

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

MEDIA RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
May 22, 1993
93-41

Contact: Tom Houston
Chris Cimko
(703) 696-0504

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission is studying 43 major U.S. military installations as possible alternatives to 43 others recommended for closure or realignment by the Secretary of Defense.

In a public hearing in Washington, D.C., on Friday, May 21, the Commission voted to add 69 major and smaller installations for further consideration as alternatives to the 165 recommended for closure and realignment by the Secretary. Four installations (McClellan Air Force Base, CA, Presidio of Monterey, CA, Great Lakes Naval Training Center, Ill., and Agana Naval Station, Guam) were added for further consideration when the Commission met in a public hearing on March 29.

The Commission will publish the names of the additional installations in the Federal Register by June 1 as required by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1991, as amended. The law also requires the Commission to transmit its final recommendations to the President by July 1.

"I want to emphasize that this is not a final list of closure and realignment recommendations," Commission Chairman Jim Courter said. "We won't take that kind of action until late June. We have simply added bases for further consideration, not because we have determined that we need to close more bases than the Secretary has recommended but because we want to make sure he has selected the right ones for closure and realignment.

"I also want to make it clear that our job is not to terrorize communities that may have breathed a sigh of relief in March when their installations did not appear on the Secretary's list. We are acutely aware of the pain and dislocation that communities fear when they face the closure or realignment of a military installation that is deeply rooted in their local economy.

"Our job as an independent Commission is to render a fair and informed judgement of the Secretary's recommendations. I don't think we can do that in some cases without making direct comparisons between bases that are on the Secretary's list and similar bases that are not on his list.

-more-

"I can't guarantee a final result for any installation that we have added for further study, but I can guarantee that we will be fair to those additional installations, just as we have been fair to those on the Secretary's list."

Courter said that at least one Commissioner will visit any major installation that has been added for further study, and representatives of communities surrounding those installations will be given an opportunity to testify in public hearings. A schedule of public hearings will be announced within the next few days.

Following is the complete list of military installations added on Friday, May 21, by the Commission for further review for closure, realignment, or to increase the extent of realignment recommended by the Secretary of Defense:

ARMY

Fort Gillem (GA)
Fort Lee (VA)
Marcus Hook U.S. Army Reserve Center (PA)
Fort McPherson (GA)
Fort Monroe (VA)
Presidio of Monterey Annex/Fort Ord (CA)
Red River Army Depot (TX)
Defense Distribution Depot, Red River (TX)
Anniston Army Depot (AL)
Defense Distribution Depot, Anniston (AL)
Tobyhanna Army Depot (PA)

NAVY

Naval Shipyard Norfolk (VA)
Defense Distribution Depot Norfolk (VA)
Naval Shipyard Portsmouth (ME/NH)
Naval Shipyard Long Beach (CA)
Naval Air Station Oceana (VA)
Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort (SC)
Naval Hospital Beaufort (SC)
Naval Air Station Miramar (CA)
Marine Corps Air Station Tustin (CA)
Naval Air Station Corpus Christi (TX)
Naval Hospital Corpus Christi (TX)
Naval Station Ingleside (TX)
Naval Station Pascagoula (MS)
Naval Station Everett (WA)

-more-

Naval Hospital Great Lakes (IL)
 Ships Parts Control Center Mechanicsburg (PA)
 Naval Electronics Support Engineering Center Portsmouth (VA)
 Naval Air Facility Martinsburg (WV)
 Naval Air Facility Johnstown (PA)
 Naval Reserve Center Chicopee (MA)
 Naval Reserve Center Quincy (MA)
 Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center Lawrence (MA)
 Naval Ordnance Station Louisville (KY) (also known as the
 Naval Surface Warfare Center Louisville)
 Naval Air Station Memphis (TN) (Consider to close instead of realign)
 Naval Hospital Millington (TN)
 Naval Aviation Depot North Island (CA)
 Defense Distribution Depot San Diego (CA)
 Naval Aviation Depot Cherry Point (NC)
 Defense Distribution Depot Cherry Point (NC)
 Naval Aviation Depot Jacksonville (FL)
 Defense Distribution Depot Jacksonville (FL)
 Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach (CA)
 Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany (GA)
 Defense Distribution Depot Albany (GA)
 Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow (CA)
 Defense Distribution Depot Barstow (CA)

AIR FORCE

Plattsburgh Air Force Base (NY)
 Fairchild Air Force Base (WA)
 Grand Forks Air Force Base (ND)
 Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center (Tinker Air Force Base)(OK)
 Regional Processing Center Tinker Air Force Base (OK)
 (Defense Information Systems Agency)
 Defense Distribution Depot Oklahoma City (OK)

Warner Robins Air Logistics Center, Warner Robins (GA)
 Regional Processing Center Warner Robins (GA)
 (Defense Information Systems Agency) (also known as Logistics Systems Business
 Activity - Information Processing Center)
 Defense Distribution Depot Warner Robins
 San Antonio Air Logistics Center, Kelly Air Force Base (TX)

-more-

Regional Processing Center Kelly Air Force Base (TX)
(Defense Information Systems Agency) (also known as Logistics Systems Business
Activity - Information Processing Center)
Defense Distribution Depot San Antonio (TX)
Defense Distribution Center McClellan Air Force Base (CA)
Gentile Air Force Station (OH)
Ogden Air Logistics Center, Hill Air Force Base (UT)
(Tactical Missile Workload)

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Construction Supply Center Columbus (OH)
Defense Information Technology Services Organization Columbus (OH)
Defense Contract Management District Northeast (MA)

DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY

Defense Information Technology Services Organization Denver (CO)
(Resource Management Business Activity Denver)
Defense Information Technology Services Organization Cleveland (OH)
(Resource Management Business Activity Cleveland)

Army Information Processing Center Chambersburg (PA)
(Multi-Function Information Processing Activity Chambersburg)
Army Information Processing Center Huntsville (AL)
(Multi-Function Information Processing Activity Huntsville)

###

Document Separator



NEWS RELEASE

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

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

March 12, 1993

No. 101-93
(703) 695-0192 (info)
(703) 697-3189 (copies)
(703) 697-5737 (public/industry)

Aspin Forwards Recommendations to Base Closure Commission

Secretary of Defense Les Aspin today recommended that 31 major military installations be closed and that 12 others be realigned to support a smaller and less costly force structure. In addition, the Secretary announced recommendations for closure, realignment and disestablishment of 122 other smaller bases and activities. As required by law, the recommendations for actions on these domestic bases and activities are being forwarded today to the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Aspin said base closures have not kept pace with overall reductions in defense. The Defense budget will decline by more than 40 percent in real terms from 1985 to 1997, and military personnel in the United States will be reduced by about 30 percent. Base closures agreed to in 1988 and 1991 will reduce the domestic base structure by nine percent. The Department must further reduce the domestic and overseas base structures to align them with the force and budget reductions, thereby preserving military effectiveness and the capability to respond to crises.

Closing bases saves taxpayer dollars. This round of base closures and realignments will save about \$3.1 billion per year starting in the year 2000. The 1993 program, coupled with the previously approved 1988 and 1991 closures, will result in savings of \$5.6 billion annually.

