

**UNITED STATES INFORMATION
AGENCY**

**Determination for Guatemala's
Emergency Request—Peten Region**

AGENCY: United States Information Agency.

ACTION: Determination for Guatemala's Emergency Request—Peten Region.

Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (Pub. L. 97-446); Import Restrictions on Archaeological Material from Guatemala. Pursuant to the authority vested in me under Executive Order 12555, and delegation Order No. 86-3 of March 18, 1986 (51 FR 10137).

Findings

I hereby find:

(1) That the Government of Guatemala made a request to the United States Government of the type and in the form required by sec. 303(a) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2602 (a), on October 3, 1989, seeking emergency U.S. import restrictions and has supplied information which supports a determination that an emergency condition exists with respect to archaeological material from the Peten region, which material was identified as comprising a part of Guatemala's cultural patrimony pillaged, or in danger of being pillaged, in crisis proportions;

(2) That pursuant to sec. 303(f)(1), 19 U.S.C. 2602(f)(1), notification of this

request was published in the Federal Register on October 23, 1989, 54 FR 24914;

(3) That pursuant to sec. 303(f)(2), 19 U.S.C. 2602(f)(2), this request was submitted to the Cultural Property advisory Committee on November 14, 1989, for investigation, review and recommendation;

(4) That on February 9, 1990, the Committee transmitted to me its Report within the statutory ninety (90) day period prescribed in section 304(c)(2), 19 U.S.C. 2603(c)(2);

(5) That the Committee, in accordance with the requirements of sec. 306(f), 19 U.S.C. 2605(f), has thoroughly considered this request and has investigated the situation described in it;

(6) That the Committee recommends that emergency import restrictions be imposed on archaeological material from the Peten region;

(7) That the archaeological material involved here satisfies the definition in sec. 302(2)(i), 19 U.S.C. 2601(2)(i), in that it is of cultural significance, at least two hundred and fifty years old, and normally discovered as a result of scientific excavation, clandestine or accidental digging, or exploration on land or underwater;

(8) That the Peten region is defined as an area of approximately 40,000 square kilometers which shares a border to the north with Campeche, Mexico, and to the east with Belize. To the west, it is bound by the Rio Usumacinta and

Chiapas, Mexico, and to the south by the Guatemalan Highlands;

(9) That archaeological material from the Peten Region is part of the remains of a particular culture (i.e. the Lowland Maya culture) and that the record of the Maya culture found in the Peten region is in jeopardy from pillage, dismantling, dispersal or fragmentation which is, or threatens to be of crisis proportions;

(10) That the imposition of emergency import restrictions on a temporary basis would, in whole or in part, reduce the incentive for pillage, dismantling, dispersal or fragmentation.

Determinations

Now, therefore, in accordance with the aforementioned authority vested in me, I hereby determine:

(1) That, pursuant to section 304(b) of the Act, 19 U.S.C. 2603(b), an emergency condition exists with respect to the archaeological material from the peten region as part of the remains of the Lowland Maya culture.

(2) That the import restrictions set forth in section 307, 19 U.S.C. 2606, be applied to the archaeological materials from the Peten Region and forming part of the remains of the Lowland Maya culture.

Dated: December 11, 1990.

Eugene P. Kopp,

Deputy Director United States Information Agency.

[FR Doc. 91-8796 Filed 4-12-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8230-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

19 CFR Part 12

[T.D. 91-34]

Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological Artifacts from Guatemala

AGENCY: U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document amends the Customs Regulations by imposing emergency import restrictions on pre-Columbian culturally significant archaeological artifacts from the Peten region of Guatemala. These restrictions are being imposed pursuant to a Determination of the United States Information Agency issued under authority of the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act in accordance with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 15, 1991.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Legal Aspects: Donnette Rimmer, Intellectual Property Rights Branch (202) 566-6956.

Operational Aspects: Pamela Wenner, Trade Operations (202) 535-4931.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

The value of cultural property, whether archaeological or ethnological in nature, is immeasurable. Such items often constitute the very essence of a society and convey important information concerning a people's origin, history, and traditional setting. The importance and popularity of such items regrettably make them targets of theft, encourages clandestine looting of archaeological sites, and results in their illegal export and import.

The U.S. shares in the international concern for the need to protect endangered cultural property. The appearance in the U.S. of stolen or illegally exported artifacts from other countries where there has been pillage has, on occasion, strained our foreign and cultural relations. This situation, combined with the concerns of museum, archaeological, and scholarly communities, was recognized by the President and Congress. It became apparent that it was in the national interest for the U.S. to join with other

countries to control illegal trafficking of such articles in international commerce.

The U.S. joined international efforts and actively participated in deliberations resulting in the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export, and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property (823 U.N.T.S. 231 (1972)). U.S. acceptance of the 1970 UNESCO Convention was codified into U.S. law as the "Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act" (Pub. L. 97-446, 19 U.S.C. 2601 *et seq.*). The spirit of the Convention was enacted into law to promote U.S. leadership in achieving greater international cooperation towards preserving cultural treasures that are of importance not only to the nations whence they originate, but also to greater international understanding of mankind's common heritage. The U.S. is, to date, the only major art importing country to implement the 1970 Convention.

Customs issued regulations to carry out the provisions of the Act as T.D. 86-52, published in the *Federal Register* on February 27, 1986 (51 FR 6905), which took effect on March 31, 1986. Those regulations were amended by T.D. 90-3, on January 19, 1990 (55 FR 1809), so that the public would have a listing of countries and those T.D.s which contained detailed information on articles for which import restrictions had been imposed under of the Act.

This document amends the listing by adding the name of State Party "Guatemala" and the description of the archaeological material from the Peten Archaeological Region contained in this T.D. to the regulations. The document further describes the cultural property from the Peten Archaeological Region for which import restrictions exist.

Guatemala

Under section 303(a)(3) of the Cultural Property Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 2602(a)(3)), the Government of Guatemala, a State Party to the 1970 UNESCO Convention, asked the U.S. Government to impose emergency import restrictions on certain archaeological materials from the Peten region of Guatemala. This material, identified as comprising part of Guatemala's cultural patrimony, the record of the Maya culture found in the Peten region, was being pillaged, or is in danger of being pillaged, in crisis proportions. Notice of receipt of this request was published by the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) in the *Federal Register* on October 23, 1989 (54 FR 43213).

On November 14, 1989, the request was referred to the Cultural Property Advisory Committee, which conducted a review and investigation, and submitted its report in accordance with the provisions of 19 U.S.C. 2605(f) to the Deputy Director, USIA, on February 9, 1990. The Committee found the situation in Guatemala to be an emergency, in accordance with the provisions of 19 U.S.C. 2603(a)(3), and recommended that emergency import restrictions be imposed on archaeological material from the Peten region. The Deputy Director, pursuant to the authority vested in him under Executive Order 12555 and USIA Delegation Order 86-3, considered the Committee's recommendations and made the determination that emergency import restrictions be applied. (See this issue of the *Federal Register*.)

The Commissioner of Customs, in consultation with the Deputy Director of the USIA, has drawn up a list of types of covered archaeological material from the Peten region of Guatemala. The materials on the list are subject to § 12.104a(b), Customs Regulations. As provided in 19 U.S.C. 2601 *et seq.*, and § 12.104a(b), Customs Regulations, listed material from this area may not be imported into the U.S. unless accompanied by documentation certifying that the material left Guatemala legally and not in violation of the laws of Guatemala.

