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS REGARDING FORT MCCLELLAN INCLUDED IN MARCH 10 LETTER.

950320-12R1 (O, R)
Originated: 03/29/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/29/95 COMPLETE.
From: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
To: DUNN, JAMES A. (CHAIRMAN at CALHOUN COUNTY COMMISSION).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: THANK YOU FOR FORWARDING INFORMATION CONERNING FORT MCCLELLAN.

950327-12 (O, O)
Originated: 03/21/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/27/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: REQUESTING INFORMATION CONCERNING THE AIR FORCE DISASTER PREPAREDNESS SCHOOL AT FORT MCCLELLAN.

950327-8 (I, O)
Originated: 03/24/95 Received: 03/27/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/27/95 NONE REQ.
From: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
To: REESE, ANN (CROSS SERVICE DOD ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): KELLY AFB, TX (F-MBPB), and MCCLELLAN AFB,CA (F-PRJY).
Contents: PROVIDING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR AF COBRA RUNS ON KELLY AND MCCLELLAN AFB'S. RESPONSE TO MARCH 16 REQUEST.

950330-12 (O, O)
Originated: 03/30/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/30/95 NONE REQ.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: QUESTIONS REGARDING SAVANNA ADA, FORT MCCLELLAN AND SENECA ADA.

NOTE: 28 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950330-14 (O, O)
Originated: / / Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/30/95 NONE REQ.
From: CREEDON, MADELYN R. (GENERAL COUNSEL at DBCRC).
To: SHORR, DAVID (DIRECTOR, STATE OF MO at DEPT OF NATURAL RESOURCES).
Installation(s): WOOD, FORT LEONARD, MO (A-29995), and MCCLELLAN, FORT,AL (A-01102).
Contents: QUESTIONS REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS OF MOVING FUNCTIONS OF FORT MCCLELLAN TO FORT LEONARD WOOD.

950331-2 (I, O)
Originated: 03/27/95 Received: 03/31/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/31/95 NONE REQ.
From: PHILLIPS, WALTON (COL. (RET) U.S. ARMY at CALHOUN COUNTY CHAMBER).
To: LYLES, DAVID (STAFF DIRECTOR at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: FORWARDING COPIES OF VIEWGRAPHS DURING DBCRC VISIT TO FORT MCCLELLAN.

950407-14 (O, O)
Originated: 04/07/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/07/95 NONE REQ.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102), and WOOD, FORT LEONARD,MO (A-29995).
Contents: QUESTION REGARDING FORT MCCLELLAN AND FORT LEONARD WOOD.

950419-17 (I, O)
Originated: 04/13/95 Received: 04/19/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 04/26/95 COMPLETE.
From: HEFLIN, HOWELL T. (SEN. (AL) at U.S. SENATE), and SHELBY, RICHARD (SEN. (AL.) at U.S. SENATE).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: REQUEST THAT THE COMMISSION REQUIRE THE ARMY TO PROVIDE ANSWERS TO INDICATED QUESTIONS CONCERNING PROPOSED CLOSURE O FT. MCCLELLAN.

950420-20 (O, O)
Originated: 04/20/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/20/95 NONE REQ.
From: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
To: HARRISON, JERRY (CHIEF OF LEG LIAISON at OFFICE OF SEC OF ARMY).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: FORWARDING LETTER FROM ALABAMA DELEGATION CONCERNING THE CHEMICAL DEFENSE TRAINING FACILITY BEING MOVED FROM FORT MCCLELLAN.

950425-6 (I, O)
Originated: 04/19/95 Received: 04/25/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 04/26/95 COMPLETE.
From: DETHRAGE, DAVID (MAYOR at CITY OF ANNISTON, AL).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR THE RETENTION OF THE CHEMICAL DEFENSE TRAINING FACILITY AT FORT MCCLELLAN.

950428-2 (I, O)
Originated: 04/27/95 Received: 04/28/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/28/95 NONE REQ.
From: BROWDER, GLEN (REP. (AL) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: LENHARDT, ALFONSO (COMMANDER at USA CHEMICAL AND MIL POL).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: REQUESTING INFORMATION REGARDING REQUESTS TO FORT MCCLELLAN FOR SUPPORT OR ASSISTANCE IN COMBATTING TERRORISM.

NOTE: 28 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950428-3 (I, O)
Originated: 04/27/95 Received: 04/28/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/28/95 NONE REQ.
From: BROWDER, GLEN (REP. (AL) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: PROCIV, THEODORE (DEP FOR CHEM/BIO MATTERS at OFFICE OF SEC OF DEFENSE).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: HOW DOES DOD PLAN TO ATTAIN AND MAINTAIN A FIELDED BIOLOGICAL DEF CAPABILITY IF FORT MCCLELLAN IS CLOSED.