"Failure to close bases in line with reductions in budgets and personnel constitutes a double hit: resources are drained into bases we don't need, and therefore are not available to buy the things we do need," Aspin said.

During the six-year implementation period, these actions will reduce DoD employment by 24,000 military and 57,000 civilians nationwide.

(more)

"These base closures are necessary, but they will hurt local economies. The Administration recognizes its responsibilities for parallel efforts to stimulate economic growth in the affected communities," Aspin said. These efforts will build on the three ways DoD can help support economic growth: investing in people, investing in industry and investing in communities. The President announced yesterday the details of how the Department will use funds previously authorized and appropriated by Congress for reinvestment.

Secretary Aspin directed that the consolidation of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) continue at the five existing large centers for the time being. Secretary Aspin rejected the plan for consolidating the DFAS workforce based on a site selection process known as the "opportunity for economic growth." The "opportunity for economic growth" policy offered DoD jobs only to those communities willing to make the highest bids in return for those jobs. In effect, the "opportunity for economic growth" policy proposed transferring from the federal government to local taxpayers the burden of financing facilities used by the DoD.

The DFAS centers are currently located in Cleveland, Columbus, Indianapolis, Denver and Kansas City. The Secretary will review options for the permanent consolidation of DFAS and make a final decision in the next months.

The Department is reducing its military forces and bases overseas much more than it is in the U.S. and under a different process. DoD has announced it will end or reduce its operations overseas at sites accounting for 28 percent of replacement value. The plan is to reduce the overseas base structure by 35-40 percent while drawing personnel stationed overseas to about 200,000, or a reduction of 56 percent from 1985 levels.

The following pages contain lists of major closures; major realignments; smaller base or activity closures, realignments, disestablishments, or relocations; and changes to previously approved 1988 and 1991 Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommendations. A chart of impacts by state is also attached.

-END-

1993 List of Military Installations
Inside the United States
for Closure or Realignment

Part I: Major Base Closures

Army

Ft McClellan, Alabama
Vint Hill Farms, Virginia

Navy

Naval Station Mobile, Alabama
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California
Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, California
Naval Air Station Alameda, California
Naval Aviation Depot Alameda, California
Naval Hospital Oakland, California
Naval Station Treasure Island, San Francisco, California
Naval Supply Center Oakland, California
Naval Training Center San Diego, California
Naval Air Station Cecil Field, Florida
Naval Aviation Depot Pensacola, Florida
Naval Training Center Orlando, Florida
Naval Air Station Barbers Point, Hawaii
Naval Air Station Glenview, Illinois
Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, St. Inigoes,
Maryland
Naval Air Station Meridian, Mississippi
Naval Air Station South Weymouth, Massachusetts
Naval Station Staten Island, New York
Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Charleston Naval Shipyard, South Carolina
Naval Station Charleston, South Carolina
Naval Air Station Dallas, Texas
Naval Aviation Depot Norfolk, Virginia

Air Force

Homestead Air Force Base, Florida
K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan
Newark Air Force Base, Ohio
O'Hare Int'l. Airport Air Force Reserve Station, Chicago Illinois

Defense Logistics Agency

Defense Electronics Supply Center, Dayton, Ohio
Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Part II: Major Base Realignment

Army

Ft Monmouth, New Jersey
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania
Tooele Army Depot, Utah
Ft Belvoir, Virginia

Navy

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut
Naval Surface Warfare Center (Dahlgren) White Oak Detachment,
White Oak, Maryland
1st Marine Corps District, Garden City, New York
Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island
Naval Air Station Memphis, Tennessee

Air Force

March Air Force Base, California
McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey
Griffiss Air Force Base, New York

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

Army

None

Navy

Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Port Hueneme, California
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Western Engineering Field
Division, San Bruno, California
Planning, Estimating, Repair and Alterations (Surface) Pacific,
San Francisco, California
Public Works Center San Francisco, California
Naval Electronic Security Sys. Engineering Ctr., Washington, D.C.
Naval Hospital Orlando, Florida
Naval Supply Center Pensacola, Florida
Naval Surface Warfare Center - Carderock, Annapolis Detachment,
Annapolis, Maryland
Navy Radio Transmission Facility, Annapolis, Maryland
Sea Automated Data Systems Activity, Indian Head, Maryland
Naval Air Facility Detroit, Michigan
Naval Air Facility, Midway Island

Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning and Procurement,
Portsmouth, New Hampshire
Naval Air Warfare Center - Aircraft Division, Trenton, New Jersey
DoD Family Housing Office, Niagara Falls, New York
Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania
Planning, Estimating, Repair and Alterations (Surface) Atlantic
(HQ), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Charleston, South
Carolina
Naval Hospital Charleston, South Carolina
Naval Supply Center Charleston, South Carolina
Naval Surface Warfare Center - Port Hueneme, Virginia Beach
Detachment, Virginia Beach, Virginia
Navy Radio Transmission Facility, Driver, Virginia
Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Norfolk Detachment, Norfolk,
Virginia
Planning, Estimating, Repair and Alterations (Surface) Atlantic,
Norfolk, Virginia
Planning, Estimating, Repair and Alterations (CV), Bremerton,
Washington

Navy National Capital Region (NCR) Activities

Security Group Command, Security Group Station, and Security
Group Detachment, Potomac, Washington, DC
Bureau of Navy Personnel, Arlington, Virginia (including
the Office of Military Manpower Management, Arlington,
Virginia)
Naval Air Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Alexandria, Virginia
Naval Sea Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia
Naval Supply Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia (including
Defense Printing Office, Alexandria, Virginia and Food
Systems Office, Arlington, Virginia
Naval Recruiting Command, Arlington, Virginia
Tactical Support Office, Arlington, Virginia

Navy/Marine Reserve Activities

Naval Reserve Centers at:

Gadsden, Alabama
Montgomery, Alabama
Fayetteville, Arkansas
Fort Smith, Arkansas
Pacific Grove, California
Macon, Georgia
Terre Haute, Indiana
Hutchinson, Kansas
Monroe, Louisiana
New Bedford, Massachusetts

Pittsfield, Massachusetts
Joplin, Missouri
St. Joseph, Missouri
Great Falls, Montana
Missoula, Montana
Atlantic City, New Jersey
Perth Amboy, New Jersey
Jamestown, New York
Poughkeepsie, New York
Altoona, Pennsylvania
Kingsport, Tennessee
Memphis, Tennessee
Ogden, Utah
Staunton, Virginia
Parkersburg, West Virginia

Naval Reserve Facilities at:

Alexandria, Louisiana
Midland, Texas

Navy/Marine Corps Reserve Centers at:

Fort Wayne, Indiana
Billings, Montana
Abilene, Texas

Readiness Command Regions at:

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

Defense Logistics Agency

Defense Distribution Depot Oakland, California
Defense Distribution Depot Pensacola, Florida
Defense Contract Management District Northcentral, Chicago,
Illinois
Defense Logistics Service Center, Battle Creek, Michigan
Defense Contract Management District Midatlantic, Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania
Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny, Pennsylvania
Defense Logistics Agency Clothing Factory, Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania
Defense Distribution Depot Charleston, South Carolina
Defense Distribution Depot Tooele, Utah
Defense Contract Management District West, El Segundo, California
Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service, Battle Creek,
Michigan
Defense Industrial Supply Center, Pennsylvania