In the event an importer cannot produce the certificate, documentation, or evidence required by § 12.104c, Customs Regulations, at the time of making entry, § 12.104d provides that the district director shall take custody of the material until the certificate, documentation, or evidence is presented. Section 12.104e provides that if the importer states in writing that he will not attempt to secure the required certificate, documentation, or evidence, or the importer does not present the required certificate, documentation, or evidence to Customs within the time provided, the material shall be seized and summarily forfeited to the U.S. in accordance with the provisions of part 162, Customs Regulations (19 CFR part 162).

These import restrictions of smaller, portable archaeological material are a logical extension of the restrictions imposed by the 1972 Pre-Columbian Monumental or Architectural Sculpture or Murals Statute (19 U.S.C. 2091-2095), which denied entry into the United States of segments of Maya monuments and stelae from the Peten region since May 2, 1973.

Archaeological Material From the Peten Region, Guatemala

The Peten Region has yielded pre-Hispanic ceramic, stone, shell and bone artifacts. The Peten region is defined as an area of approximately 40,000 square kilometers which shares a border to the north with Campeche, Mexico and to the east with Belize. To the west, it is bound by the Rio Usumacinta and Chiapas, Mexico and to the south by the Guatemalan Highlands. The archaeological material from the Peten region is part of the remains of the Lowland Maya Culture. As this region is further excavated, it is expected that other similar artifacts may be discovered. The following is a non-inclusive list of types of artifacts which have been identified as originating in the Peten region.

I. Ceramics

(Dimensions are approximate)

Ceramic vessels and other ceramic forms from the Peten region are decorated with one or a combination of two decorative techniques, regardless of the vessel's color. The decorative techniques are:

- Altering the smooth surface with incisions, punctures channels and similar work, or by adding feet or bases, or handles;
- Adding decorative designs, such as buttons, curls, little faces and similar designs, or especially by painting with two or more colors.

The types of ceramic forms are:

A. Common Vessels

1. Vases with straight or rounded sides, sometimes with 3 feet, pedestal base or lid. Height, 9.9-29 cm.
2. Bowls, sometimes with feet, base, or lid. Height, 8.7-21.5 cm.
3. Dishes and plates, sometimes with 3 or 4 feet. Diameter, 17-62 cm.
4. Jars. Height, 16-38 cm.

B. Special Ceramic Forms

1. Drums. Height, 35-75 cm.
2. Figurines. Height, 5-6 cm.
3. Whistles. Height, 6-15 cm.
4. Miniature vessels. Height, 5-12 cm.
5. Stamps/Seals.

6. Effigy vessels. Height, 16-30 cm.
7. Incense Burners.

II. Stone

(Dimensions are approximate)

Moveable stone artifacts from the Peten region are made from the following mineral components:

A. Jade or Green Stone, May Have Traces of Red Pigment

1. Masks. Height, 14.5-28 cm.
2. Jaguar Figure. Length, 15 cm.
3. Earplug. Diameter, 3.5-9 cm.

B. Obsidian Length, 3-20 cm.

C. Flint Length, 10-15 cm.

D. Alabaster or Calcite Height (Vase), 6-23 cm.

III. Shell

(Dimensions Are Approximate)

Shell artifacts from the Peten region may be carved or incised into human or animal or other shapes and designs and may have traces of red pigment. Height, 4-6.5 cm; length, 5-32 cm; diameter, 5-7 cm.

IV. Bone

(Dimensions are approximate)

Bone artifacts from the Peten region may be carved or incised into human or animal or other shapes and designs and may have traces of red pigment. Length, 6.5-7 cm.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

Because no Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is required, the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) do not apply. Accordingly, this final rule is not subject to the regulatory analysis or other requirements of 5 U.S.C. 603 and 604.

Executive Order 12291

This document does not meet the criteria for a "major rule" as specified in E.O. 12291. Accordingly, no regulatory impact analysis has been prepared.

Inapplicability of Notice and Delayed Effective Date

Because this amendment imposes emergency import restrictions on

cultural property which is currently subject to pillage and looting, pursuant to section 553(b)(B) of the Administrative Procedure Act, no notice of proposed rulemaking or public procedure is necessary. For the same reason, a delayed effective date is both impracticable and contrary to the public interest.

Drafting Information

The principal author of this document was Peter T. Lynch, Regulations and Disclosure Law Branch, U.S. Customs Service. However, personnel from other offices participated in its development.

List of Subjects in 19 CFR Part 12

Customs duties and inspections, Imports, Cultural property.

Amendment to the Regulations

Accordingly, part 12 of the Customs Regulations (19 CFR part 12) is amended as set forth below:

PART 12—[AMENDED]

1. The general and specific authority citation for part 12 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301, 19 U.S.C. 66, 1202 (General note 8, Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS)), 1624. * * * §§ 12.104-12.104i also issued under 19 U.S.C. 2612.

§ 12.104g [Amended]

2. Section 12.104g(b) is amended by adding "Guatemala" under the column headed "State Party", the description "Archaeological material from the Peten Archaeological Region forming part of the remains of the ancient Maya culture" under the column headed "Cultural Property", and "91-34" in the column headed "T.D. No."

Carol Hallett,

Commissioner of Customs.

Approved: April 10, 1991.

Peter K. Nunez,

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

[FR Doc. 91-8788 Filed 4-12-91; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820-02-M

Register Federal Register

**Monday
April 15, 1991**

Part VIII

**Department of
Defense**

Office of the Secretary

**Recommended Base Closures and
Realignments; Notice**

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

BILLING CODE: 3810-01

Office of the Secretary

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DoD)

ACTION: Recommended Base Closures and Realignment

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Defense is authorized to recommend military installations inside the United States for closure and realignment in accordance with title XXIX, part A of the FY 1991 National Defense Authorization Act. He is required to publish his recommendations in the Federal Register by April 15th. The recommendations follow.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 15, 1991

FOR A REPORT ON THE DOD RECOMMENDATIONS CONTACT: The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Directorate of Public Communication, (703) 697-5737


F. H. MeansOSD Federal Register
Liaison Officer
Department of Defense

April 11, 1991

Recommended Base Closures and Realignment

Introduction

Pursuant to Title XXIX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510), this document contains the list of military installations that the Secretary of Defense recommends for closure or realignment on the basis of the force structure plan and the final criteria established under Public Law 101-510.

To implement Title XXIX of P.L. 101-510, the Deputy Secretary of Defense issued general policy guidance on December 10, 1990, to the Secretaries of the Military Departments, the Directors of Defense Agencies and key DoD staff. In that guidance the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Production and Logistics (ASD(P&L)) was authorized to issue implementing instructions and ensure consistency in the DoD base closure and realignment process.

ASD(P&L) formed a steering committee of representatives from the Military Departments, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and key Department of Defense staff. This steering committee developed the final base closure criteria and coordinated several implementing policy memoranda. The Military Departments, under the general guidance of ASD(P&L), each adopted implementing processes tailored to their unique missions and organizational structures.

The Secretaries of the Military Departments reported to the Secretary of Defense their nominations for closure or realignment based on the force structure plan and final criteria established under Public Law 101-510.

