

## **BRAC 2005 Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC) Meeting Minutes of March 28, 2005**

The Deputy Secretary of Defense chaired this meeting. The list of attendees is attached.

After introductory remarks, the Deputy Secretary began the meeting with a discussion on the financial return of candidate recommendations. IEC members were asked how DoD could justify recommendations that end up being a net cost. Highlights of the discussion are:

- All candidate recommendations must enhance and support operational capabilities.
- Military value is the primary consideration. Recommendations should be analyzed individually and in the context of their broader strategy to assess their impact on military value.
- The Army, the Air Force Guard and Reserve initiatives, and the Army global posture should receive particular attention.
- There are two types of candidate recommendations that have net present value costs: 1) discrete pieces of a larger action that if viewed separately, have net present value costs, but when combined with related actions produce net present value savings; and 2) those that are not part of a larger set of actions that cost money in the final analysis.

The Deputy Secretary then asked Mr. Wynne, Acting Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L), to begin the briefing using the attached slides.

Mr. Wynne briefed Headquarters and Service Activities (H&SA) Candidate Recommendation 0029, which consolidates 25 Civilian Personnel Offices (CPO) into 10 regional CPOs. During the brief, some IEC members suggested that H&SA Candidate Recommendation 0031 be re-considered. This is a similar scenario with a service centric approach. [H&SA 0031 would consolidate 25 CPOs to 12 regional CPOs vice 10; however, its Net Present Value (NPV) savings are higher.] The IEC directed HSA to analyze and present HSA-0031 due to the higher NPV savings.

Mr. Wynne then briefed Intelligence (INT) Candidate Recommendation 0004, which consolidates all National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) functions on Fort Belvoir into the new facility at Engineer Proving Grounds (EPG), Fort Belvoir, Virginia. The accompanying discussion concerned whether the recommendation should specify the Engineering Proving Ground section of Fort Belvoir, or Fort Belvoir at large, leaving specific site selection to the implementation phase. The IEC agreed that the

recommendation should be modified to indicate Fort Belvoir at large rather than the Engineering Proving Ground.

Mr. Wynne proceeded to brief four Technical (TECH) Candidate Recommendations (TECH-0005, 0006, 0018 and 0042A) that would consolidate Research, Development, Acquisition, Testing and Evaluation (RDAT&E) functionally. These recommendations were tentatively approved by the IEC but should come back for review after revisions to incorporate modifications that would address issues raised by the Services. Next, Mr. Wynne briefed TECH-0042C (relocates C4ISR functions from several locations including Corona, California) and 9A (consolidates Air Force research labs, including Hanscom AFB). The IEC directed further analysis to respond to the concern about the resulting 60 percent population increase at Hanscom AFB and how that would affect costs. Mr. Wynne then briefed TECH-0020, which closes the Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) at Monterey and relocates all function to the Stennis Space Center in Mississippi. The Navy objected to this recommendation, stating that the costs of moving the NRL are understated. The IEC directed the Technical JCSG to revisit this candidate recommendation and consider leaving NRL at Monterey.

Lt Gen George Taylor, Chairman of the Medical JCSG, briefed the issue of closing the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USHHS) (MED 0030). The IEC tentatively approved this candidate recommendation.

Mr. Charles Abell, Chairman of the Education and Training (E&T) JCSG, briefed E&T 0046, which realigns several locations to consolidate Undergraduate Pilot, Rotary Wing and Navigator Training at certain bases. After the Air Force and the Marine Corps raised several issues, the IEC directed that this recommendation be returned to E&T for further analysis on the agreed upon elements.

Mr. Wynne concluded the meeting by reminding everyone that the next IEC meeting is scheduled for April 4, 2005. Military Departments are being asked to prepare their Secretary of Defense briefs and be ready to present their strategies, lay down, and likely results.

Approved:   
Michael W. Wynne  
Executive Secretary  
Infrastructure Executive Council

Attachments:

1. List of Attendees

2. Briefing slides entitled “Base Realignment and Closure 2005, Infrastructure Executive Council” dated March 28, 2005

**Infrastructure Executive Council Meeting  
March 28, 2005**

**Attendees**

**Members:**

- Mr. Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense
- Gen Michael Hagee, Commandant of the Marine Corps
- Mr. Michael W. Wynne, Acting Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L)
- GEN Peter. J. Schoomaker, Chief of Staff of the Army
- Gen John P. Jumper, Chief of Staff of the Air Force
- Hon Gordon R. England, Secretary of the Navy
- Mr. Michael L. Dominguez, Acting Secretary of the Air Force