DoD Data Center Consolidation

Army Data Processing Centers

None

Navy Data Processing Centers

Facilities Systems Office, Port Hueneme, California
Fleet Industrial Support Center, San Diego, California
Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, China Lake,
California
Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, Point Mugu,
California
Naval Command Control & Ocean Surveillance Center, San Diego,
California
Navy Regional Data Automation Center, San Francisco, California
Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, San Diego,
California
Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, DC
Naval Computer & Telecommunications Station, Washington, DC
Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida
Naval Air Station, Mayport, Florida
Naval Computer and Telecommunication Station Pensacola, Florida
Trident Refit Facility, Kings Bay, Georgia
Naval Computer & Telecommunications Area Master Station, EASTPAC
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii
Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii
Enlisted Personnel Management Center, New Orleans, Louisiana
Naval Computer & Telecommunications Station, New Orleans,
Louisiana
Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine
Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Patuxent River,
Maryland
Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina
Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia
Naval Computer & Telecommunications Area Master Station,
Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia
Navy Data Automation Facility, Corpus Christi, Texas
Navy Recruiting Command, Arlington, Virginia
Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia
Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington
Naval Supply Center, Puget Sound, Washington
Trident Refit Facility, Bangor, Washington

Marine Corps Data Processing Centers

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California
Regional Automated Services Center, Camp Pendleton, California
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina
Regional Automated Services Center, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

Air Force Data Processing Centers

Regional Processing Center, McClellan AFB, California
Air Force Military Personnel Center, Randolph AFB, Texas
Computer Service Center, San Antonio, Texas
7th Communications Group, Pentagon, Arlington, Virginia

Defense Logistics Agency Data Processing Centers

Information Processing Center, Battle Creek, Michigan
Information Processing Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Information Processing Center, Ogden, Utah
Information Processing Center, Richmond, Virginia.

Defense Information Systems Agency Data Processing Centers

Defense Information Technology Service Organization, Indianapolis
Information Processing Center, Indiana
Defense Information Technology Service Organization, Kansas City
Information Processing Center, Kansas
Defense Information Technology Service Organization, Columbus
Annex (Dayton), Ohio

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes BOS contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Out		In		Net Gain/(Loss)		
		Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	
Alabama								
Anniston Army Depot	Receive	0	0	30	567	30	567	
Ft. McClellan	Close	6,017	2,074	981	0	(6,017)	(2,074)	
Ft. Rucker	Receive	0	0	41	0	41	0	
Redstone Arsenal	Redirect	0	1,245	0	0	0	(1,245)	
Defense Depot Anniston	Receive	0	0	0	166	0	166	
RPC Gunter Annex (DISA)	Receive	0	0	0	71	0	71	
Naval Station Mobile	Close	524	126	0	0	(524)	(126)	
NRC Gadsden	Close	6	0	0	0	(6)	0	
NRC Huntsville	Receive	0	0	3	0	3	0	
NRC Montgomery	Close	12	1	0	0	(12)	(1)	
	Total	6,559	3,446	74	804	(6,485)	(2,642)	
Arkansas								
NRC Fayetteville	Close	7	0	0	0	(7)	0	
NRC Ft. Smith	Close	7	0	0	0	(7)	0	
	Total	14	0	0	0	(14)	0	
California								
Defense Contract Mgmt District West	Receive	0	0	0	136	0	136	
Defense Depot Barstow	Receive	0	0	1	35	1	35	
Defense Depot Oakland	Disestablish	4	270	0	0	(4)	(270)	
Defense Depot San Diego	Receive	0	0	1	55	1	55	
Defense Depot Tracy	Receive	0	0	1	95	1	95	
NARDAC San Francisco (DISA)	Disestablish	10	70	0	0	(10)	(70)	
NAWC WD China Lake (DISA)	Disestablish	0	21	0	0	0	(21)	
FASCO Port Hueneme (DISA)	Disestablish	0	51	0	0	0	(51)	
MCAS El Toro (DISA)	Disestablish	13	9	0	0	(13)	(9)	
NAWC WD Point Mugu (DISA)	Disestablish	0	28	0	0	0	(28)	
RPC McClellan AFB (DISA)	Disestablish	0	169	0	0	0	(169)	
NCCOSC San Diego (DISA)	Disestablish	0	7	0	0	0	(7)	
NCTS San Diego (DISA)	Disestablish	0	170	0	0	0	(170)	
RASC Camp Pendleton (DISA)	Disestablish	46	4	0	0	(46)	(4)	
NSC San Diego (DISA)	Disestablish	0	71	0	0	0	(71)	
Beale AFB (940th AFRS)	Receive	0	0	0	243	0	243	
March AFB	Realign	2,961	997	0	0	(2,961)	(997)	
McClellan AFB (940th AFRS)	Redirect	0	243	0	0	0	(243)	
Travis AFB	Receive	0	0	1,077	59	1,077	59	
Marine Island Naval Shipyard	Close	1,963	7,567	0	0	(1,963)	(7,567)	
MCAS Camp Pendleton	Receive	0	0	949	0	949	0	
MCAS El Toro	Close	5,689	979	0	0	(5,689)	(979)	
MCAS 29 Palms	Redirect	3,225	0	0	0	(3,225)	0	
Naval Air Station Alameda	Close	10,586	556	0	0	(10,586)	(556)	
Naval Air Station Lemoore	Receive	0	0	4,629	317	4,629	317	
Naval Air Station Miramar	Receive	7,600	1,005	9,329	751	1,729	(254)	
NASA AMES (NAS Moffett)	Receive	0	0	348	105	348	105	
Naval Air Station North Island	Receive	0	0	3,982	47	3,982	47	
Naval Air Warfare Center China Lake	Receive	0	0	65	202	65	202	
Naval Amphibious Base Coronado	Receive	0	0	48	0	48	0	

These figures represent the impact of BRAC 93 recommendations only. They do not include the impact of any other initiative outside of the BRAC 93 process

(1)