950504-6 (O, O)
Originated: 05/04/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/04/95 COMPLETE.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: FORWARDING QUESTIONS REGARDING THE PROPOSED CLOSURE OF FORT MCCLELLAN.

950509-17 (I, O)
Originated: 05/08/95 Received: 05/09/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/09/95 NONE REQ.
From: GREILING, GEORGE (CHIEF, SPECIAL ACTION BRA at DEPT OF THE ARMY).
To: HEFLIN, HOWELL T. (SEN. (AL) at U.S. SENATE).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: LETTER REGARDING THE COST OF BUILDING A NEW CHEMICAL DEFENSE TRAINING FACILITY AT FORT LEONARD WOOD AND DISMANTLEING THE CURRENT ONE LOCATED AT FORT MCCLELLAN.

950516-4 (I, O)
Originated: 05/15/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/16/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: REQUESTING 2 COBRA RUNS:
1) CLOSURE OF MINNEAPOLIS ARS.
2) MODIFY RUN OF CLOSURE FOR MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD AND RELOCATION TO MCCLELLAN AFB.

950530-8 (O, O)
Originated: 05/30/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/30/95 COMPLETE.
From: BROWN, EDWARD (ARMY TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: JONES, MICHAEL G. (DIRECTOR at THE ARMY BASING STUDY).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: FORWARDING LETTER AND REQUESTING COMMENTS ON SPECIFYING LOCATIONS FOR RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING THAT WOULD BE DIVERTED FROM FORTS CHAFFEE, HUNTER LIGGETT, INDIANTOWN GAP, MCCLELLAN AND PICKETT AND COSTS AND SCHEDULING OF SUCH EFFORTS.

950607-18 (I, O)
Originated: 06/07/95 Received: 06/07/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/14/95 Closed: 06/15/95 COMPLETE.
From: VALDEZ, ARTHUR T. (PRESIDENT, LOCAL at PROF AND TECH ENGINEERS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (F-PRJY).
Contents: FORWARDING AF DECISION LETTER AWARDING INSTRUMENTS TO MCCLELLAN AFB AND DISCUSSING PROGRAM

950619-33 (I, O)
Originated: 06/19/95 Received: 06/19/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/22/95 Closed: 06/30/95 COMPLETE.
From: BROWDER, GLEN (REP. (AL) at U.S. CONGRESS), and HEFLIN, HOWELL T. (SEN. (AL) at U.S. SENATE).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102), and WOOD, FORT LEONARD,MO (A-29995).
Contents: STATING FINAL FOG OIL AIR PERMIT ISSUED TO FORT LEONARD WOOD IS RESTRICTIVE AND WILL NOT ALLOW ARMY TO USE CERTAIN

NOTE: 28 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

SUBSTANCES CURRENTLY BEING USED AT MCCLELLAN - MEMOS FROM ARMY REGARDING PERMIT INCLUDED

950619-7 (I, O)
Originated: 06/16/95 Received: 06/19/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/19/95 NONE REQ.
From: DICKINSON, ROGER (SUPERVISOR at SACRAMENTO).
To: NURRE, DEIRDRE (INTERAGENCY ENVIR. ANAL. at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (F-PRJY).
Contents: FORWARDING INFO REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP COSTS AT MCCLELLAN AFB

950620-15 (I, O)
Originated: 06/08/95 Received: 06/20/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/20/95 NONE REQ.
From: DUNN, JAMES A. (CHAIRMAN at CALHOUN COUNTY COMMISSION).
To: CLINTON, WILLIAM J. (PRESIDENT at UNITED STATES).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN, FORT, AL (A-01102).
Contents: EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER PROPOSED RELOCATION OF FORT MCCLELLAN TO FORT LEONARD WOOD

950620-62 (I, O)
Originated: 06/20/95 Received: 06/20/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/27/95 Closed: 06/21/95 NONE REQ.
From: WALKER, MIKE (ASST SEC OF THE ARMY at DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: IN SUPPORT OF FT. LEONARD WOOD; "CLOSING FT. MCCLELLAN MAKES TRAINING SENSE, ACHIEVES SUBSTANTIAL SAVINGS, AND IS TH RIGHT CHOICE FOR DOD AND THE NATION.