As required by law, this document includes a summary of the selection process that resulted in the recommendation for each installation, including a justification for each recommendation.

Department of the Army

Summary of Selection Process**Introduction**

The Army is reducing its force structure and tailoring its base structure in light of changes in the world situation and the reduction in resources devoted to national defense. By 1995, the Army will have 12 active divisions, 6 fewer than in 1990. The end strength of the Army will decline by almost 30 percent, with the majority of that decline overseas.

In projecting future force reductions, the Army has focused on maintaining sufficient forces in the Active Component to satisfy crisis and contingency response, and forward presence requirements, and on a structure for domestically based reinforcing forces that relies primarily on the Reserve Components.

The Selection Process

The Army has performed a detailed study of its installations to determine which, based on the final criteria and the force structure plan established under Title XXIX of Public Law 101-510, should be closed or realigned. In making its choices, the Army determined which bases would serve well into the next century.

The Army began its Total Army Basing Study by determining the military value of its bases, as defined by the first four and the seventh of the final criteria. After grouping its installations for comparative purposes, the Army produced a baseline from which to formulate and gauge reasonable realignment/closure alternatives. The Army categorized bases according to like missions, capabilities, and attributes, without regard to whether the base was previously considered for closure or realignment.

In determining military value, the Army evaluated bases that historically performed the same types of missions and determined their military value relative to the entire Army. Each installation within a particular category was measured against a set of uniform attributes relative to the category's mission. Installations were judged on their relative overall value in a category, rather than by capacity for current mission needs. The Army weighed the attributes to assess a starting point in the evaluation of

the base structure. The ranking alone does not produce a decision, but represents a logical basis for judging possible opportunities for closure and realignment.

Next, the Army began the process of selecting bases for realignment and closure. The Army screened installations to determine whether any should be excluded from active consideration during this process. To do this, the Army considered the force structure plan, assessments of military value, and visions of the future to identify reasonable candidates for more detailed study. Then the study focused on whether the cost of the closure or realignment package would provide a return on investment. After considering the potential impacts on the environment and local economies, recommendations were presented to senior Army leaders. As this study progressed, those alternatives considered not feasible were eliminated. The Army routinely met with the Air Force and the Navy representatives to discuss the potential for interservice asset sharing.

The Army established internal controls to ensure that data were collected and assessed in a consistent and equitable manner. Standard attributes to quantify and measure the operational efficiencies, expandability, and quality of life for a base were established. The Army Audit Agency tracked the data used to quantify each attribute, performed random testing of data at Major Commands, verified the calculations, and evaluated the reasonableness of the procedures used.

The Secretary of the Army, with the advice of the Chief of Staff of the Army, nominated bases to the Secretary of Defense for closure and realignment based on the force structure plan and final criteria established under Public Law 101-510. The Secretary of Defense recommends the following Army bases for closure or realignment pursuant to Public Law 101-510:

Recommendations and Justifications

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana

Recommendation: Close Fort Benjamin Harrison, retain the Department of Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Indianapolis Center. This proposal is a revision to the recommendations of the 1988 Base Closure Commission; the U. S. Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) will now relocate from Fort Sheridan to Fort Knox, KY rather than to Fort Benjamin Harrison. Realign the Soldier Support Center (U.S. Army Adjutant General and Finance Schools) from Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN, to Fort Jackson, SC to initiate the Soldier Support Warfighting Center.

Justification: The Army is creating a "vision of the future" for the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) which incorporates the need for reduced training loads as the force structure decreases and also recommends management initiatives that will reduce expenditures. Part of this TRADOC "vision" calls for the creation of a Soldier Support Warfighting Center which will eventually collocate the Adjutant General, Finance, Staff Judge Advocate General and Chaplain schools. The collocation of these branches enhances their synergistic effect by training as a team similar to the manner in which they are employed. Although force structure reductions do not dictate specific base structure changes in the training installation category, they do suggest that adjustments are possible through operational and management changes. Fort Benjamin Harrison has a small TRADOC mission. The training functions are important but require less unique, special, or extensive facilities or acreage than other training schools. Expansion external to the property line is limited and would be expensive.

Retaining the DOD Finance and Accounting Service, Indianapolis Center in Building 1, the second largest administrative building in the DOD inventory, will allow continued operations without engaging in costly leases or incurring moving costs at this time. Diverting the realignment of USAREC to Fort Knox, KY, places USAREC on an active duty installation with its own airfield, hospital, family housing and other Army community services once Fort Benjamin Harrison is closed. This action can occur in a time frame consistent with the closure of Fort Sheridan. USAREC's realignment costs to Fort Knox are less than to Fort Benjamin Harrison.

Closure of Fort Benjamin Harrison has an immediate return on investment. Implementing this recommendation will save \$59M, including \$104M in land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$36M. One building at Fort Benjamin Harrison is on the National Register of Historic sites; additional buildings are potentially eligible. Ground water and asbestos remedial actions are required and other cleanup costs are likely. The current environmental restoration cost estimate is \$4 million. Closure may result in a potential employment change of -1% in the Indianapolis area, +2% at Fort Jackson, and +3% at Fort Knox. Future reuse of facilities after disposal may mitigate this impact. Reserve components require a small enclave carved out to house current USAR activities.

Fort Chaffee, Arkansas

Recommendation: Close Fort Chaffee, retaining the facilities and training area to support Reserve Component (RC). The permanent stationing of the current Active Component tenant, the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC) at Fort Polk, LA is outlined in another paper (Fort Polk).

Justification: All the installations in the major training area category have similar military value, except for Fort Irwin, CA, which ranked first by a wide margin. Study of the installations in this category, including Fort Chaffee, was driven by the desire to reduce overall manpower and costs while increasing the training opportunities for their primary users, the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

When Fort Chaffee was designated the temporary location of the JRTC, Army National Guard and US Army Reserve training was constrained by active component requirements for training areas and facilities. This realignment will eliminate constraints to training and better support RC units in the geographic area. While Reserve Component end strength will decline by FY 95, changes in force structure by geographic region have not been determined. In fact, while a given area may lose force structure, other units requiring training in that area may make it impossible to close an installation. Further analysis of RC force structure and training requirements remains to be done. The transfer of Fort Chaffee to the Reserve Component, coupled with the realignment of the 5th ID (MX) from Fort Polk to Fort Hood and the permanent stationing of the JRTC at Fort Polk, provides a return on investment four years after the completion of the realignment.

Implementing this recommendation (including the transfer of JRTC from Fort Chaffee to Fort Polk, the 5th ID (MX) from Fort Polk to Fort Hood and the 199th SMB from Fort Lewis to Fort Polk) will cost \$256M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$23M. The environmental impact will be positive at Fort Chaffee. Action may result in a potential loss of 6.1 percent of jobs in the local community. Oil and gas drilling activities on the installation may mitigate that impact. Since training tempo will decline in the near future, land use may be reduced. However, drilling associated with oil and gas leases managed by the Bureau of Land Management will continue.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts

Recommendation: Close Fort Devens, retaining only facilities to support Reserve Component training requirements. This proposal is a revision to the recommendations of the 1988 Base Closure Commission that directed the relocation of HQ, Information Systems Command (ISC), and supporting elements to Fort Devens from Forts Huachuca, AZ, Monmouth, NJ, and Belvoir, VA, and leased space in the National Capital Region. It is more cost effective to leave HQ, ISC, where it is currently located. This recommendation would: create a small reserve enclave on Fort Devens main post and retain approximately 3,000 acres for use as a regional training center; dispose of the remainder of the post; retain HQ, Information Systems Command (ISC) and supporting elements at Fort Huachuca, AZ and Fort Monmouth, NJ; relocate 10th Special Forces Group (SFG) (Airborne) from Fort Devens, MA, to Fort Carson, CO; relocate selected ISC elements from Fort Belvoir, VA, to Fort Ritchie, MD or another location within the National Capital Region. Essential facilities and training areas will be retained; excess facilities and land will be sold.