3/11/93

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes BOS contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Out		In		Net Gain/(Loss)	
		Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
Naval CB Ctr. Pt. Huene	Receive	0	0	77	52	77	52
Naval Civil Engineering Lab	Close	1	64	0	0	(1)	(64)
Naval Public Works Ctr San Francisco	Disestablish	10	1,834	0	0	(10)	(1,834)
Naval Air Facility El Centro	Receive	0	0	6	0	6	0
Naval Aviation Depot Alameda	Close	376	2,672	0	0	(376)	(2,672)
Naval Aviation Depot North Island	Receive	0	0	3	1,889	3	1,889
Naval Hospital Oakland	Close	1,472	809	0	0	(1,472)	(809)
Naval Hospital San Diego	Receive	0	0	622	59	622	59
Naval Station San Diego	Receive	0	0	4,423	111	4,423	111
Naval Station Treasure Island	Close	637	454	0	0	(637)	(454)
Naval Supply Center Oakland	Close	2,374	948	0	0	(2,374)	(948)
Naval Supply Center San Diego	Receive	0	0	17	5	17	5
Naval Training Center San Diego	Close	5,186	402	0	0	(5,186)	(402)
Naval Reserve Center Fresno	Receive	0	0	28	0	28	0
Naval Reserve Center Pacific Grove	Close	6	1	0	0	(6)	(1)
SUPSHIP San Diego	Receive	0	0	0	77	0	77
WESNAVFACENGCOM San Bruno	Realign	7	24	0	0	(7)	(24)
Total		42,166	19,425	25,606	4,238	(16,560)	(15,187)
Colorado							
DITSO Denver (DISA)	Disestablish	25	41	0	0	(25)	(41)
Fort Carson	Redirect	238	105	0	0	(238)	(105)
Total		238	105	0	0	(263)	(146)
Connecticut							
Naval Sub Base New London	Realign	4,655	1,114	3,542	0	(1,113)	(1,114)
Total		4,655	1,114	3,542	0	(1,113)	(1,114)
District of Columbia							
NCTS Washington (DISA)	Disestablish	20	301	0	0	(20)	(301)
Naval Security Station Washington	Realign	510	636	0	0	(510)	(636)
Misc Naval Activities National Capital Reg.	Realign	231	275	36	485	(195)	210
Total		761	1,212	36	485	(725)	(727)
Florida							
Defense Depot Jacksonville	Receive	0	0	3	256	3	256
Defense Depot Pensacola	Disestablish	3	87	0	0	(3)	(87)
NCTS Jacksonville (DISA)	Receive	0	0	0	18	0	18
NAS Key West (DISA)	Disestablish	0	4	0	0	0	(4)
NCTS Pensacola (DISA)	Disestablish	0	184	0	0	0	(184)
Homestead AFB	Close	3,865	912	0	0	(3,865)	(912)
MacDill AFB (JCSE)	Receive	0	0	253	362	253	362
Patrick AFB	Receive	0	0	0	156	0	156
Tyndall AFB	Receive	0	0	76	8	76	8
Naval Air Station Cecil Field	Close	6,833	995	0	0	(6,833)	(995)
Naval Air Station Jacksonville	Receive	0	0	152	77	152	77
Naval Air Station Pensacola	Receive	19	150	8,926	670	8,907	520
Naval Aviation Depot Jacksonville	Receive	0	0	204	1,683	204	1,683
Naval Aviation Depot Pensacola	Close	297	3,107	0	0	(297)	(3,107)

These figures represent the impact of BRAC 93 recommendations only. They do not include the impact of any other initiative outside of the BRAC 93 process

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes BOS contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Out		In		Net Gain/(Loss)	
		Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
Naval Hospital Jacksonville	Receive	0	0	92	12	92	12
Naval Hospital Orlando	Close	759	352	0	0	(759)	(352)
Naval Station Mayport	Receive	0	0	2,138	8	2,138	8
Naval Training Center Orlando	Close	8,727	753	0	0	(8,727)	(753)
Naval Supply Center Jacksonville	Receive	0	0	0	23	0	23
NSWC Panama City	Receive	0	0	7	300	7	300
	Total	20,503	6,544	11,851	3,573	(8,652)	(2,971)
Georgia							
TRF Kings Bay (DISA)	Disestablish	0	17	0	0	0	(17)
RPC Warner-Robins AFB (DISA)	Disestablish	72	27	0	0	(72)	(27)
Defense Contract Mgt District South	Receive	0	0	0	61	0	61
Naval Air Station Atlanta	Receive	0	0	183	0	183	0
Naval Sub Base Kings Bay	Receive	0	0	4,754	47	4,754	47
Naval Reserve Center Macon	Close	7	0	0	0	(7)	0
SWFLANT Kings Bay	Receive	0	0	0	3	0	3
	Total	7	0	4,937	111	4,858	67
Hawaii							
NCTAMS Pearl Harbor (DISA)	Disestablish	3	28	0	0	(3)	(28)
NSC Pearl Harbor (DISA)	Disestablish	0	13	0	0	0	(13)
MCAS Kaneohe Bay	Receive	1,681	788	2,648	280	967	(508)
Naval Air Station Barbers Point	Close	3,534	618	0	0	(3,534)	(618)
Naval Station Pearl Harbor	Receive	0	0	3	0	3	0
Naval Sub Base Pearl Harbor	Receive	0	0	147	5	147	5
	Total	5,215	1,406	2,798	285	(2,420)	(1,162)
Illinois							
Rock Island Arsenal	Receive	0	0	272	1,382 ²⁶²⁷	272	1,382
Rock Island Arsenal	Redirect	15	362	0	1,245	(15)	883
Defense Contract Mgt Dist North-Central	Disestablish	6	266	0	0	(6)	(266)
O'Hare IAP ARS	Close	5	757	0	0	(5)	(757)
Rockford (or other location)	Receive	0	0	5	757	5	757
Naval Air Station Glenview	Close	1,833	389	0	0	(1,833)	(389)
Naval Hospital Great Lakes	Receive	0	0	632	58	632	58
Naval Training Center Great Lakes	Receive	0	0	8,077	251	8,077	251
	Total	1,859	1,774	8,986	3,693	7,127	1,919
Indiana							
DITSO Indianapolis IPC (DISA)	Disestablish	1	197	0	0	(1)	(197)
NMCRG Evansville	Receive	0	0	3	0	3	0
NMCRG Gary	Receive	0	0	10	0	10	0
NMCRG South Bend	Receive	0	0	3	0	3	0
NRC Fort Wayne	Close	17	0	0	0	(17)	0
NRC Terre Haute	Close	7	0	0	0	(7)	0
	Total	24	0	16	0	(9)	(197)

These figures represent the impact of BRAC 93 recommendations only. They do not include the impact of any other initiative outside of the BRAC 93 process