950626-8 (I, O)
Originated: 06/20/95 Received: 06/26/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 07/03/95 Closed: 06/30/95 COMPLETE.
From: JUDD, CASEY (PRESIDENT, LOCAL F-57 at MCCLELLAN AFB FIRE DEPT.).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (F-PRJY).
Contents: EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER HANDLING OF MCCLELLAN DURING HEARING

950705-1 (I, O)
Originated: 07/05/95 Received: 07/05/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 07/07/95 Closed: 07/07/95 COMPLETE.
From: SPECTER, ARLEN (SEN. (PA.) at U.S. SENATE).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): TOBYHANNA ARMY DEPOT, PA (A-42780), and MCCLELLAN AFB,CA (F-PRJY).
Contents: EXPRESSING CONCERN THAT DBCRC MAY BE CONSIDERING NOT TRANSFERRING WORK FROM MCCLELLAN TO TOBYHANNA

950712-2 (I, O)
Originated: 07/12/95 Received: 07/12/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 07/14/95 Closed: / / PENDING.
From: WATTS, J.C. (REP. (OK) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (F-PRJY), and KELLY AFB,TX (F-MBPB).
Contents: STATING AIR FORCE MUST ELIMINATE EXCESS CAPACITY AT KELLY AND MCCLELLAN BEFORE PRIVATIZATING WORK

950713-2 (I, O)
Originated: 07/12/95 Received: 07/13/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 07/17/95 Closed: 07/19/95 COMPLETE.
From: HANSEN, JAMES V. (REP. (UT) at U.S. CONGRESS), and WATTS, J.C. (REP. (OK) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): MCCLELLAN AFB, CA (F-PRJY), and KELLY AFB,TX (F-MBPB).
Contents: EXPRESSING CONCERN OVER POSSIBILITY JOBS MAY BE PRIVATIZED AT MCCLELLAN AND KELLY

NOTE: 28 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950302-7 (I, O)
Originated: 02/15/95 Received: 03/02/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/02/95 NONE REQ.
From: WALKER, MIKE (ASST SEC OF THE ARMY at DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY).
To: BOATRIGHT, JAMES F. (DEPASSTSEC at DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE).
Installation(s): , (-).
Contents: TRANSFER OF LAND AND BUILDINGS FROM DEPT OF AIRFORCE TO ARMY; BROOKS AFB, TEXAS.

950328-3 (I, O)
Originated: 03/23/95 Received: 03/28/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 03/28/95 NONE REQ.
From: TEJEDA, FRANK (REP. (TX) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: COX, REBECCA (COMMISSIONER at DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: THANK YOU FOR MEETING WITH HIM REGARDING BROOKS AFB.

950404-2 (O, O)
Originated: 04/03/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/04/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: REQUESTING THEY PROVIDE REVIEW OF COBRA RUN REGARDING BROOKS AFB.

950410-24 (O, O)
Originated: 04/10/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/10/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: REQUESTING THAT THEY PERFORM A COBRA RUN ON BROOKS AFB USING NEW ASSUMPTIONS.

950420-2 (O, O)
Originated: 04/20/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 04/20/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: ROBERSON, PAUL (PROJECT DIRECTOR at BRAC '95 TASK FORCE SA,TX).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: PLEASE PROVIDE DBCRC THE CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS THAT SUPPORTS YOUR CANTOMENT PROPOSAL FOR BROOKS.

950427-10 (I, O)
Originated: 04/26/95 Received: 04/27/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/03/95 COMPLETE.
From: CHEEVER, CHARLES E. (BRAC 95 CO-CHAIR at SAN ANTONIO BRAC 95), and VILLARREAL, JOSE (BRAC 95 CO-CHAIR at SAN ANTONIO B
To: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: DESCRIBING ALTERNATIVE PLAN FOR CLOSURE OF BROOKS AFB USING CANTONMENT AREA.

950501-3 (I, O)
Originated: 04/12/95 Received: 05/01/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/01/95 NONE REQ.
From: HICKMAN, JAMES R. (at).
To: DAVIS, GEN J.B. (COMMISSIONER at DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: EXPRESSING CONCERN THAT THE USAF SCHOOL OF AEROSPACE MEDICINE AND THE ARMSTRONG LAB ARE BEING MOVED FROM BROOKS.

NOTE: 18 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950504-3 (O, O)
Originated: 05/03/95 Received: / / Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 05/04/95 COMPLETE.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: REQUESTING COBRA RUNS FOR BROOKS AFB.

950510-19 (I, O)
Originated: 05/04/95 Received: 05/10/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 05/19/95 COMPLETE.
From: KRIER, CYNDI T. (COUNTY JUDGE at SAN ANTONIO, TX).
To: COX, REBECCA (COMMISSIONER at DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: FORWARDING ISSUE PAPER DEALING WITH INTERACTIONS BROOKS AFB HAS WITH LOCAL MILITARY INSTALLATIONS, SAN ANTONIO AND SOUTH TEXAS.