**Alternates:**

- Gen Peter Pace, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff for Gen Richard B. Myers, Joint Chiefs of Staff
- ADM Robert F. Willard, Vice Chief of Naval Operations for ADM Vern Clark, Chief of Naval Operations
- Dr. Craig College, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Hon Francis J. Harvey, Secretary of the Army

**Others:**

- Hon William Haynes, DoD General Counsel
- Mr. Raymond DuBois, Director, Administration & Management
- Mr. Philip Grone, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment)
- Mr. Pete Potochney, Director, OSD BRAC
- Ms. Anne R. Davis, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy for BRAC
- Maj Gen Gary Heckman, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force
- Mr. Fred Pease, Deputy Under Secretary of the Air Force (B&IA)
- VADM Donald Arthur, Surgeon General for the Navy
- VADM Keith Lippert, Chairman, Supply and Storage JCSG
- Lt Gen George Taylor, Chairman, Medical JCSG
- BG Frank Helmick, Senior Military Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Defense
- Mrs. Nicole D. Bayert, Associate General Counsel, Environment and Installations
- Mr. Charles S. Abell, Chairman, Education and Training JCSG
- Dr. Ronald Sega, Chairman, Technical JCSG
- Ms. Carol Haave, Chairman, Intelligence JCSG
- Mr. Donald Tison, Chairman, Headquarters and Service Activities JCSG
- Mr. Dave Patterson, Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of Defense



---

# **BRAC 2005**

Briefing to the  
Infrastructure Executive Council

March 28, 2005





# Purpose

---

- Process Overview
- Candidate Recommendations Review
  - JCSG Candidate Recommendations
    - o Headquarters & Support (1)
    - o Intel (1)
    - o Technical (7)
    - o Medical (1)
    - o Education & Training (1)
  - Financial Summary
- Strategic Presence



# Process Overview





# Summary of Candidate Recommendations

---

- Total of 11 candidate recommendations (CR) presented for approval
- CRs IEC members previously identified for discussion
- No MilDep CRs identified
- IEC members raised issues with the following:
  - Consolidate Civilian Personnel Offices
  - Consolidate National Geospatial – Intelligence Agency
  - Joint Center for Rotary Wing RDAT&E
  - Joint Center for Fixed Wing RDAT&E
  - Joint Center for Weapons & Armaments RDAT&E
  - C4ISR RDAT&E Consolidation – Navy
  - C4ISR RDAT&E Consolidation – Air Force
  - Defense Research Service Led Laboratories – Air Force
  - Joint Weather Center at Stennis MS
  - Uniform Services University of Health Sciences (USUHS)
  - Consolidate Undergraduate Flight Trng (comparison)




---

# Headquarters & Support Activities JCSG



# Regional CPOs Transactional Services



**From 25 CPOs locations to 10**



# HSA-0029 – Consolidate CPOs Transactional Services

**Candidate Recommendation (summary):** Realign the CPOs of DLA, New Cumberland; DISA, Arlington; DLA, Columbus; DoDEA, Arlington; WHS, Arlington; DeCA, Arlington; Rock Island Arsenal; Fort Richardson; Wright-Patterson AFB; Robins AFB; Hill AFB; Tinker AFB; Bolling AFB; Pacific-Honolulu; Stennis; leased-facilities/installations by consolidating from **25 CPOs into 10** DoD regional civilian personnel offices at: DFAS, Indianapolis; Redstone Arsenal; Aberdeen Proving Ground; Ft. Riley; Ft. Huachuca; Randolph AFB; Silverdale; Portsmouth; Naval Station, San Diego; and Naval Support Activity, Mechanicsburg – Philadelphia.

<u>Justification</u>	<u>Military Value</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Creates single DoD entity for managing CPO transactional operations</li> <li>✓ Improves jointness by eliminating 15 CPOs and creating 10 joint DoD CPOs.</li> <li>✓ Eliminates excess capacity and leased space.</li> <li>✓ Enabling potential to close Rock Island Arsenal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Increases average military value for civilian personnel centers from .520 to .567.</li> </ul>
<u>Payback</u>	<u>Impacts</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ One Time Cost: \$102.4M</li> <li>✓ Net Implementation Cost: \$58.9M</li> <li>✓ Annual Recurring Savings: \$32.3M</li> <li>✓ Payback Period: 3 years</li> <li>✓ NPV (savings): \$250.0M</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Economic: -30 to -426 jobs; less than 0.1% to 0.2%.</li> <li>✓ Community: No significant issues.</li> <li>✓ Environmental: No impediments.</li> </ul>

