DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

DCN 3529

July 1, 2005

The Honorable Donald H. Rumsfeld
Secretary of Defense
1400 Defense Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-1000

Dear Secretary Rumsfeld:

As you are aware, before the Base Closure and Realignment Commission can even consider making a change in your recommendations that would add military installations for closure or realignment, or expand a realignment, we are required by Section 2914(d)(3) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended, to seek an explanation from you as to why such actions were not included on your May 13, 2005 list. A series of issues on installations on which we seek such explanation is enclosed. No deliberation will be made on whether to include any of these installations for further study of closure or realignment until the Commission's open hearing of July 19, 2005. Therefore, we would greatly appreciate receipt of your explanation no later than July 18th.

In addition, we invite you or your representative to elaborate on these explanations at a public hearing to be held in the Washington, D.C. area at 8:30 a.m. on July 18, 2005.

If, at the July 19 hearing, seven or more Commissioners support adding an installation to your list for consideration, at least two Commissioners will visit each of the installations added to your list and public hearings will be conducted regarding them. While this is a requirement of law, the Commission's view is that such public hearings are not only mandatory, but also highly desirable.

At the Commission's final deliberations during the week of August 22, the vote of at least seven Commissioners will be required to effect any change in your recommendations that would close or realign an installation that you did not recommend for such closure or realignment, or expand a realignment that you recommended.

Your assistance in complying with this stringent timetable will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Tony

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Enclosure

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret),The Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

1. MARINE CORPS RECRUIT DEPOT SAN DIEGO, CA

ISSUE:

- Why was Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD) San Diego, CA, not closed and consolidated with Marine Corps recruit training at MCRD Parris Island, SC?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- The Marine Corps operates two stand-alone recruit depots -- one on each coast. Consolidation of all recruit training to MCRD Parris Island generates training efficiencies, reduces excess capacity, and saves recurring costs due to fence-line closure of MCRD San Diego, and may generate offsetting revenues due to potential commercial development after a DoD property transfer. Consolidating recruit training at one location may theoretically increase operational risks; however, the Department of Navy and Air Force have successfully implemented similar transformational options experiencing little or no actual risk to recruit training while maintaining a surge capability. Military value of MCRD San Diego is lower than MCRD Parris Island partially due to encroachment and land constraints.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATIONS:

- None

---

2. NAVAL SHIPYARD PEARL HARBOR, HI

ISSUE:

- Why was the Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor, HI, not closed and the ship depot repair function realigned to Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA; Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, ME; and Naval Shipyard Puget Sound, WA?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- Four naval shipyards perform depot-level ship refueling, modernization, overhaul and repair work. There appears to be sufficient excess capacity in the aggregate across the four shipyards to close either Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor or Naval Shipyard Portsmouth. Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor is less efficient than Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, according to Department of Navy data and additional savings could be found from reduced unit costs at the receiving shipyards because of a higher volume of work. Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor has low military value compared to other shipyards according to DoD analysis supporting the recommendation to close Naval Shipyard Portsmouth.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATIONS:

- DON-23: Close Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, ME

---

3. NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK, ME

ISSUE:

- What considerations were given to a complete closure of Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME, and what were the driving factors in deciding on realignment?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- Closure would appear to reduce excess capacity, may save approximately four times more than DoD's realignment recommendation and could open land to State or community development to offset economic impact.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATIONS:

- DON-18: Realign Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME

---

4. NAVY BROADWAY COMPLEX, SAN DIEGO, CA

ISSUE:

- Why was the Navy Broadway Complex, San Diego, CA, not considered for closure and realignment of existing functions to Naval Station San Diego, CA?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- Consolidating Navy activities in a more secure location at the Naval Station complex at 32nd Street could improve security and allow for future commercial development.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATION:

- None

---

5. REALIGNMENT OF NAVAL MASTER JET BASE

ISSUE:

- What consideration was given to the realignment of the Master Jet Base located at NAS Oceana, VA, to Moody AFB, GA? Was movement of the assets assigned to Moody AFB, GA to Cannon AFB, NM, considered and if so, what were the driving considerations not to do so?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- Realigning the Master Jet Base at NAS Oceana, VA, to Moody AFB, GA, would appear to alleviate the severe encroachment which affects NAS Oceana training and operations as well as operations at the outlying field, Fentress OLF. Moody AFB, GA, would appear to have the necessary room for expansion and suffers less encroachment. Cannon AFB, NM, would appear to have ample space and facilities to accommodate any aircraft currently operating or planned for movement to Moody AFB, NM.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATION:

- AF-6: Realign Eielson AFB
- AF-32: Close Cannon AFB
- AF-35: Maintenance realignment from Shaw AFB
- E&T-14: Realignment of Undergraduate Pilot Training.