950530-16 (I, O)
Originated: 05/26/95 Received: 05/30/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: / / Closed: 06/05/95 COMPLETE.
From: PETERSON, PETE (REP. (FL) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): TYNDALL AFB, FL (F-XLWU), and BROOKS AFB,TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: FORWARDING INFORMATION SUPPORTING MOVE OF AF CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL EXCELLENCE FROM BROOKS AFB TO TYNDALL AFB.

950606-10 (I, O)
Originated: 06/05/95 Received: 06/06/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/08/95 Closed: 06/13/95 COMPLETE.
From: TEJEDA, FRANK (REP. (TX) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: PROVIDING COMMENTS ON HQ USAF/RT ANALYSES OF THE BROOKS CANTONMENT PROPOSAL. STATING AF/RT DEPARTED SUBSTANTIALLY FROM THE CANTONMENT PLAN PRESENTED TO COMMISSION.

950606-11 (I, O)
Originated: 06/06/95 Received: 06/06/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/08/95 Closed: 06/15/95 COMPLETE.
From: HALL, TONY P. (REP. (OH.) at U.S. CONGRESS).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: FORWARDING QUESTIONS FOR AIR FORCE REGARDING THE MILITARY VALUE OF THE BROOKS CONTONMENT PACKAGE.

950608-1 (I, O)
Originated: 06/01/95 Received: 06/08/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/15/95 Closed: 06/16/95 COMPLETE.
From: WHITE, TIMOTHY (PRESIDENT at AM COLLEGE OF SPORTS MED).
To: GENERAL, (at DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: OPPOSING MOVE OF AIR FORCE BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES FROM BROOKS TO WRIGHT-PATTERSON

950609-7 (O, O)
Originated: 06/09/95 Received: 06/09/95 Referred to: AIR FORCE Due: 06/16/95 Closed: 06/09/95 NONE REQ.
From: CIRILLO, FRANK (AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER at 1993 DBCRC).
To: BLUME, JAY (SPECIAL ASST TO SEC OF AF at HEADQUARTERS USA/RT).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: REQUEST MORE INFORMATION ON THE SITE SURVEY FOR THE BROOKS AFB RECOMMENDATION.

NOTE: 18 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Executive Correspondence Tracking System (ECTS)

950613-25 (I, O)
Originated: 06/09/95 Received: 06/13/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/13/95 NONE REQ.
From: ROBERSON, PAUL (PROJECT DIRECTOR at BRAC '95 TASK FORCE SA,TX).
To: FARRINGTON, LES (CROSS SERVICE GAO ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: RESPONSE TO CONG PETE PETERSON'S MAY 26 LETTER DISCUSSING BROOKS CONTONMENT PACKAGE

950613-28 (I, O)
Originated: 06/09/95 Received: 06/13/95 Referred to: LIAISON Due: 06/20/95 Closed: 06/16/95 COMPLETE.
From: KLEIN, SHEILA (EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at BROOKS HERITAGE FOUNDATIO).
To: DIXON, ALAN (CHAIRMAN at DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: REQUESTING DBCRC NOT CLOSE BROOKS BECAUSE IT IS A VERY IMPORTANT PART OF MILITARY HISTORY

950613-30 (I, O)
Originated: 06/11/95 Received: 06/13/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/13/95 NONE REQ.
From: KLEIN, HERBERT (PRIVATE CITIZEN at SAN ANTONIO, TX).
To: FARRINGTON, LES (CROSS SERVICE GAO ANALYST at DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC).
Contents: PROVIDING NEW COBRA RUN FOR BROOKS

950613-34 (I, O)
Originated: / / Received: 06/13/95 Referred to: Due: / / Closed: 06/13/95 NONE REQ.
From: GLENN, JOHN (SEN. (OH.) at U.S. SENATE).
To: LYLES, DAVID (STAFF DIRECTOR at DBCRC).
Installation(s): BROOKS AFB, TX (F-CNBC), and WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB,OH (F-ZHTV).
Contents: FORWARDING POINT PAPER FROM AIR FORCE STATING FACTS SUPPORT AF/DOD PROPOSAL TO CLOSE BROOKS AFB VERSUS THE COMMUNITY PROPOSAL TO CANTON BROOKS AFB

NOTE: 18 Records Selected by ACKERMAN, Criteria: .