Justification: The decision to transfer Fort Devens to the Reserve Components was driven by the need to reduce the number of command and control installations. A review of the Army's requirements in this category revealed that all missions located on post or scheduled to be realigned to the post could be accommodated at other installations within the current structure with little or no effect on the readiness of active units. Retaining a reserve enclave and training facility was necessitated by the desire to maintain the readiness of the numerous reserve component units from the New England area that currently depend on the facilities at Fort Devens for training. The relocation of the 10th SFG has been under study by the Army for quite some time because of the inadequate training land available at Ft Devens.

The Army will need fewer command and control installations in the future. Of the Army's Command and Control installations, Fort Devens was ranked 9 out of 11 in military value. It is not critical to either the mid-term management of the Army's build-down or the long-term strategic requirements of the Army's command and control installation structure. The closure of Fort Devens and the transfer to the Reserve Components has an immediate return on investment upon completion.

Implementing this recommendation will save \$143M, including \$112M in land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$55M. Environmental mitigation will be required. Asbestos abatement and other remedial actions are likely. The recommendation may result in a potential employment change of -3.5% in the Fort Devens area. There is great potential for reuse of facilities which can be expected to mitigate impact. The Reserve Components would retain a small enclave on main post and run the training area. This will incur a small annual cost for personnel and maintenance of the facilities and training area.

Fort Dix, New Jersey

Recommendation: Close Fort Dix, retaining only facilities to support Reserve Component (RC) training requirements. This recommendation, which is a change to the recommendation of the 1988 Base Closure Commission, relocates active organizations without a direct RC support mission except those which cannot be accommodated elsewhere. Essential facilities and training areas will be retained; excess facilities and land will be sold.

Justification: This proposal retains facilities and training areas essential to support ARNG and USAR units in the Mid-Atlantic states. However, it reduces base operations and real property maintenance costs considerably by eliminating excess facilities and relocating non-RC support tenants. While Reserve Component end strength will decline by FY 95, changes in force structure by geographic region have not been determined. In fact, while a given area may lose force structure, other units requiring training in that area may make it impossible to close an installation. Further analysis of RC force structure and training requirements remains to be done. All the installations in the major training area category have similar military value, except for Fort Irwin, CA, which ranked first by a wide margin. Study of the installations in this category, including Fort Dix, was driven by the desire to reduce overall manpower and costs while increasing the training opportunities for their primary users, the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

The Fort Dix recommendation has an immediate return on investment. Implementing this recommendation will save \$116M, including \$83M in land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$34M. Overall environmental impact will be minimal, because training will continue. There is a sanitary landfill which is on the National Priority List (NPL). A Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) of the installation is ongoing. The planned waste water treatment facility will be funded in FY 94, at the 4.6 million gallons per day rate to ensure compliance with New Jersey State clean water regulations when facilities are exceeded. This proposed realignment may result in a potential loss of 0.9 percent of jobs in the community, a reduction additive to losses predicted (1.8 percent) as a result of the change to "semi-active" status under the 1988 Base Closure Commission. Future reuse of facilities after disposal may be expected to mitigate some of the impact to the local economy. By relocating active tenants and excessing property and facilities no longer required for RC training, substantive reductions to operating costs can be achieved without any degradation of that training. The Air Force is interested in assuming some of the family housing units on Fort Dix; the number will be determined after a study of the requirement.

Fort McClellan, Alabama

Recommendation: Close Fort McClellan. Realign the U.S. Army Chemical and Military Police schools to Fort Leonard Wood, MO; realign the Department of Defense Polygraph School to Fort Huachuca, AZ; retain Pelham Range, the Special Operations Test Site (SOTS) and a reserve enclave; place in caretaker status, the Chemical Decontamination Training Facility (CDTF). Create the Maneuver Support Warfighting Center at Fort Leonard Wood.

Justification. The Army is creating a "vision of the future" for the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) which incorporates the need for reduced training loads as the force structure decreases and also recommends intelligent management initiatives that will reduce expenditures. Part of this vision calls for the creation of a Maneuver Support Warfighting Center which collocates the Army Engineer, Chemical and Military Police schools. The collocation of these branches enhances the synergistic effect of chemical, military police and engineer units by training as a team similar to the manner in which they would be tactically employed. Although force structure reductions do not dictate specific base structure changes in the training installation category, they do suggest that adjustments are possible through operational and management changes. Fort McClellan is the home of the smallest Army Training Center. The skills produced there represent about 5% of the Total Force and the respective schools can be reestablished on another installation which otherwise will be operating at less than current capacity with the smaller force. Return on investment is 2 years. Proceeds from the sale of excess land are projected but some areas will require environmental restoration prior to disposal.

Implementing this recommendation will result in a net cost of \$28M, including \$49M in land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$26M. Fort McClellan is currently undergoing investigation to generate data necessary to score the site under the Environmental Protection Agency's Hazard Ranking System. An Enhanced Preliminary Assessment has been completed. Ground water and asbestos remedial actions are required and other cleanup costs are likely. Closure may result in a potential employment change of -18% in the Fort McClellan area, +16% at Fort Leonard Wood, and +0.3% at Fort Huachuca (economic impact for all recommended actions at Fort Huachuca is +8% employment change). Future reuse of facilities after disposal may mitigate impact. Army reserve components will require a small enclave carved out for use.

Additionally, this proposal recommends licensing Pelham Range and carving out selected facilities for use by the Alabama Army National Guard. Under a separate 1988 Base Closure Commission action, part of the ground communications maintenance workload currently at Sacramento Army Depot (SAAD), CA will transfer from SAAD to Anniston Army Depot, AL. Additionally, tactical missile maintenance workload will move from Anniston Army Depot, AL, to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA.

Fort Ord, California

Recommendation: Close Fort Ord and relocate 7th Infantry Division (Light) to Fort Lewis, WA.

Justification: The decision to close Fort Ord is based upon required force structure reductions by 1995 and the Army's reduced requirement to house divisions in the United States. Force structure and budget reductions require the Army to close several installations while maximizing use of those remaining installations with the highest military value. By 1995, the Army will have 12 Active divisions. It currently has the capacity to house 13 divisions in the U.S. Based on force structure decisions already made, the Army has excess capacity to station at least one division. Fort Ord was selected for closure because it ranks relatively low among the Army's fighting bases in military value. The closure of Fort Ord and relocation of the 7th ID (L) to Fort Lewis is the best way to reduce excess capacity, maintain flexibility, and capitalize on the superior deployability and operational security attributes of Fort Lewis. Because of the downsizing of the 9th ID in FY 90 to the 199th Separate Motorized Brigade, Fort Lewis has excess capacity and can easily absorb the 7th ID (L). The 199th Separate Motorized Brigade, will relocate to Fort Polk, LA.

Fort Ord requires the use of a civilian airport, since the military airfield is not fully capable of handling C-141 aircraft. Those war fighting installations ranking below Fort Ord were not recommended for closure due to strategic location or because final disposition decisions for major units have not been made. Closing Fort Ord provides an immediate return on investment. Proceeds from the sale of excess land are projected. Implementing this recommendation will save \$362M, including \$400M in land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$70M. Environmental impacts will be positive because air and noise pollution sources will be eliminated. The estimated socio-economic impact of the closure of Fort Ord is a potential loss of 17.5 percent of jobs in the local community. Future reuse of facilities after disposal may be expected to mitigate this impact. A Reserve Component enclave will be established to accommodate missions which cannot be relocated. The Navy is interested in assuming some of the family housing units on Fort Ord; the number will be determined after a study of the requirement.

Sacramento Army Depot, California

Recommendation: Close Sacramento Army Depot. Transfer the ground communication electronic maintenance workload from Sacramento Army Depot, CA, to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA, Anniston Army Depot, AL, Red River Army Depot, TX, Letterkenny Army Depot, PA, and Corpus Christi Army Depot, TX. Retain 50 acres for Reserve Component (RC) use.

Justification: The decision to close Sacramento was driven by the need to consolidate functions in a time of decreasing resources. Based upon commodity studies done by the Services, the Defense Depot Maintenance Council (DDMC) evaluated DoD depot capacity in 21 separate studies and concluded that the Sacramento workload could be more economically and efficiently accommodated at other depots. Sacramento Army Depot is rated 7 out of 10 in the military value matrix. The three depots rated lower than Sacramento have critical ammunition missions that would preclude closure. Sacramento Army Depot is one of two "electronic repair" depots. High labor rates are a key reason the DDMC recommended shifting workload to other depots with idle capacity. Closure of Sacramento provides an immediate return on investment. Land value of zero was used in the analysis. The depot real estate (less 50 acres for the RC) is programmed for disposal after cleanup. Implementing this recommendation will save \$31M excluding any land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$56M.

Sacramento Army Depot is a National Priority List site. The Enhanced Preliminary Assessment is finished. Ground water and asbestos remedial actions are required and other cleanup costs are likely. Closure of the depot and redistribution of workload results in an employment change of -0.8% at Sacramento. Future reuse of Sacramento facilities after disposal may be expected to mitigate impact. Reserve components would retain 50 acres to house current USAR activities and to collocate activities in the region currently in leased space. Information Systems Command tenant will be relocated to Fort Lewis, WA. DLA supply activities would likely be moved to one of the facilities of Defense Depot West at Tracy or Sharpe Depots, both in California.

**Aviation Systems Command And Troop Support Command
Saint Louis, Missouri**

Recommendation: Merge Aviation Systems Command and Troop Support Command (AVSCOM/TROSCOM), St. Louis, MO, as part of the Inventory Control Point (ICP) consolidation under a Defense Management Report decision.

Justification: To improve efficiency of Army logistics, the Army's implementation of the Defense Management Report includes the consolidation of Inventory Control Points. The merging of AVSCOM and TROSCOM into one organization accomplishes part of the Defense Management Report by consolidating these organization in place. Military value in the form of management and costs efficiency was the driving factor for this recommendation. Of all the commodity oriented installations, the Price Support Center and the Saint Louis Federal Center which house the elements of AVSCOM and TROSCOM are rated 10 and 15 of 15, respectively. Neither facility will close under this recommendation. Merging AVSCOM and TROSCOM in place provides an immediate return on investment. Implementing this recommendation will save \$31M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$23M. There are no foreseen environmental impacts as a result of this proposal. Realignment results in a potential employment change of -0.1% in the Saint Louis, MO area due to personnel reductions which will be achieved by the merger of the two organizations.

Fort Polk, Louisiana

Recommendation: Realign 5th Infantry Division (Mechanized) to Fort Hood, TX from Fort Polk, LA; the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC) from Fort Chaffee, AR, to Fort Polk; in addition, realign 199th Separate Motorized Brigade (SMB) from Fort Lewis, WA to Fort Polk. The transfer of Fort Chaffee, AR to the Reserve Component is discussed in another paper (Fort Chaffee).

Justification: Realigning the 5th ID (MX) to Fort Hood allows the Army to fully utilize its finest fighting installation (Fort Hood) and to station the JRTC at the installation best suited to its requirements (Fort Polk). Fort Hood is the only installation which can house two divisions; fully utilizing the installation optimizes base operations. Fort Hood also ranks first in military value among fighting installations. Its ranges and training areas are outstanding as is its ability to support deployment. Realigning the 199th SMB operating force from Fort Lewis to Fort Polk enhances the training capability at JRTC as well as frees space at Fort Lewis for the 7th Infantry Division (Light). Fort Polk's military value is average relative to other similar installations; however, it has excellent permanent facilities and training areas ideally suited to light fighters.

The realignment of 5th ID (MX) and the 199th SMB, coupled with the transfer of Fort Chaffee to the Reserve Component (current temporary site of JRTC), provides a return on investment four years after the completion of the realignment. Implementing this recommendation (including the transfer of JRTC from Fort Chaffee to Fort Polk, the 5th ID (MX) from Fort Polk to Fort Hood and the 199th SMB from Fort Lewis to Fort Polk) will cost \$256M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$23M. Increases in population or in training tempo at Forts Hood and Polk could have minor adverse impact on the environment, principally in the areas of air pollution and land use. The proposed decrease in population at Fort Polk may result in a potential loss of approximately 25 percent of jobs in the area. Even with the JRTC and the 199th SMB, Fort Polk affords the Army with expansion capability in the future. Employment in the Fort Hood area will increase.

Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania

Recommendation: Realign the Headquarters, Depot Systems Command (DESCOM) (including the Systems Integration and Management Activity) from Letterkenny Army Depot to Rock Island Arsenal and merge it with the Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command (AMCCOM) to form the Industrial Operations Command (IOC). Relocate the Material Readiness Support Activity (MRSA) from Lexington-Bluegrass Army Depot to Redstone Arsenal, AL, along with the relocation of the Logistics Control Activity (LCA) from the Presidio of San Francisco, CA, to Redstone Arsenal, AL. This proposal is a revision to the recommendations of the 1988 Base Closure Commission, which directed MRSA to relocate from Lexington-Bluegrass Army Depot, KY, to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA. The merger of these two activities will form the Logistics Support Activity (LOGSA).

Losses in personnel at Letterkenny Army Depot are partially offset by a concurrent action to move the tactical missile maintenance workload from Anniston Army Depot, AL, Red River Army Depot, TX, Sacramento Army Depot, CA, Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA, and several Navy and Air Force industrial facilities into Letterkenny Army Depot and to realign the tactical vehicle and artillery maintenance workload from Letterkenny to Tooele, UT, and Red River Army Depots, TX, respectively.

Justification: To improve efficiency of the Army logistics, the Army's implementation of the Defense Management Report includes the consolidation of Inventory Control Points. Sixteen million dollars (\$16M) have already been programmed for building a facility for MRSA and LCA at Letterkenny Army Depot to implement a the 1988 Base Closure Commission recommendation. The Material Readiness Support Activity (MRSA) move to Letterkenny was specified by the 1988 Base Closure Commission. There are no additional costs to the changed destination of MRSA. Leaving MRSA at Letterkenny Army Depot would not be as operationally efficient as the proposed change.

In order to streamline management functions for industrial operations, DESCOM and AMCCOM are being merged into the IOC at Rock Island. Merging them at Letterkenny was also considered but was determined to be more costly.

Implementing this recommendation will cost \$3M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$2M. Changes in the force structure have indirect effects on industrial operations. The actual changes in workloads and required capacity will be affected by decisions on equipment policies that have not been made yet. When reviewing the military value matrix calculations, Letterkenny Army Depot rates 5 of 10 depot facilities. Moving DESCOM to Rock Island Arsenal provides an immediate return on investment. This action will have no effect on remedial environmental actions currently ongoing at any installation and the environmental impact the losing and gaining installations is expected to be minimal. These realignment actions may result in a potential employment change of -2.2% at Letterkenny.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois

Recommendation: Realign Armament, Munitions, and Chemical Command (AMCCOM) from Rock Island Arsenal, IL to Redstone Arsenal, AL, as part of the Inventory Control Point (ICP) consolidations under a Defense Management Report decision.

Justification: To improve efficiency of Army logistics, the Army's implementation of the Defense Management Report includes the consolidation of Inventory Control Points. Moving the armament portion of AMCCOM to Redstone Arsenal permits the Army to consolidate the missile and armament functions into one ICP. Changes in the force structure only have indirect effects on industrial operations. This recommendation is a business oriented decision to improve supply distribution efficiency.

Moving the AMCCOM Inventory Control Point to Redstone Arsenal provides an immediate return on investment. Implementing this recommendation (including the consolidation of the missile and armament functions into one ICP at Redstone Arsenal, AL, as well as formation of the Industrial Operations Command (IOC) at Rock Island, IL) will save \$2M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$66M. This action will have no effect on remedial environmental actions ongoing at any installation and the environmental impacts are expected to be minimal. These realignment actions may result in a potential employment change of +2.6% at Redstone Arsenal and -1.1% at Rock Island Arsenal. Losses in personnel at Rock Island Arsenal are partially offset by a concurrent action to move the Headquarters, Depot Systems Command (DESCOM) from Letterkenny Army Depot, PA, to Rock Island Arsenal, merging AMCCOM and DESCOM to form the Industrial Operations Command (IOC).

Realign Army Laboratories (LAB 21 Study)

Recommendation: The LAB 21 study establishes the Combat Materiel Research Laboratory (CMRL), at Adelphi, MD. The Army also recommends that the Army Material Technology Laboratory (AMTL), Watertown, MA not be split up and sent to Detroit Arsenal, Picatinny Arsenal and Fort Belvoir but instead that the AMTL be sent to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD less the Structures Element that should be collocated at the NASA-Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA. This proposal is a revision to the recommendations of the 1988 Base Closure Commission.

Justification: The decision to form the CMRL was driven by the LAB 21 Study and a Defense Management Report decision to consolidate Army laboratories to create a world class laboratory and achieve savings through a more efficient laboratory system. The military value of CMRL lies with the exploration of technology to be used in both the improvement of current of military systems and the development of future systems. The establishment of the CMRL will provide a return on investment in 3 years. Implementing this recommendation will cost \$92M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$51M. The establishment of CMRL will have minimum environmental impact. The establishment of CMRL may result in a potential employment change of +0.1% in the Adelphi, Maryland area. Specific realignments for the CMRL follow:

- o Move the Army Research Institute (ARI) MANPRINT function from Alexandria, VA to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD.

- o Move the 6.1 and 6.2 materials elements from the Belvoir Research and Development Center, VA to APG, MD.

- o Move the Army Materials Technology Laboratory (AMTL) (less Structures element) from Watertown, MA to APG (Change to the recommendations of the 1988 Base Closure Commission).

- o Move the AMTL Structures element to the Army Aviation Aerostructures Directorate collocated at NASA-Langley Research Center at Hampton, VA and expand the mission at that site to form an Army Structures Directorate. (Change to the recommendations of the 1988 Base Closure Commission).

- o Move the Directed Energy & Sensors Basic and Applied Research element of the Center for Night Vision and Electro-Optics at Fort Belvoir, VA to Adelphi, MD.

- o Move the Electronic Technology Device Laboratory from Fort Monmouth, NJ to Adelphi, MD.

o Move the Battlefield Environment Effects element of the Atmospheric Science Laboratory at White Sands Missile Range, NM to Adelphi, MD.

o Move Ground Vehicle Propulsion Basic and Applied Research from Warren, MI to the Army Aviation Propulsion Directorate collocated at the NASA-Lewis Research Center in Cleveland, OH to form the Army Propulsion Directorate.

o Move the Harry Diamond Laboratories Woodbridge Research Facility element to CMRL, Adelphi, MD and close/dispose of the Woodbridge, VA facility.

o Move the Fuze Development and Production Mission (Armament related) from Harry Diamond Laboratories, Adelphi, MD to Picatinny Arsenal (ARDEC), NJ.

o Move the Fuse Development and Production Mission (Missile related) from Harry Diamond Laboratories, Adelphi, MD to Redstone Arsenal (MRDEC), AL.

Tri-Service Project Reliance Study

Recommendation: Execute the Tri-Service Project Reliance medical research aspects of a Defense Management Report decision by reducing the number of Army medical research labs from 9 to 6. This action includes disestablishing the Letterman Army Institute of Research (LAIR), Presidio of San Francisco, CA (change to the 1988 Base Closure Commission recommendation); disestablishing the U.S. Army Institute of Dental Research (USAIDR), Washington, DC and disestablishing U.S. Army Biomedical Research Development Laboratory (USABRDL), Fort Detrick, MD. The proposal recommends consolidating the Army's trauma research and medical materiel development with existing Army medical Research Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) facilities. The proposal also recommends the collocation of seven Tri-Service medical research programs at existing Army, Navy and Air Force medical laboratories as follows: the Army blood research with the Navy; the Army combat dentistry with the Navy; Army directed energy (laser and microwave) bioeffects with the Air Force; elements of the Army and Navy biodynamics with the Air Force; Navy and Army toxicology (environmental quality and occupational health) with the Air Force; Navy infectious disease research and Air Force environmental medicine (heat physiology) with the Army.

Justification: Realigning medical research laboratories and programs achieves efficiencies through inter-department consolidations, transfers and reliance in technology. Medical research activities are relatively unaffected by changes in force structure. Military value in the form of mission requirements and the technological capabilities of existing staff expertise and facilities were the driving factors in this recommendation. Implementation of Project Reliance medical realignments results in steady state savings to the Army from elimination of civilian authorizations. This proposal changes the recommendation of the 1988 Base Closure Commission that previously identified LAIR for movement to Fort Detrick, MD. Under this proposal, LAIR is disestablished and the construction of a new laboratory at Fort Detrick is eliminated. Implementing the LAIR portion of this recommendation will save \$56M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$7M. Environmental and community impacts are expected to be minimal. Closure of LAIR, USABRDL and USAIDR and other realignments may result in potential employment impacts of 0.8% at Fort Detrick, MD and less than .1% at other installations. Specific realignments are:

o Disestablish the Letterman Army Institute of Research (LAIR) as part of the closure of the Presidio of San Francisco, cancel the design and construction of the replacement laboratory at Fort Detrick, Maryland, and realign LAIRs research programs in the following manner (Change to recommendations of the 1988 Base Closure Commission):

-- Move trauma research to the U.S. Army Institute of Surgical Research, Fort Sam Houston, TX.

-- Move blood research and collocate with the Naval Medical Research Institute (NMRI), Bethesda, MD.

-- Move laser bioeffects research and collocate with the U.S. Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine (USAFSAM), Brooks Air Force Base, TX.

o Disestablish U.S. Army Biomedical Research Development Laboratory at Fort Detrick, MD, and transfer medical materiel research to the U.S. Army Medical Materiel and Development Activity at Fort Detrick and collocate environmental and occupational toxicology research with the Armstrong Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory (AAMRL) at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH.

o Disestablish the U.S. Army Institute of Dental Research, Washington, DC and collocate combat dentistry research with the Naval Dental Research Institute at Great Lakes Naval Base, IL.

o Move microwave bioeffects research from Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (WRAIR), Washington, DC and collocate with USAFSAM.

o Move infectious disease research from NMRI and collocate with WRAIR.

o Move biodynamics research from U.S. Army Aeromedical Research Laboratory, Fort Rucker, AL and collocate with AAMRL.

o Move heat physiology research from USAFSAM and collocate with U.S. Army Research Institute of Environmental Medicine (USARIEM), Natick, MA.

Department of the Navy

Summary of Selection Process**Introduction**

By 1995, the Navy will have 12 aircraft carriers and 11 active carrier air wings which is one fewer aircraft carrier and two fewer carrier air wings than in 1990. Navy battle force ships will decline from 545 to 451 ships, a 17% reduction. The Navy will also have 73,000 fewer active duty personnel, a 13% reduction. The Marine Corps will undergo a 15% reduction in active duty personnel. These factors require a reduction in the Navy and Marine Corps base structure.

The Navy's basing structure is focused primarily on homeporting active and reserve ships and carrier air wings. The Marine Corps basing structure is focused primarily on support of the Marine Expeditionary Forces. The base structure also provides the requisite training, logistics, and housing and related support. Forward deployment operations, supported by a few overseas bases, and the domestic base structure allow Navy and Marine Corps forces to respond to the full spectrum of international conflict.

The Selection Process

The Secretary of the Navy established a Base Structure Committee chaired by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Environment) to ensure that a high level, comprehensive base structure review was conducted. The Committee reviewed all installations inside the United States on an equal footing, without regard to whether the installation was previously considered for closure or realignment. They also reviewed geographic complexes in order to identify key installations whose closure could warrant other closures or realignments within those complexes.

The Committee received operational input from the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps. Internal controls and the use of existing data bases ensured data accuracy.

The Committee categorized all facilities according to function and determined which categories possessed significant excess capacity to warrant a further, detailed analysis. The Committee separated the training category

into sub-areas for additional capacity analysis.

Missions, capabilities, and attributes determined categories. For example, "Naval Stations" serve as home ports for ships. "Naval Air Stations" serve as the home base for aircraft. However, some naval air stations possess waterfront property to berth ships. These bases were not considered naval stations, but their berthing capacity was taken into account in the naval station capacity analysis.

In conducting the capacity analysis, the Committee determined critical facility codes for each category of shore installation. These served as the unit of measure for determining the capacity of a base. The Committee then considered these critical factors as well as projected deployment schedules, planning criteria, data from existing data bases and unique factors relating forces to critical facilities in the capacity analysis. Some other considerations were air installation compatible use zones, airspace congestion, and explosives safety.

After validating that some categories possessed excess capacity and evaluating the military value of bases in those categories, the Committee arrived at a list of closure or realignment candidates. The Committee then evaluated the potential costs and savings, economic impact, community infrastructure and environmental impact on these candidates (and any potential receiving locations) before making its nominations to the Secretary of the Navy. The Committee also evaluated multi-service alternatives.

The Secretary of the Navy, with the advice of the Chief of Naval Operations and Commandant of the Marine Corps, nominated bases to the Secretary of Defense for closure or realignment based on the force structure plan and the final criteria established under Public Law 101-510. The Secretary of Defense recommends the following Navy and Marine Corps bases for closure or realignment:

Recommendations and Justifications

Chase Field Naval Air Station, Texas

Recommendation: Naval Air Station (NAS) Chase Field is recommended for closure, with retention of the capability to be operated as an outlying field (OLF) for an undetermined period of time. Air operations personnel will be retained as necessary to operate the OLF. Air training squadrons and all other tenants will be disestablished. All basic and advanced strike air training will be accomplished at NAS Kingsville, TX, and NAS Meridian, MS. Air training squadrons at those locations will be expanded to handle any increase in student throughput, especially during transition. Runway improvements will be made at NAS Kingsville to improve safety and efficiency of additional flight operations.

Justification: Projected force structure reductions of both aircraft carriers and carrier air wings will result in reductions in the Navy's annual strike pilot training rate (PTR). This equates to an excess of approximately one of the current three advanced air training installations.

In conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered for closure, on an equal basis, all three advanced air training installations along with all other air stations. Initially, using the first four DOD selection criteria, the military value of all three was evaluated. NAS Chase Field was graded lower in military value for these key reasons:

- Chase Field has infrastructure deficiencies requiring construction--buildings and training devices are still required there to introduce new T-45 aircraft to replace aging T-2 and TA-4 aircraft.
- Chase Field can more readily function as an OLF than NAS Kingsville, and NAS Meridian cannot so function due to distance from the other two.
- Realignment of Chase Field is easily reversible should the world situation dictate increased force structure with a commensurate increase in strike pilot training.

The BSC concluded NAS Chase Field was the most likely candidate for closure, and then considered the other DOD selection criteria as they pertain to closure of NAS Chase Field. Specifically, closure of NAS Chase Field will eliminate over 2300 direct and indirect positions (approximately 27.4% of the employment in the area). This will slow the housing market and reduce school district population by nearly 1000 students. No significant impacts are anticipated at the receiving locations. Continued use of the Chase airfield will not change the environmental impacts on the area. Removal of personnel will, however,

remove main pollution sources (less congestion and pollution). Return on investment was favorable. NAS Chase Field is not on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing this recommendation will cost about \$48 million. The anticipated land value is \$2 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$22 million.

Davisville Construction Battalion Center, Rhode Island

Recommendation: Naval Construction Battalion Center (NCBC) Davisville is recommended for closure. Three sets of equipment and tools for Reserve Naval Mobile Construction Battalions (NMCB), and other Prepositioned War Reserve Material Stock (PWRMS) will be relocated to NCBCs Gulfport, MS, and Port Hueneme, CA.

Justification: Projected reduction of the Naval Construction Force (NCF) by two Reserve NMCBs enables reduction in the support infrastructure to balance assets with requirements.