- ✓ Strategy
- ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ✓ COBRA
- ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps



# Issues – Civilian Personnel Offices

---

- National Security Personnel System and BRAC execution - DoN



---

# Intelligence JCSG

Redacted



---

# Technical JCSG



# RDAT&E Consolidation

---

- Technical JCSG has several candidate recommendations that consolidate RDAT&E functionally
  - Tech - 0005 – Rotary Wing
  - Tech - 0006 – Fixed Wing
  - Tech - 0018 – Weapons and Armament
  - Tech – 0042A – C4ISR
- Navy has raised similar issues with each of these RDAT&E consolidations
  - Departing Lakehurst NJ
  - Keeping Corona CA functions together
- Following slides cover each of these candidate recommendations

Redacted




# TECH-0020 Joint Meteorology & Oceanography Center

**Consolidates all DoD Weather Modellers with operational command;  
enables Navy leaving Monterey**

- ❑ **Losing activities are:**
  - ❑ **Naval Postgraduate School (Monterey)**
  - ❑ **White Sands Missile Range**

★ **Gain (1)**  
■ **Lose (2)**





# Tech-0020 Joint Meteorology & Oceanography Center

**Candidate Recommendation:** Close the Naval Research Laboratory, Monterey Detachment Division, Monterey, CA. Relocate all functions to the Stennis Space Center, MS, and consolidate them with Naval Research Laboratory Detachment at Stennis Space Center, MS. Realign Army Research Laboratory, White Sands Missile Range, NM, by relocating the Battlespace Environments research, development and acquisition functions to Stennis Space Center, MS, and consolidate them with Naval Research Laboratory Detachment, Stennis Space Center, MS.

### Justification

- Enhances technical synergy in Meteorology & Oceanography RD&A
- Supports the Battlespace Environments Joint Functional Concepts (CJCSI 3170)

### Military Value

- Research: Stennis 2<sup>nd</sup> of 5; Monterey 3<sup>rd</sup> of 5; White Sands 5<sup>th</sup> of 5
- Development & Acquisition: Stennis 3<sup>rd</sup> of 3, Monterey 1<sup>st</sup> of 3
- Military judgment supported Stennis, not Monterey, because quantitative military value does not account for presence of Stennis NOAA National Ocean Center

### Payback

- One-time cost: \$12.7M
- Net implementation cost: \$10K
- Annual recurring savings: \$2.3M
- Payback time: 6 years
- NPV (savings): \$20.7M

### Impacts

- Criterion 6:
  - Las Cruces -114 jobs (56 direct, 58 indirect); 0.14%
  - Salinas -155 (76 direct, 79 indirect); <0.1%
- Criterion 7: No issues
- Criterion 8: No impediments



# Issues – Joint Weather Center

---

- Costs - DoN
- Movement of associated activity - DoN



# Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

28 Mar 2005



## Bottom Line

---

- USUHS and HPSP implemented in 1972 to address military provider shortfalls
- Maturity of HPSP and salary bonus program – enhanced opportunities to address provider recruitment and retention
- Military medical readiness training is mitigated by military residency programs
- MJCSG review of options: outsourcing USUHS is acceptable




## Why USUHS?

---

- Established in 1972 with HPSP program – limited alternatives available – Berry plan
- Intended to address physician recruiting shortfall and avoid physician draft
- Provide focused military medical readiness training



# Making ~1,000 Military Physicians Annually



\* Financial Assistance Program  
Year for Year payback

*Annual US Civilian Medical Training: 16,500 Med Students, 20,000 Residents*



# Costs to Train by Source

## Medical School


	Grade	Pay/Stipend	Cost/Yr	Commit
<b>USUHS</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> Lt (AD)	\$30-50K	\$190K	7 Yrs
Scholarship	2 <sup>nd</sup> Lt (IRR)	\$25K	\$50K	4 Yrs*

\* Extending to 5 years in 2006

## Residency/Fellowship



	Grade	Pay/Stipend	Cost/Yr	Commit
<b>Military</b>	Capt (AD)	\$37-55K	\$96K-\$114	1 for 1
<b>Civilian</b>	Capt (IRR)	\$0	\$0 (if deferred)	None

# Medical Officer Cost Per Years of Service (By Accession Source)





# USUHS Students vs Civilian Students



Data Sources  
 American Association of Medical Colleges  
 and USUHS Board of Governors Report,  
 2005