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes BOS contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Out		In		Net Gain/(Loss)	
		Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
Kansas							
Fort Leavenworth	Receive	0	0	1	31	1	31
NRC Hutchinson	Close	6	0	0	0	(6)	0
REDCOM 18 Olathe	Close	45	12	0	0	(45)	(12)
McConnell AFB	Receive	0	0	263	11	263	11
	Total	51	12	264	42	213	30
Louisiana							
EPMAC New Orleans (DISA)	Disestablish	20	9	0	0	(20)	(9)
NCTS New Orleans (DISA)	Disestablish	2	70	0	0	(2)	(70)
Barksdale AFB	Receive	513	59	1,292	65	779	6
NRF Alexandria	Close	6	0	0	0	(6)	0
NRC Monroe	Close	6	1	0	0	(6)	(1)
NAS New Orleans	Receive	0	0	122	1	122	1
	Total	525	60	1,414	66	867	(73)
Massachusetts							
Defense Contract Mgt Dist Northeast	Receive	0	0	0	183	0	183
Naval Air Station South Weymouth	Close	653	365	0	0	(653)	(365)
Naval Reserve Center New Bedford	Close	10	0	0	0	(10)	0
Naval Reserve Center Pittsfield	Close	6	0	0	0	(6)	0
	Total	669	365	0	183	(669)	(182)
Maryland							
Fort George G. Meade	Receive	0	0	486	160	486	160
NAWC AD Patuxent River (DISA)	Disestablish	1	35	0	0	(1)	(35)
Naval Air Facility Washington	Receive	0	0	142	27	142	27
NSWC White Oak	Receive	5	1,332	360	3,439	355	2,107
NESEC St. Ingoes	Close	33	2,786	0	0	(33)	(2,786)
NAWCAD Patuxent River	Receive	9	103	523	1,944	514	1,841
NSWC Bethesda	Receive	0	0	3	50	3	50
NSWC Indian Head	Receive	0	11	0	265	0	254
NSWC Annapolis	Disestablish	3	350	0	0	(3)	(350)
	Total	51	4,617	1,514	5,885	1,463	1,268
Maine							
Naval Air Station Brunswick	Receive	0	0	128	0	128	0
	Total	0	0	128	0	128	0
Michigan							
Detroit Arsenal	Receive	0	0	4	162	4	162
Defense Logistics Services Center	Disestablish	4	420	0	0	(4)	(420)
Defense Reutilization & Marketing Svc	Relocate	5	396	0	0	(5)	(396)
IPC Battle Creek (DISA)	Disestablish	1	2	0	0	(1)	(2)
K.I. Sawyer AFB	Close	2,354	788	0	0	(2,354)	(788)
Naval Air Facility Detroit	Close	523	24	0	0	(523)	(24)
	Total	2,887	1,630	4	162	(2,883)	(1,468)

These figures represent the impact of BRAC 93 recommendations only. They do not include the impact of any other initiative outside of the BRAC 93 process

(4)

3/11/93

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes BOS contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Out		In		Net Gain/(Loss)		
		Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	
Minnesota								
Naval Air Station Twin Cities	Receive	0	0	230	0	230	0	
	Total	0	0	230	0	230	0	
Mississippi								
Naval Air Station Meridian	Close	1,999	1,037	0	0	(1,999)	(1,037)	
Naval Station Pascagoula	Receive	0	0	465	3	465	3	
	Total	1,999	1,037	465	3	(1,534)	(1,034)	
Missouri								
Fort Leonard Wood	Receive	0	0	5,742	220	5,742	220	
DTSO Kansas City IPC (DISA)	Disestablish	56	70	0	0	(56)	(70)	
Naval Reserve Center Joplin	Close	9	0	0	0	(9)	0	
Naval Reserve Center St. Joseph	Close	7	0	0	0	(7)	0	
	Total	72	70	5,742	220	5,670	150	
Montana								
NMCRB Billings	Close	27	0	0	0	(27)	0	
Naval Reserve Center Great Falls	Close	6	0	0	0	(6)	0	
Naval Reserve Center Missoula	Close	6	0	0	0	(6)	0	
	Total	39	0	0	0	(39)	0	
New Hampshire								
SUBMEPP	Receive	0	0	8	406	8	406	
	Total	0	0	8	406	8	406	
North Carolina								
MCAS Cherry Point (DISA)	Disestablish	1	57	0	0	(1)	(57)	
RASC Camp Lejeune (DISA)	Disestablish	27	11	0	0	(27)	(11)	
MCAS New River	Receive	0	0	207	0	207	0	
MCAS Cherry Point	Receive	0	0	3,350	66	3,350	66	
Naval Aviation Depot Cherry Point	Receive	0	0	314	1,573	314	1,573	
Naval Hospital Camp Lejeune	Receive	0	0	39	0	39	0	
	Total	0	0	3,910	1,639	3,882	1,571	
North Dakota								
Grand Forks AFB	Receive	609	23	929	33	320	10	
Minot AFB	Receive	466	11	680	14	214	3	
	Total	1,075	34	1,609	47	534	13	

These figures represent the impact of BRAC 93 recommendations only. They do not include the impact of any other initiative outside of the BRAC 93 process

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes BOS contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Out		In		Net Gain/(Loss)	
		Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
New Jersey							
Fort Monmouth	Realign	565	2,720	140	598	(425)	(2,122)
McGuire AFB	Realign	3,289	374	0	0	(3,289)	(374)
Naval Weapons Station Earle	Receive	0	0	50	0	50	0
NAWC Lakehurst	Receive	0	0	30	42	30	42
NAWCAD Trenton	Close	8	448	0	0	(8)	(448)
Naval Reserve Center Atlantic City	Close	6	4	0	0	(6)	(4)
Naval Reserve Center Perth Amboy	Close	9	1	0	0	(9)	(1)
	Total	3,877	3,547	220	640	(3,657)	(2,907)
New York							
Stewart Annex	Receive	0	0	396	0	396	0
Griffiss AFB	Realign	3,338	1,191	0	0	(3,338)	(1,191)
Plattsburgh AFB	Receive	0	0	2,845	257	2,845	257
DoD Family Housing Dist. Niagra Falls	Close	0	19	0	0	0	(19)
First MARCORPS Dist. Garden City	Realign	60	40	0	0	(60)	(40)
REDCOM 2 Scotia	Disestablish	39	18	0	0	(39)	(18)
Naval Station Staten Island	Close	1,773	1,001	0	0	(1,773)	(1,001)
Naval Reserve Station Jamestown	Close	6	0	0	0	(6)	0
Naval Reserve Center Poughkeepsie	Close	12	0	0	0	(12)	0
	Total	5,228	2,269	3,241	257	(1,987)	(2,012)
Nevada							
Naval Air Station Fallon	Receive	0	0	194	9	194	9
	Total	0	0	194	9	194	9
Ohio							
Defense Construction Supply Center	Receive	0	0	94	2,935	94	2,935
Defense Electronic Supply Center	Close	93	2,804	0	0	(93)	(2,804)
DITSO Cleveland IPC (DISA)	Disestablish	0	8	0	0	0	(8)
DITSO Columbus IPC (DISA)	Disestablish	1	96	0	0	(1)	(96)
DITSO Columbus Annex (DISA)	Disestablish	0	99	0	0	0	(99)
PPC Wright-Patterson AFB (DISA)	Receive	0	0	0	204	0	204
Newark AFB	Close	92	1,760	0	0	(92)	(1,760)
Rickenbacker ANGB	Receive	0	0	0	522	0	522
Springfield Beckley MAP AGS (178FG)	Realign	54	312	0	0	(54)	(312)
Wright-Patterson AFB	Receive	0	522	54	560	54	38
NRRCREG 5 Ravenna	Close	44	12	0	0	(44)	(12)
	Total	284	5,613	148	4,221	(136)	(1,392)
Oklahoma							
RPC Tinker AFB (DISA)	Disestablish	0	22	0	0	0	(22)
Altus AFB	Receive	0	0	668	38	668	38
	Total	0	0	668	38	668	16

These figures represent the impact of BRAC 93 recommendations only. They do not include the impact of any other initiative outside of the BRAC 93 process

(6)