---

6. GALENA AIRPORT FORWARD OPERATING LOCATION (FOL), AK

ISSUE:

- Was any consideration given to merging the missions of Galena FOL, AK, and Eielson AFB, AK? Why does the United States need to maintain two FOLs in Alaska, given the current national security environment and 20-year threat assessment?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- Galena is one of two FOLs in Alaska that serve as alert bases for air intercept aircraft in support of North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) missions. The requirement for maintaining two FOLs in Alaska may no longer be valid. The mission could be accomplished by maintaining one FOL and two Air Force bases in Alaska.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATIONS:

- AF-6: Eielson AFB, AK; Moody AFB, GA; and Shaw AFB, GA
- AF-7: Kulis Air Guard Station, AK; and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK
- AF-18: Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID; Nellis Air Force Base, NV; and Elmendorf Air Force Base, AK
- AF-43: Ellsworth Air Force Base, SD; and Dyess Air Force Base, TX

---

7. POPE AIR FORCE BASE, NC

ISSUE:

- What considerations drove the recommendation to realign, rather close Pope AFB NC, under Fort Bragg, NC? Are the joint operational synergies that exist between the XVIII Airborne Corps and the 43rd Airlift Wing/23rd Fighter Group able to be replicated from other locations?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- DoD appears to have determined that much of the benefits of the collocation of the joint forces that will operate together (CAS aircraft, operational planning staffs) are outweighed by the ability to schedule support as necessary through third parties.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATIONS:

- USA-8: Fort Gillem, GA
- USA-8: Fort McPherson, GA
- AF-35: Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA; and Yeager Air Guard Station, WV
- H&SA-35: Create Joint Mobilization Sites

---

8. GRAND FORKS AIR FORCE BASE, ND

ISSUE:

- What considerations drove the recommendation to realign rather than close Grand Forks AFB, ND? What is the number of UAVs planned for assignment to Grand Forks AFB, ND, and what is the timing of the potential deployment?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- While there is no "emerging mission" programmed within the BRAC timeline (2006-2011), there are indications that the Air Force is considering assigning UAVs to Grand Forks AFB, ND.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATIONS:

- AF-37: Grand Forks Air Force Base, ND

---

9. AIR NATIONAL GUARD

ISSUE:

- Were the Adjutants General and Governors of the States consulted in the re-allocation of aircraft, personnel, facilities and missions from their states? What impact does the realignment of the ANG have on the homeland defense and homeland security missions?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- Many of the Air Force's recommendations address Air National Guard installations. While only four of these installations will completely close, many Guard installations will lose aircraft and personnel leaving only an "expeditionary combat support" unit remaining, with several states losing their entire flying missions. Many of these aircraft will relocate to other locations, which may negatively impact personnel recruiting and retention as well as State and Homeland Security missions.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDTION:

- Various

---

10. DEFENSE FINANCE ACCOUNTING SERVICE

- DFAS Buckley Annex, CO
- DFAS Columbus, OH
- DFAS Indianapolis, IN

ISSUE:

- Why were keeping DFAS Buckley Annex, CO, DFAS Columbus, OH, and DFAS Indianapolis, IN, open and closing the remaining DFAS sites the only scenario

considered? Why did DoD not consider other options, which could have avoided military construction costs and possibly produced a more cost effective option?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- Closing or realigning these installations may reduce operating and sustainment costs, balance mission and strategic redundancy requirements, eliminate excess capacity and avoid closing other DFAS installations that provide a lower locality pay and have an existing infrastructure for expansion without military construction or additional leasing.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATION:

- HSA-37: Defense Finance & Accounting Service

---

11. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION

- Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA
- Defense Language Institute Monterey, CA
- Air Force Institute of Technology Wright Patterson AFB, OH

ISSUE:

- What consideration was given to the closure or realignment of the Air Force Institute of Technology at Wright Patterson AFB, OH, and the Defense Language Institute at Monterey, CA, with Naval Postgraduate School at Monterey, CA, to create a consolidated professional development education center?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- Consolidating the Professional Development Education currently provided by the Air Force Institute of Technology, the Naval Postgraduate School, and the Army's Defense Language Institute would provide significant savings and efficiencies to the Department of Defense by (1) eliminating redundant support structure for advanced education, (2) reducing infrastructure; and (3) consolidating command and instructional staff.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATIONS:

- None

---

12. JOINT MEDICAL COMMAND HEADQUARTERS

- Navy Bureau of Medicine, Potomac Annex, DC
- Air Force Medical Command, Bolling AFB, DC
- TRICARE Management Authority, Leased Space, VA
- Office of the Army Surgeon General, Leased Space, VA

ISSUE:

- What consideration was given to establishing a Joint Medical Command Headquarters, through collocation of disparate Department of Defense Surgeons General, at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, MD?

ISSUE BACKGROUND:

- Such a consolidation could eliminate 166,000 square feet of leased space within the National Capitol Region and enable the closure of the Potomac Annex, DC. The National Naval Medical Center, MD, has a higher military value ranking than present locations. Establishing a Joint Medical Command Headquarters would take advantage of the transformation of legacy medical infrastructure proposed in recommendation MED-4, which establishes the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD.

ASSOCIATED DOD RECOMMENDATIONS:

- MED-4: Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD
- TECH-5: Co-locate Extramural Research Program Managers