Roughly Comparable to Civilian Community



## MJCSG Recommendation Includes:

---

- Clinical workload - retains military manpower to maintain USUHS clinical contribution
- Increases Scholarship to cover additional students
- Maintains Central Continuing Medical Training capability
- Out-sources graduate training – small numbers
- Out-sources or moves research efforts to other military facilities



## Other Concerns:

---

- 10:1 USUHS (medical school applicants) applicant pool not comparable to 1:1 HPSP (already accepted to a medical school) pool
- Readiness training – 77% of providers attend military residency: equalizing readiness capabilities
- Seniority of providers – lower cost alternatives available: Academy graduates; more effective use of retention incentives



# Issues and Possible Mitigation Alternatives

---

- Recruitment of new physicians – increasing scholarship program by ~160 (18% increase)
  - Large pool: 16,000 new med students in US annually
  - Adjust stipends to recruitment environment
- Retention of physicians
  - More effective use of bonus program – link to retention goals
  - Change commitment times for scholarship programs
- Military Professionalism
  - Increase military component for Scholarship students (summer programs)
  - Increase quota from Service Academies for physicians
  - Increase military component in Military Residency programs
  - More specialized (eg: SOF) training in residencies and other post-grad training programs



## Alternative Source - Academies

---

- *USUHS*
- Costs: \$760K
- Obligation: 7 Years
- *Academy*
- Costs: \$566
  - Academy: \$316
  - Scholarship: \$250
- Obligation: 9 Years



# Candidate #MED-0030 USUHS

**Candidate Recommendation:** Close the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences (USUHS) at the National Naval Medical Center (NNMC) Bethesda, MD.

### Justification

- ✓ Reduces excess capacity
- ✓ USUHS 3 times more costly than scholarships.
- ✓ The civilian sector offers alternatives for educating military physicians.
- ✓ Redistributes military providers (faculty) to patient care and operational mission.

### Military Value

- ✓ Average military value major education and training activities of the MHS increases from 32.43 to 32.63 without USUHS while retaining the continuing education and Medical Training Network functions.

### Payback

- ✓ One Time Cost: \$39M
- ✓ Net Implementation Savings: \$34M
- ✓ Annual Recurring Savings: \$58M
- ✓ Payback Period: 1 year
- ✓ NPV (savings): \$575M

### Impacts

- ✓ Criteria 6: -3,561 jobs (1998 direct, 1563 indirect; 0.49%)
- ✓ Criteria 7: No issues
- ✓ Criteria 8: No impediments
- ✓ Other Risks:
  - ✓ Title 10 prohibits closure of USUHS
  - ✓ Expansion of scholarship program by ~161 students.

- ✓ Strategy
- ✓ COBRA

- ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification

- ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis

- ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps


# Candidate Recommendations



**Mr. Charles S. Abell**  
**Chair, E&T JCSG**

---

# E&T 0046: Consolidate Common UFT Functions



USAF Advanced Jet Pilot	★
Joint Primary Pilot	★
Joint Multi Eng Pilot	★
USN / USMC Advanced Jet Pilot	★
Joint CSO/NFO	★
Joint Helicopter Pilot	★
USAF PIT	★
"Uncovered"	★





# Candidate E&T-0046 Cooperative

**Candidate Recommendation (Summary):** Realign several locations to consolidate UPT at Columbus AFB, NAS Corpus Christi, NAS Kingsville, Laughlin AFB, NAS Meridian, Sheppard AFB, and Vance AFB; UNT at NAS Pensacola, and URT at Fort Rucker.

### Justification

- ✓ Establishes Undergraduate Flight Training baseline with Inter-Service Training Review Organization for all Phases of UPT, URT, & UNT
- ✓ Eliminates redundancy (Opportunity to reduce aircraft maintenance costs)
- ✓ Postures for joint acquisition of Services' undergraduate program replacement aircraft

### Military Value

- ✓ UPT:
  - Vance AFB 2<sup>nd</sup> of 11
  - Laughlin AFB 3<sup>rd</sup> of 11
  - NAS Meridian 4<sup>th</sup> of 11
  - NAS Kingsville 6<sup>th</sup> of 11
  - Columbus AFB 7<sup>th</sup> of 11
- ✓ URT: Ft. Rucker 1<sup>st</sup> of 2
- ✓ UNT: Pensacola 1<sup>st</sup> of 11

### Payback

- ✓ One-time cost \$399.83M
- ✓ Net Implementation cost \$199.375M
- ✓ Annual Recurring savings \$35.313M
- ✓ Payback Period 10 years
- ✓ NPV savings \$130.98M

### Impacts

- ✓ Reduces Excess Capacity: 52.9% to 28.85%
- ✓ Criteria 6: -340 to -3983 jobs; 0.23 to 2.79%
- ✓ Criteria 7: No Issues
- ✓ Criteria 8: No Impediments

- ✓ Strategy
- ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- ✓ JCSG/MilDep Rec'd
- ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ✓ COBRA
- ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDepts



# Air Force UFT Proposal

Realign Moody, Randolph, and Whiting to place USAF Primary UPT and Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals (IFF) at Columbus, Laughlin, Randolph, Sheppard and Vance; DoN Primary UPT at Corpus Christi, and Meridian; Advanced Striker/Fighter at Kingsville; consolidate USAF/USN UNT at NAS Pensacola; and consolidate USAF/USN/USA URT at Fort Rucker.

## Justification

- ✓ Establishes Undergraduate Flight Training baseline with Inter-Service Training Review Organization for Primary Phase of UPT, URT & UNT
- ✓ Reduces turbulence of transition by retaining Status Quo Alignment for DoD Undergraduate Pilot Training
- ✓ Fewer PCS Moves for USAF than E&TCR0046

## Military Value

- ✓ UPT:
  - Vance AFB 2<sup>nd</sup> of 11
  - Laughlin AFB 3<sup>rd</sup> of 11
  - NAS Meridian 4<sup>th</sup> of 11
  - NAS Kingsville 6<sup>th</sup> of 11
  - Columbus AFB 7<sup>th</sup> of 11
  - Randolph AFB 8<sup>th</sup> of 11
  - Sheppard AFB 9<sup>th</sup> of 11
  - NAS Corpus Christi 10<sup>th</sup> of 11
- ✓ URT: Ft. Rucker 1<sup>st</sup> of 2
- ✓ UNT: Pensacola 1<sup>st</sup> of 11

## Payback

- |                            |           |
|----------------------------|-----------|
| ✓ One-time cost            | \$248.88M |
| ✓ Net Implementation cost  | \$102.17M |
| ✓ Annual Recurring savings | \$17.94M  |
| ✓ Payback Period           | 13 years  |
| ✓ NPV savings              | \$63.45M  |

## Impacts

- ✓ Reduces Excess Capacity: 52.9% to 42.82%
- ✓ Criteria 6: -813 to -1709 jobs; 0.08% to 1.23%
- ✓ Criteria 7: No Impediments
- ✓ Criteria 8: No impediments



# AF UFT Proposal vs E&TCR0046, Cooperative

---

## Pros:

- Less disruptive to pilot production during implementation period
- Basing capacity sufficient for USAF laydown
- Reduces PCS moves for USAF students
- Less Expensive to Execute; lower one-time cost

## Wash:

- Opportunity for Joint Helo and Navigator/NFO training
- Realigns IFF
- Also uncovers NAS Whiting Field and Moody AFB

## Cons:

- No change in Joint Training for Primary and Multi-engine Pilots
- Meridian capacity insufficient to support force laydown
  - USN working alternate laydown (retain Whiting, vacate Corpus)
- Retains additional base for UFT (Randolph AFB)
- Still Increases PCS moves for USN students
- Less long-term Return on Investment



# Candidate Recommendations – Cost and Savings (\$M)


(As of 24 Mar 05)

	<b>One-Time (Costs)</b>	<b>Net Implementation Savings/(Costs)</b>	<b>Annual Recurring Savings/(Costs)</b>	<b>NPV Savings/(Costs)</b>
<b>Army BRAC</b>	(9,553.1)	(8,426.3)	332.5	(4,945.1)
Overseas	(348.5)	4,360.2	1,248.5	15,610.4
BRAC + Overseas	(9,901.6)	(4,066.0)	1,581.0	10,665.3
<b>Navy</b>	(1,304.9)	621.2	607.0	6,240.7
<b>Air Force</b>	(2,303.8)	(282.8)	747.4	6,660.2
<b>JCSGs</b>	(14,563.0)	(165.7)	3,881.5	35,878.1
E&T	(2,876.9)	(863.9)	524.3	3,992.7
H&SA	(3,005.1)	667.0	998.7	9,903.2
Industrial	(1,682.6)	2,573.6	1,002.5	11,710.0
Intelligence	(1,723.9)	(1,326.8)	154.3	272.6
Medical	(2,024.9)	(1,047.7)	322.7	2,014.4
S&S	(331.9)	1,169.7	382.1	4,636.3
Technical	(2,917.8)	(1,337.8)	497.0	3,348.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>(27,724.7)</b>	<b>(8,253.6)</b>	<b>5,568.4</b>	<b>43,833.9</b>
<b>Total W/Overseas</b>	<b>(28,073.3)</b>	<b>(3,893.4)</b>	<b>6,816.9</b>	<b>59,444.3</b>