3/11/93

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes BOS contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Out		In		Net Gain/(Loss)		
		Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	
Pennsylvania								
Letterkenny Army Depot	Realign	2	1,944	0	0	(2)	(1,944)	
Letterkenny Army Depot	Redirect	0	0	15	362	15	362	
New Cumberland Army Depot	Receive	0	0	60	22	60	22	
Tobyhanna Army Depot	Receive	0	0	69	619	69	619	
Defense Clothing Factory Philadelphia	Close	2	1,235	0	0	(2)	(1,235)	
Defense Contract Mgt Dist Mid Atlantic	Disestablish	3	231	0	0	(3)	(231)	
Defense Depot Letterkenny	Disestablish	0	400	0	0	0	(400)	
Defense Depot Tobyhanna	Receive	0	0	0	169	0	169	
Defense Distribution Region East	Receive	0	0	67	4,176	67	4,176	
Defense Industrial Supply Center	Relocate	26	1,846	0	0	(26)	(1,846)	
Defense Personnel Support Center	Close	78	3,878	0	0	(78)	(3,878)	
AIPC Chambersburg (DISA)	Receive	0	0	0	139	0	139	
SPCC Mechanicsburg (DISA)	Receive	0	0	0	177	0	177	
ASO Philadelphia (DISA)	Disestablish	0	136	0	0	0	(136)	
IPC Philadelphia (DISA)	Disestablish	0	143	0	0	0	(143)	
Naval Air Station Willow Grove	Receive	0	311	157	1	157	(310)	
Naval Aviation Supply Office	Close	65	2,351	0	0	(65)	(2,351)	
Navy Ships Parts Control Center	Receive	2	10	124	1,913	122	1,903	
Naval Reserve Center Altoona	Close	7	0	0	0	(7)	0	
NSWC Philadelphia	Receive	0	0	0	200	0	200	
Naval Shipyard Philadelphia (PERA)	Disestablish	4	187	0	0	(4)	(187)	
	Total	189	12,672	492	7,778	303	(4,894)	
Rhode Island								
Naval Educ & Trng Center	Realign	830	3	20	306	(810)	302	
Naval Undersea Warfare Center	Receive	0	0	2	504	2	504	
	Total	830	3	22	809	(808)	806	
South Carolina								
Fort Jackson	Receive	0	0	293	52	293	52	
Defense Depot Charleston	Disestablish	5	202	0	0	(5)	(202)	
NSC Charleston (DISA)	Disestablish	0	77	0	0	0	(77)	
Charleston AFB (JCSE)	Redirect	253	37	0	0	(253)	(37)	
Shaw AFB	Receive	0	0	258	5	258	5	
Charleston Naval Shipyard	Close	74	4,837	0	0	(74)	(4,837)	
MCAS Beaufort	Receive	0	0	111	0	111	0	
Naval Hospital Beaufort	Receive	0	0	683	119	683	119	
Naval Hospital Charleston	Close	682	647	0	0	(682)	(647)	
Naval Station Charleston	Close	8,634	1,194	0	0	(8,634)	(1,194)	
Naval Supply Center Charleston	Disestablish	26	408	0	0	(26)	(408)	
NCCOSC Charleston	Close	3	1,885	0	0	(3)	(1,885)	
	Total	9,677	9,287	1,345	176	(8,332)	(9,111)	
South Dakota								
Ellsworth AFB	Receive	263	11	503	10	240	(1)	
	Total	263	11	503	10	240	(1)	

These figures represent the impact of BRAC 93 recommendations only. They do not include the impact of any other initiative outside of the BRAC 93 process

(7)

3/11/93

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes BOS contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Out		In		Net Gain/(Loss)	
		Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
Tennessee							
Arnold Eng Dev Center	Receive	0	0	2	44	2	44
Naval Air Station Memphis	Realign	8,041	1,376	1,331	1,126	(6,710)	(250)
Naval Reserve Center Kingsport	Close	9	0	0	0	(9)	0
	Total	8,050	1,376	1,333	1,170	(6,717)	(206)
Texas							
Red River Army Depot	Receive	0	0	0	737	0	737
Defense Depot Red River	Receive	0	0	2	240	2	240
AFMPC Randolph AFB (DISA)	Disestablish	62	1	0	0	(62)	(1)
CPSC San Antonio (DISA)	Disestablish	25	15	0	0	(25)	(15)
RPC Kelly AFB (DISA)	Receive	0	0	0	27	0	27
Bergstrom AFB (Reserve Unit)	Redirect	0	625	0	0	0	(625)
Carswell AFB	Receive	0	0	1,657	589	1,657	589
Lackland AFB	Receive	0	0	129	22	129	22
Sheppard AFB	Redirect	135	15	0	0	(135)	(15)
Naval Air Station Corpus Christi	Receive	0	0	176	19	176	19
Naval Air Station Dallas	Close	1,374	268	0	0	(1,374)	(268)
Naval Air Station Kingsville	Receive	0	0	174	73	174	73
Naval Station Ingleside	Receive	0	0	396	7	396	7
NMCRRC Abilene	Close	17	0	0	0	(17)	0
Naval Reserve Center Midland	Close	6	0	0	0	(6)	0
	Total	1,619	924	2,534	1,714	915	790
Utah							
Tooele Army Depot	Realign	16	1,942	0	0	(16)	(1,942)
Defense Depot Tooele	Disestablish	1	230	0	0	(1)	(230)
IPC Ogden (DISA)	Disestablish	1	114	0	0	(1)	(114)
RPC Hill AFB (DISA)	Disestablish	0	2	0	0	0	(2)
Naval Reserve Center Ogden	Close	12	1	0	0	(12)	(1)
	Total	30	2,289	0	0	(30)	(2,289)
Virginia							
Fort Belvoir	Realign	4	455	28	28	24	(427)
Vint Hill Farms Station	Close	407	1,472	0	0	(407)	(1,472)
Defense General Supply Center Richmond	Receive	0	0	0	4	0	4
7th Communications Gp. Pentagon (DISA)	Disestablish	108	41	0	0	(108)	(41)
BUPERS Arlington (DISA)	Disestablish	31	13	0	0	(31)	(13)
CRUTCOM Arlington (DISA)	Disestablish	3	1	0	0	(3)	(1)
NCTAMS Norfolk (DISA)	Disestablish	0	122	0	0	0	(122)
NSC Norfolk (DISA)	Disestablish	0	125	0	0	0	(125)
IPC Richmond (DISA)	Disestablish	0	261	0	0	0	(261)
Bureau of Personnel (Navy)	Relocate	1,070	924	0	0	(1,070)	(924)
NAVAIRSYSCOM	Relocate	543	3,128	0	0	(543)	(3,128)
NAVSEASYSYCOM	Relocate	360	3,439	0	0	(360)	(3,439)
NAVSUPSYSCOM	Relocate	89	291	0	0	(89)	(291)
Fleet Combat Training Center, Atlantic	Receive	22	73	970	199	948	126
HQ USMC	Relocate	28	63	0	0	(28)	(63)
Naval Air Station Norfolk	Receive	0	0	49	423	49	423

These figures represent the impact of BRAC 93 recommendations only. They do not include the impact of any other initiative outside of the BRAC 93 process

Recommendation Impacts by State

(Military includes average student load; civilian includes BOS contractor personnel)

State Installation	Action	Out		In		Net Gain/(Loss)	
		Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ
Naval Air Station Oceana	Receive	0	0	2,597	42	2,597	42
Naval Facilities Engineering Command	Relocate	36	485	0	0	(36)	(485)
Naval Security Grp Activity Chesapeake	Relocate	221	431	0	0	(221)	(431)
Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek	Receive	0	0	262	4	262	4
Naval Aviation Depot Norfolk	Close	104	4,295	0	0	(104)	(4,295)
Naval Hospital Portsmouth	Receive	0	0	603	59	603	59
Naval Station Norfolk	Receive	0	14	4,621	92	4,621	78
Naval Surface Warfare Center	Receive	0	0	5	175	5	175
Naval Weapons Station Yorktown	Realign	7	205	117	14	110	(191)
NAVMAC	Disestablish	96	108	0	0	(96)	(108)
NAVSEACYSENGST (NUWC)	Disestablish	4	1,407	0	0	(4)	(1,407)
Norfolk Naval Shipyard	Receive	0	16	228	1,139	228	1,123
Naval Reserve Center Staunton	Close	6	0	0	0	(6)	0
SUPSHIP Portsmouth	Receive	0	0	5	340	5	340
MCCDC Quantico	Receive	0	0	28	63	28	63
Total		3,139	17,369	9,513	2,582	6,374	(14,787)
Washington							
Fairchild AFB	Redirect	1,181	98	0	0	(1,181)	(98)
TRF Bangor (DISA)	Disestablish	0	13	0	0	0	(13)
NAS Whidbey Island (DISA)	Disestablish	0	5	0	0	0	(5)
NSC Puget Sound (DISA)	Disestablish	36	0	36	0	0	0
Naval Air Station Whidbey Island	Receive	0	0	1,026	13	1,026	13
Naval Hospital Bremerton	Receive	0	0	154	31	154	31
Naval Station Puget Sound	Receive	0	0	77	15	77	15
Naval Sub Base Bangor	Receive	0	0	400	660	400	660
Naval Supply Center Puget Sound	Receive	0	0	1	36	1	36
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard	Receive	1	173	4,644	7	4,643	(166)
Total		1,218	289	6,338	762	5,120	473
West Virginia							
NMCR Parkersburg	Close	6	0	0	0	(6)	0
Total		6	0	0	0	(6)	0
Midway Island							
Naval Air Facility Midway	Close	7	160	0	0	(7)	(160)
Total		7	160	0	0	(7)	(160)
Grand Total		123,786	98,660	99,686	42,008	(24,252)	(57,144)

These figures represent the impact of BRAC 93 recommendations only. They do not include the impact of any other initiative outside of the BRAC 93 process

Document Separator

**DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
OFFICE OF REVIEW AND ANALYSIS**

1 March 1993

1993 REVIEW AND ANALYSIS PLAN

OBJECTIVE

To review and analyze the base closures and realignments recommendations of the Secretary of Defense to enable the Commissioners to determine whether his recommendations comply with the provisions of P.L. 101-510, November 5, 1990, as amended.

BACKGROUND

The purpose of the review and analysis plan is to describe the procedures that the Review and Analysis staff will use to enable the Commissioners to determine whether the SECDEF's recommendations deviated substantially from the Force Structure Plan and final selection criteria and to recommend changes when substantial deviations occur. The Commissioners can determine that a substantial deviation has occurred if one or both of the following criteria are met:

1. Methodology is so flawed, or was applied so inconsistently, that the Force Structure Plan or one or more of the selection criteria were effectively not considered and correcting the flawed methodology or applying the methodology consistently causes a change in an installation's status.
2. Data used for evaluating specific installations against the Force Structure Plan or one or more of the selection criteria are so inaccurate that application of valid data causes a change in an installation's status.

ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions apply in all phases of analysis:

1. The Force Structure Plan as submitted by the Department of Defense is valid for use by the 1993 Commission.
2. Subjective judgments are appropriate for evaluating certain criteria when such judgments cannot be objectively supported.
3. Audits of data by Service audit agencies and the General Accounting Office are valid.

ORGANIZATION

The Office of Review and Analysis is headed by a direct-hire director and includes four analysis teams. The analysis teams for each Service (Army, Navy/Marine Corps, and Air Force) will consist of a team leader and three research analysts (all direct hires), two military analysts detailed from the pertinent Military Department, and two research analysts detailed from the General Accounting Office. The Interagency Issues Team will consist of a direct-hire team leader, a military analyst detailed from the Department of Defense, and analysts detailed from the General Services Administration, General Accounting Office, Federal Aviation Agency, Environmental Protection Agency, and Department of Commerce.

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

Each Service Team will perform all review work for the first four selection criteria (military value) for that Service's recommendations. The Interagency Issues Team and the Service Teams will establish procedures to jointly review criteria five through eight (return on investment and cost, environmental, and economic impacts). The Interagency Issues Team, with support as needed from the Service Teams, will review and analyze all recommendations pertaining to Defense Agencies. The analysis will be conducted in the four phases: general compliance; specific compliance; community input; and matrix of issues. The purpose of each phase is discussed below.

GENERAL COMPLIANCE

During this phase, each analysis team will:

1. Explain the methodology used by the Service or Defense Agency in developing their recommendations.
2. Evaluate the Service's or Defense Agency's process in terms of the selection criteria and the force structure plan.
3. Conclude if the Service's or Defense Agency's methodology generally complies with the provisions of P.L. 101-510.
4. Recommend alternatives for the Commissioners to consider for areas judged to be in noncompliance.

Details for accomplishing this task are in enclosure 1.

SPECIFIC COMPLIANCE

During this phase, each analysis team, will:

1. Determine whether the methodology was applied consistently within each installation or Defense Agency category.

2. Verify the data used by the Service or Defense Agency in developing their recommendations.

3. Validate the military value evaluations/rankings within each installation or Defense Agency category.

4. Determine whether application of valid data or the consistent application of the methodology results in a change to an installation's status.

Details for accomplishing this task are in enclosure 2.

COMMUNITY INPUT

The Commission will receive rebuttals from affected communities throughout the time period of the Commission's activities. Each input must be examined carefully, both as a check on the Service's or Defense Agency's and analysis team's analyses and to ensure fairness and openness in the review process. Some of these inputs will contain detailed military and economic analyses. It is possible that one or more of these inputs will make valid points with respect to data, models, methods, and their applications. For each input, each analysis team will:

1. Review the input to determine whether previously performed analyses address the issues raised.

2. Send the input to the appropriate Military Department or Defense Agency for further review if deemed appropriate.

3. Evaluate the Military Department or Defense Agency analysis.

4. Develop conclusions for consideration by the Commissioners.

MATRIX OF ISSUES

The final analysis step is the arraying of issues based on the recommendations of the Department of Defense, the input from affected communities, and the analyses of the analysis teams. The Commissioners will receive this information as part of the formal, open-hearing process. The presentation of this information will allow the Commissioners to determine those installations they will recommend to the President for closure and realignment.

Enclosures

1. General Compliance
2. Specific Compliance

**DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
OFFICE OF REVIEW AND ANALYSIS**

1 March 1993

1993 REVIEW AND ANALYSIS PLAN

GENERAL COMPLIANCE

GENERAL

The analysis teams will develop a detailed understanding of how the process worked for each Service and Defense Agency, including the methods, models, and data used at each step in the process. The analysis teams will also determine how these methods, models, and data interrelate to each other and the eight selection criteria. The analysis teams will request the COBRA and any other models used by each Service and Defense Agency. The analysis teams will request backup data used by each Services and Defense Agency and will note deficiencies.

Using the outline below, the analysis teams will prepare a position paper that evaluates the general compliance of the Service's and Defense Agency's methodology with the provisions of P.L. 101-510. The analysis teams will prepare flow charts of each Service's and Defense Agency's evaluation and description process. These detailed flow charts and descriptions will be verified by each Service and Defense Agency and will be used to guide the Commissioners' understanding and evaluation of the methodologies. The questions serve only as a guideline for doing the analysis. Teams are free to delve deeper into the analysis or to investigate additional issues. The position paper and flow charts will be available for use by the Commissioners NLT 12 April 1993.

PURPOSE

State the purpose of evaluation as outlined in the 1993 Review and Analysis Plan.

PROCESS

Explain in detail the process used by the Service or Defense Agency in developing their closure and realignment recommendations.

FINDINGS

1. How was each of the eight selection criteria included in the methodology and at what stage?
 - a. How were the eight criteria weighted (whether quantitatively or qualitatively) and why?

b. If one or more of the selection criteria were to be used as a “tiebreaker,” was it in fact used to break any ties?

2. Were categories of installations or individual installations excluded from the part of the methodology that contained the eight selection criteria or the Force Structure Plan? Are the reasons for such exclusions reasonable and supportable?

3. Did the methodology support the Force Structure Plan? Did it support the current Force Structure Plan or a prediction of a possible future Force Structure Plan?

4. How were installation capacities calculated and used?

5. Were the categories used to classify the installations logical for that Service or Defense Agency?

OBSERVATIONS

1. Is all or part of the methodology flawed?

a. Did the methodology fail to use one or more of the eight selection criteria in accordance with P.L. 101-510, Sec. 2903(b)(2)(B)?

b. Did the methodology fail to address the Force Structure Plan in accordance with P.L. 101-510, Sec. 2903(b)(2)(B)?

c. Did the methodology omit data elements that should logically have been considered?

d. Were the models and algorithms used appropriate or did they produce accurate results?

2. If the methodology is flawed, what effect is it likely to have? Is a corrected methodology, when applied, likely to change the status of an installation? For example, is it likely to lead to a substantial deviation?

3. Should the Commission support the Services’ and Defense Agencies’ decisions on categorical or individual exclusions?

4. Should the Commission modify the methodology before applying it to the data?

a. How should the methodology be modified?

b. What additional data will be needed for the modified methodology?

c. How long will it take to gather the additional data and apply the new methodology to it?

5. Have the concerns about the methodology been discussed with Service or Defense Agency counterparts? What was the Service's or Defense Agency's response?
6. Should the Commission accept the Service's or Defense Agency's methodology in total?
7. If not, what aspects should the Commission modify and how should the modifications be made?
 - a. How are additional data to be gathered?
 - b. Does the staff need help from outside? For example, if the modified methodology includes subjective analysis, should a team of recognized experts be assembled for that part?

**DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
OFFICE OF REVIEW AND ANALYSIS**

1 March 1993

1993 REVIEW AND ANALYSIS PLAN

SPECIFIC COMPLIANCE

GENERAL

Using accurate and appropriate supporting data, the analysis teams will apply the methodologies accepted by the Commissioners from the General Compliance review to each installation within each category in order to determine whether those methodologies were applied correctly and consistently by the Services and Defense Agencies. This analysis will enable the Commissioners to identify substantial deviations and formulate options for redressing identified substantial deviations.

Using the outline below, the analysis teams will prepare a position paper and a briefing for each installation category. The questions below serve only as a guideline for doing the required analysis. Teams are free to delve deeper into the analysis or to investigate additional issues. Each analysis team will brief the Staff Director on its progress and preliminary observations NLT 7 May 1993. This briefing is intended to be a brainstorming session in case there are procedural or policy questions to iron out. By that time, all of the installations recommended for closure and realignment by the Department of Defense will have been analyzed.

Based on this review, each analysis team will prepare a position paper for each installation category to be sent to the Commissioners NLT 14 May 1993. Each analysis team will brief the Commissioners on their observations during the deliberation hearings scheduled for 21-22 May 1993.

PURPOSE

State the purpose of evaluation as outlined in the 1993 Review and Analysis Plan.

PROCESS

In general terms, explain the process used by the Service or Defense Agency in developing their closure and realignment recommendations.

FINDINGS

I Data Accuracy - Explain how the accuracy of the data was determined.

II Data Verification - Explain how the data were verified.

III Category Validation - Explain how the proper data elements and methodology were applied.

IV Base Validation - Explain whether the Service or Defense Agency final recommendations appear accurate based on application of the methodology and evaluation of data.

1. Were the data used in the methodology valid and accurate?
 - a. What proportion of the data was accepted based on Service audit agency or General Accounting Office verification?
 - b. What proportion of the data was verified by the team?
2. Were the categorization rules of the methodology applied consistently? Did the bases in each category belong there?
3. Were the exclusion rules of the methodology applied consistently? Did the stated reasons for each exclusion apply to each base excluded?
4. Do valid data and the application of the methodology support the numerical or color coding of each factor used?
5. Do the factors' numerical or color codings support the overall rating given to the base?
6. Is there a justifiable, non-random pattern to the closure and realignment decisions at the final step of the Service's and Defense Agency's process?

OBSERVATIONS

1. Did corrections to the data call into question any of the Service's or Defense Agency's closure or realignment recommendations?
 - a. Should any bases on the closure list drop off?
 - b. Should any bases not on the list be considered for closure?
 - c. Should any realignment actions be reconsidered?
2. For those bases categorized incorrectly, did you re-categorize them into a more appropriate category? Did the new categorization indicate that any closure, non-closure, or realignment decisions should be reconsidered?

3. For those bases inappropriately excluded, did you apply the full methodology to them to see how they rate in their appropriate category? Did the change indicate that any closure, non-closure, or realignment decisions should be reconsidered?

4. For those changes in factor or overall base coding, did you re-prioritize any bases? Did the change indicate that any closure, non-closure, or realignment decisions should be reconsidered?

5. Do the installations selected for closure seem logical when compared to changes in the Force Structure Plan? (A matrix would be useful for this comparison.) Conversely, do the bases remaining support the FY 95 Force Structure Plan?

6. What did sensitivity analysis on each of the eight selection criteria show?

a. In general, how much do the data used to evaluate a criterion have to change in order to change a color or numerical coding?

b. How much does a criterion's color and numerical coding have to change in order to change a closure, non-closure, or realignment decision?

7. Have the conclusions been discussed with Service or Defense Agency counterparts? What was the Service's response?

8. Should the Commission accept all of the Service's decisions on all of its installations? If not, what options for changes to the base closure and realignment list are there for the Commission to consider?

9. What changes should the Commission recommend for the base closure and realignment process in 1995?