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

MEMORANDUM

TO: R&A Staff

FROM: Ben Borden

DATE: 2-24-95

RE: R&A copier room

As most of you know, we will soon be using the R&A conference room for a variety of smaller meetings, including community meetings. Since the appearance of the Commission should always be foremost in our minds, we should all take a responsibility for the appearance of the R&A copier room.

Please be sure to discard all paper products in the recycling or trash bins. In addition, any empty cardboard boxes or other large materials can be placed outside the R&A doors for pick-up. Should you have any questions about the copier room or a specific question about the operation of a machine, please do not hesitate to ask Rob Kress. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
1700 NORTH MOORE STREET SUITE 1425
ARLINGTON, VA 22209
703-696-0504

February 6, 1995

MEMORANDUM TO COMMISSION STAFF

From: Staff Director

To: All Staff members

SUBJECT: Long Distance Phone Calls

As a reminder, personal phone calls during work hours should be kept to a minimum. Staff members making long distance personal phone calls must use personal telephone credit cards or call collect. The Office of the Secretary of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services requires that all long distance phone calls be verified for official use by checking our monthly phone bill against each office phone. This procedure will be enforced by the Director of Administration throughout the 1995 process.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

February 13, 1995

MEMORANDUM TO COMMISSION STAFF

From: David Lyles

Subj: **Standard Letter Procedures**

The following process will be followed for all outgoing correspondence:

1. Draft all letters using TT Times New Roman 12pt. Route all draft versions on non-letterhead paper in a manila folder. Paragraphs are indented and left justified.

2. The responsible office will coordinate, route, and track the letter from the initial draft to draft approval. The responsible office should coordinate a draft response with all action addressees using the ECTS routing slip if the letter is an ECTS response. For all other letters, the responsible office should fill out an attached routing sheet, clearly placing an "X" in the Action Addressee column next to the names of staff members who will coordinate the draft response. The names of additional action addressees may be pen and inked into the blank blocks.

3. Indicate the author and file name of the draft letter on the top of the appropriate routing sheet.

4. Following staff coordination, the responsible office will route the correspondence through the appropriate department heads for their input and recommendations. All edited versions of the draft letter should be available for department head information and discussion.

5. The letter is then routed to the Director of Administration. The Director of Administration is responsible for proof-reading and ensuring the continuity of all Commission correspondence.

6. The responsible office will then make all changes before bringing the draft letter back to the appropriate department head. The responsible office will then bring the letter to the Staff Director. Upon approval by the Staff Director, the responsible office will provide the approved draft to the Executive Secretariat who will prepare a letterhead version for signature. (All outgoing correspondence will be signed by the Staff Director or Chairman unless otherwise approved.) Once signed, the Executive Secretariat will ensure proper cataloguing and delivery.

7. Also attached is a sample of the proper format for all letter correspondence.

↓
↓
↓ **(5 RETURNS at 1.8")**
↓
↓

March 1, 1995 ↓ **(CENTER DATE)**

↓ **(3 RETURNS FROM DATE TO ADDRESS BLOCK)**
↓

The Honorable Robert E. Bayer
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations)
3300 Defense Pentagon, Room 3E813
Washington, D.C. 20301-3300 ↓
↓

Dear Mr. Bayer: ↓
↓

⇒ Thank you for your letter of February 26, 1995 requesting information of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. **(FOLLOWING WILL BE THE BODY OF THE LETTER.)**

⇒ **BODY OF LETTER SECOND PARAGRAPH.**

⇒ Should you need additional assistance in the future, please do not hesitate to contact me. ↓
↓

⇒ **(5 TABS)** Sincerely,↓
↓
↓ **(5 RETURNS)**
↓
↓

⇒ **(5 TABS)** Alan J. Dixon
Chairman

↓
↓
↓ **(3- 5 RETURNS)**

Campbell
ES# 950226-2 **(ETCS Accounting number supplied by Executive Secretariat)**

EXECUTIVE ROUTING SLIP

ORIGINATED BY: DATE:

FILE NAME:

	ACTION REQUIRED	INFORMATION	INITIAL	DATE
STAFF DIRECTOR				
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR				
GENERAL COUNSEL				
MILITARY EXECUTIVE				
DIRECTOR OF CONGRESSIONAL LIAS.				
DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS				
DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION				
DIRECTOR OF INFO. SYSTEMS				
DIRECTOR OF REVIEW AND ANALYSIS				
ARMY TEAM LEADER				
NAVY TEAM LEADER				
AIR FORCE TEAM LEADER				
INTERAGENCY TEAM LEADER				
CROSS SERVICE TEAM LEADER				

COMMENTS: