



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Commission assessed the Department of Defense's (DoD's) closure and realignment recommendations for consistency with the eight statutory selection criteria and the DoD Force Structure Plan. The recommendations announced by Secretary Rumsfeld on May 13, 2005 comprised, by the Commission's count, 190 separate DoD recommendations that would produce as many as 837 distinct and identifiable recommended BRAC "close" or "realign" actions. These 837 distinct actions also involved an additional 160 installations that would gain missions or resources due to the proposed closures and realignments. All told, the 2005 BRAC recommendations exceeded the number considered by all prior BRAC Commissions combined. In addition to the unprecedented number, many DoD recommendations were extremely complex, proposing intertwining movements between and among numerous installations. Other DoD proposals consolidated apparently unrelated actions within the same recommendation.

Secretary Rumsfeld was very clear that his primary goal for the BRAC process was military transformation. And, unlike prior BRAC rounds, the Commission evaluated DoD's recommendations in the context of a stable or increasing force structure, an ongoing conflict in Southwest Asia, and the projected redeployment of 70,000 servicemembers and family members from Europe and Asia to the United States. The 20-year BRAC outlook required the Commission to make allowances for major uncertainties in the military and strategic environment. While acknowledging the importance of savings as a BRAC goal, the Commission went beyond a business model analysis of DoD's recommendations and weighed the strategic environment within which recommendations would be implemented and their effect on DoD's transformational goals.

## NUMBER OF CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS

---

Of the 190 DoD recommendations, the Commission approved 119 with no change and accepted another 45 with amendments; over 86% of those proposed by DoD. The Commission rejected 13 DoD recommendations in their entirety and significantly modified another 13.

The Commission has forwarded a total of 182 closures or realignment recommendations, including 177 of the 190 recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense and five closures or realignment recommendations from the eight installations it considered on its own initiative.

Of DoD's recommended 33 "major" closures, the Commission approved 21, recommended realignment for seven, and rejected five. In addition, the Commission recommended closure, rather than realignment, for Naval Air Station Brunswick, for a total of 22 major closures. Of DoD's 29 recommended "major" realignments, the Commission approved 25, closed rather than realigned one (Naval Air Station Brunswick) and rejected three. In addition, it added one major realignment on its own initiative for a total of 33 major realignments, including realignment of the seven installations proposed for closure by DoD.

## COSTS AND SAVINGS

---

Over the next 20 years, the total savings of the Commission's recommendations are estimated at \$35.6 billion rather than \$47.8 billion for DoD's proposals. However, if DoD's claimed cost avoidances attributable to military personnel actions are excluded, as both the Commission and GAO believe necessary, actual savings to the taxpayer are estimated at \$15 billion over 20 years. The Commission estimates that implementation of its recommendations will result in annual savings of \$4.2 billion, compared to \$5.4 billion for DoD's proposals. Implementation will require one-time up-front costs of \$21 billion compared to the \$24.6 billion that would have been required by the DoD proposal.

## BRAC AS A VEHICLE FOR JOINTNESS

---

While the Secretary of Defense described the 2005 BRAC as an opportunity to promote jointness, very few of the hundreds of proposals increased jointness, and some actually decreased or removed joint and cross-service connections. Most of the DoD proposed consolidations and reorganizations were within the Military Departments, not across the Services. "Collocation" is not synonymous with "integration", and "transformation" is not synonymous with "jointness". While the Secretary's recommendations will not move the ball across the jointness goal line, Commission decisions will help move the ball down the field.

## SAVINGS DUE TO MILITARY PERSONNEL

---

DoD frequently credited recommendations with creating “savings” derived from the costs of servicemembers who would be reassigned from a closing or realigning installation to a gaining base or activity. Much of DoD’s claimed “savings” are attributable to the reassignment of 26,830 military personnel positions that would not be eliminated, although military effectiveness would increase as servicemembers are reassigned to higher priority missions.

DoD’s claimed savings (as opposed to cost avoidance) will be significantly reduced by the extent that military personnel costs are not reduced but are instead shifted to another installation or mission. DoD claimed its proposals would produce \$47.8 billion in savings after investing \$24.6 billion in one-time implementation costs. However, if personnel savings are not realized, DoD’s 2005 BRAC proposal would still incur \$24.6 billion in one-time costs while saving only \$18.6 billion.

For some Air Force base recommendations, the cost savings due to personnel reductions were over 90% of the total savings. For example, the DoD projected savings due to personnel reductions at Pope AFB, Grand Forks AFB, and Cannon AFB were 97.8%, 94.5%, and 92%, respectively of the total savings claimed. In the case of the Air National Guard, roughly 106,000 military personnel assigned before the 2005 BRAC are retained after the 2005 BRAC. Obviously, no savings will be achieved by moving these positions around the country if the total does not change.

## AIR NATIONAL GUARD

---

DoD proposals to close or realign Air National Guard bases nationwide represented one of the most difficult issues faced by the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Thirty-seven of the 42 DoD Air Force proposals involved the Air National Guard.

As proposed by DoD, 23 Air National Guard units would have lost all their currently assigned aircraft. The proposed realignments or closures threatened the confidence of many Governors that they would have Air National Guard resources if needed for emergencies, natural disasters, or homeland defense missions. Several states have filed law suits to block such moves.

From the outset, the Commission and its staff worked long hours with the U.S. Air Force, with the National Guard Bureau, and with the Adjutants General to fashion recommendations that would achieve DoD’s objectives, conform to the military value BRAC selection criteria and respond to the concerns of the states and the Adjutants General. The result of those efforts was approved unanimously by the Commission during its hearing on August 26, 2005.

## COMMISSION PROCESS

---

In accordance with the BRAC statute, three Commissioners were directly nominated by the President and six nominated by the President after consultation with majority or minority leaders of the House and Senate. By law, and by Commission policy, the Commission’s process was open, transparent, apolitical, and fair. In addition to considering certified data provided by DoD, Commissioners sought input from communities and individuals affected by the DoD recommendations. Commissioners made 182 site visits to 173 separate installations. They conducted 20 regional hearings to obtain public input and 20 deliberative hearings for input on, or discussion of, policy issues. Commissioners were accessible to communities, citizens, and to their advocates without regard to party or agenda. Commissioners participated in hundreds of meetings with public officials and received well over 200,000 pieces of mail. All documents provided to the Commission were scanned into an “e-library” and made available through the internet. The Commission’s web site registered over 25 million “hits.”

The 2005 BRAC Commission assessed closure and realignment recommendations of unprecedented scope and complexity while setting a new standard for accessibility to the American people and transparency of deliberations.

# STATUTORY BRAC FINAL SELECTION CRITERIA

## MILITARY VALUE (GIVEN PRIORITY CONSIDERATION)

---

1. The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department of Defense, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.
2. The availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.
3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training.
4. The cost of operations and the manpower implications.

## OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

---

5. The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.
6. The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.
7. The ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel.
8. The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance.

## MAJOR CLOSURES:

### ARMY (12)

---

Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant, CA  
Fort Gillem, GA  
Fort McPherson, GA  
Newport Chemical Depot, IN  
Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, KS  
Selfridge Army Activity, MI  
Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant, MS  
Fort Monmouth, NJ  
Umatilla Chemical Depot, OR  
Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant, TX  
Deseret Chemical Depot, UT  
Fort Monroe, VA

### NAVY (5)

---

Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA  
Naval Station Pascagoula, MS  
Naval Air Station Willow Grove, PA  
Naval Station Ingleside, TX  
Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME

### AIR FORCE (5)

---

Kulis Air Guard Station, AK  
Onizuka Air Force Station, CA  
Brooks City Base, TX  
General Mitchell ARS, WI  
Cannon Air Force Base, NM\*

\* Closure recommendation goes into effect if the Secretary of the Air Force does not designate a new mission for the installation by December 31, 2009.

## MAJOR REALIGNMENTS:

### ARMY (6)

---

Walter Reed National Military Medical Center (at Bethesda), DC  
Rock Island Arsenal, IL  
Fort Knox, KY  
Army Reserve Personnel Center, St. Louis, MO  
Ft. Eustis, VA  
Red River Army Depot, TX

### NAVY (13)

---

Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA  
Naval Base Ventura City, CA  
Naval Base Coronado, CA  
Naval Medical Center San Diego, CA  
Naval District Washington, DC  
NAS Pensacola, FL  
Naval Station Great Lakes, IL  
Naval Support Activity Crane, IN  
NAS Corpus Christi, TX  
Naval Medical Center Portsmouth, VA  
NAS Oceana, VA  
Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, LA  
Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Concord Detachment, CA

### AIR FORCE (12)

---

Eielson AFB, AK  
Elmendorf AFB, AK  
Mountain Home AFB, ID  
Pope AFB, NC  
Grand Forks AFB, ND  
Lackland AFB, TX  
Sheppard AFB, TX  
McChord AFB, WA  
Otis Air National Guard Base, MA  
W.K. Kellogg Airport Guard Station, MI  
Niagara Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, NY

Pittsburg International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA

**DEFENSE AGENCIES/MULTIPLE SERVICES (2)**

---

NCR Leased locations, DC

Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) Arlington, VA

**PROPOSED CLOSURES REJECTED BY THE COMMISSION:**

---

Hawthorne Army Depot, NV

Naval Support Activity, Corona, CA

Submarine Base New London, CT

Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, ME

Ellsworth AFB, SD

**PROPOSED REALIGNMENTS REJECTED BY THE COMMISSION:**

---

NAS Brunswick, ME\*\*

Maxwell AFB, AL

Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, OR

DFAS Cleveland, OH

\*\* Commission recommended closure instead