# DoD Candidate Recommendations Costs/Savings Profile

(As of 24 Mar 05)





# Registered Closure Scenarios

Annotated to Indicate Withdrawals

(as of 25 Mar 05)

Army	Dept of the Navy	Air Force	JCSG Potential Closures
Ft Hamilton, NY	NS Pascagoula, MS ✓	Cannon AFB, NM ✓	Fort Huachuca, AZ
Selfridge Army Activities, MI ✓	NS Ingleside, TX ✓	Grand Forks AFB, ND ✓	<i>National NavMed Ctr Bethesda, MD</i>
Pueblo Chem Depot, CO ✓	NS Everett, WA	<del>Scott AFB, IL</del>	NAS Meridian, MS
Newport Chem Depot, IN ✓	<del>SUBASE San Diego, CA</del>	Ellsworth AFB, SD ✓	NAS Corpus Christi, TX
Umatilla Chem Depot, OR ✓	SUBASE New London, CT ✓	<del>Holloman AFB, NM</del>	NAES Lakehurst, NJ
Deseret Chem Depot, UT ✓	NAS Atlanta, GA ✓	Onizuka AFS, CA ✓	Presido of Monterey, CA
Ft Gillem, GA ✓	NAS JRB Fort Worth, TX	Los Angeles AFB, CA	<i>MCLB Albany, GA</i>
<del>Ft Shafter, HI</del>	NAS Brunswick, ME ✓	Moody AFB, GA	Brooks City Base, TX
Ft Monroe, VA ✓	<del>NAS Oceana, VA</del>	Pope AFB, NC ✓	
Ft McPherson, GA ✓	MCRD San Diego, CA	Rome Lab, NY ✓	
Watervliet Arsenal, NY	MCAS Beaufort, SC	Mesa AFRL, AZ ✓	
Rock Island Arsenal, IL	NAS JRB Willow Grove, PA ✓	ANG / Reserve Stations (22 sites)	
Detroit Arsenal, MI	CBC Gulfport, MS		
Sierra Army Depot, CA	NAS Whiting Field, FL		
Hawthorne Army Depot, NV ✓	MCSA Kansas, MO		
Louisiana AAP, LA	NSA New Orleans, LA		
Lone Star AAP, TX ✓	Naval Postgraduate School, CA ✓ 6		
Mississippi AAP, MS ✓	<del>NDW DC (Potomac Annex), DC</del>		
Kansas AAP, KS ✓	Navy Supply Corps School, GA ✓		
River Bank AAP, CA ✓	<del>NAV Shipyd Norfolk, VA</del>		
Carlisle Barracks, PA ✓	NAV Shipyd Portsmouth, ME ✓ 6		
Red River Army Depot, TX ✓	NSA Corona, CA		
Ft Monmouth, NJ ✓	NAS Point Mugu, CA		
Walter Reed, DC ✓ 6	<del>Arlington Service Center, VA</del>		
Soldier System Ctr Natick, MA ✓	NS Newport, RI		
NG / Reserve Centers (~ 483 sites)	MCLB Barstow, CA ✓ 6		
	NWSC Crane, IN		
	NSA Philadelphia, PA	NSWC Indian Head, MD	
	Reserve Centers (~ 40 sites)	NSWC Philadelphia, PA	


- Notes:
1. Yellow represents JCSG/MilDep cooperative effort.
  2. Italics represent options, only one of which would be recommended
  3. Strike through indicates deliberate decision to eliminate scenarios, or render it inactive
  4. Expect a significant number of realignments in addition to these closures
  5. ✓ indicates candidate recommendation submitted
  6. Awaits Service enabling scenario



# Shifts in Strategic Presence

(As of 24 Mar 05)

Candidate Recommendations Only (includes Guard and Reserve)






# Shifts in Strategic Presence

(As of 24 Mar 05)

## Guard/Reserve





# Next Steps

---

- Next IEC meeting – 4 Apr 05
- Continue to review and approve candidate recommendations