In conformance with the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered, on an equal basis, all three NCBCs for closure or reduction. Initially, the military value of each was evaluated, using the DOD selection criteria. NCBC Davisville was graded lowest of the three on military value, for these key reasons:

- The reduced mission of NCBC Davisville since it will no longer be designated as a throughput site for mobilizing reserve personnel.
- The deteriorated condition of personnel support facilities at NCBC Davisville.
- The high degree of readiness of the Reserve Naval Construction Force, as evidenced during Desert Shield/Storm. This almost eliminates pre-deployment training requirements.
- The significant mobilization and support capability of NCBCs Port Hueneme and Gulfport, also exhibited during Desert Shield/Storm.

The BSC concluded that NCBC Davisville is a likely candidate for closure, and then considered the other DOD selection criteria. Specifically, closure of NCBC Davisville would result in the loss of 250 direct and indirect positions, which equates to 0.3% of the metropolitan statistical area. There will be an insignificant impact on local public schools. Environmental impacts at NCBCs Gulfport and Port Hueneme will be inconsequential since both installations are already engaged in similar activities, but on a much larger scale than will be transferred. NCBC Davisville is not on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing this recommendation will cost about \$36 million. The anticipated land value is \$22 million. Annual saving after implementation is expected to be \$6 million.

Hunters Point Annex, California

Recommendation: The Hunters Point Annex of Naval Station Treasure Island is recommended for closure. The Navy will outlease the entire property with provisions for continued occupancy of space by Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair (SUPSHIP); Planning, Engineering, Repair and Alterations Detachment (PERA), and a contractor-operated test facility. This is a change to the 1988 Base Closure Commission recommendation to partially close this installation.

Justification: The Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered all naval stations for closure on an equal basis in conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Initially, using the first four DOD selection criteria, the military value of all eighteen stations was evaluated. Hunters Point Annex was graded lower in military value for these key reasons:

- Significantly reduced mission capability, and adverse impact on Drydock #4 certification, as a result of future encroachment due to mandated outleasing.
- Reduced need for Drydock #4.
- Serious infrastructure deficiencies which degrade mission capability and have a limited prospect for correction.

The BSC concluded that Hunters Point Annex was a likely candidate for closure, with SUPSHIP, PERA and the testing facility to remain at the site under lease-back provisions. The BSC then considered the other DOD selection criteria. Specifically, closure of Hunters Point Annex will have no significant impacts on the environment and socioeconomic status of the San Francisco Bay area. This area is already under legislative direction to be leased. Hunters Point Annex is on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Costs to implement this recommendation will be minimal. The anticipated land value is \$13 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$319 thousand.

Long Beach Naval Station, California

Recommendation: Naval Station (NAVSTA) Long Beach and the supporting Naval Hospital Long Beach are recommended for closure. Ship support functions and a parcel of land will be transferred to the Naval Shipyard. Ships assigned to the Naval Station will be reassigned to other Pacific Fleet homeports.

Justification: Substantial ship reductions in the planned force structure will result in excess berthing capacity and unneeded infrastructure. Berthing can be accomplished more economically and efficiently by consolidating remaining ships at other naval stations, thereby enabling closure of some homeports.

The Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered all naval stations for closure on an equal basis in conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Initially, using the first four DOD selection criteria, the military value of all eighteen naval stations was evaluated. NAVSTA Long Beach was graded low in military value for these key reasons:

- Significant facility deficiencies exist at NAVSTA Long Beach, which require construction to correct.
- Long Beach is a high cost location.
- Insufficient capacity to consolidate homeporting of all Southern California ships.
- Homeport location duplicative of nearby San Diego.

The BSC concluded that NAVSTA Long Beach was a likely candidate for closure, with personnel support facilities (including family housing) and functions supporting the shipyard and ships undergoing overhaul and repair to be realigned under Naval Shipyard Long Beach. Additionally, given the support role relationship of Naval hospitals to active duty military population in a given area (i.e., hospitals are "follower" installations), if NAVSTA Long Beach were to close, Naval Hospital Long Beach also would close.

The BSC then considered the other DOD selection criteria as they pertain to Long Beach. Specifically, closure of NAVSTA and Naval Hospital Long Beach will affect over 23,550 direct and indirect positions and 6,000 shipboard personnel. This equates to a cumulative 0.5% loss of employment in the area. In all cases, relocation of ships and NAVSTA operations will improve the environment. Since the receiving site will not be gaining more ships but rather replacing ships lost from the force structure, no negative impacts there are anticipated. NAVSTA Long Beach is not on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Moffett Field Naval Air Station, California

Recommendation: Naval Air Station (NAS) Moffett Field is recommended for closure. Three active duty maritime patrol squadrons will be decommissioned and the remaining active duty maritime patrol squadrons will be relocated to NAS Barbers Point, HI, NAS Brunswick, ME, and NAS Jacksonville, FL. A single P-3 Fleet Replacement Squadron (FRS) will be sited at Jacksonville.

Justification: Projected force structure reductions in Maritime Patrol Aircraft (MPA) enable reductions in the MPA support shore infrastructure to balance assets to requirements and eliminate excesses. Projected MPA reductions equate to approximately one air station.

In conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered for closure, on an equal basis, all four MPA installations along with all other air stations. Initially, using the first four DOD selection criteria, the military value of all four MPA installations was evaluated. NAS Moffett Field was graded low in military value for these key reasons:

- Air operations at NAS Moffett Field are severely encroached by air traffic at San Francisco International and San Jose and Palo Alto Municipal Airports, and air accident potential zones are particularly severe to the south with multi-family residential development.
- NAS Moffett Field operations cannot be expanded due to adjacent development. Planned multi-story construction will further encroach on operations.
- NAS Moffett Field is located in a high cost region.

The BSC concluded that NAS Moffett Field was a likely candidate for closure, and then considered the other DOD selection criteria for NAS Moffett Field. Specifically, closure of NAS Moffett Field will result in the loss of 7000 direct and indirect positions. This equates to a 0.8% employment loss in the immediate South Peninsula/San Jose metropolitan area. Air operations are expected to be continued by other aviation businesses which may be expected to mitigate the economic impact. A 28% loss of students is anticipated in the local school district, which may be partly mitigated if the Air Force decides to occupy Navy housing. Termination of Navy flight operations will eliminate certain environmental concerns for the area. Return on investment was extremely favorable. NAS Moffett Field is on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List, and environmental restoration is underway.

Implementing this recommendation will cost about \$106 million. The anticipated land value is \$90 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$69 million.

Orlando Naval Training Center, Florida

Recommendation: Naval Training Center (NTC) Orlando and the supporting Naval Hospital Orlando are recommended for closure. Recruit training will be absorbed by NTC Great Lakes, IL, and NTC San Diego, CA. The nuclear training function and all "A" schools will be relocated.

Justification: Future force structure reductions and substantial reductions in Navy manpower produce reductions in requirements for basic recruit and follow-on training. As a result, slightly over two Recruit Training Centers (RTCs) can accommodate future requirements, leaving an excess capacity of approximately one RTC.

The Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered all training installations on an equal basis in conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Initially, the military value of each training installation was evaluated using the first four DOD selection criteria. The BSC further considered the three NTCs because of excess recruit training capacity and the desirability and benefit of collocating recruit training with a Service School Command. All things considered, NTC Orlando graded lower in military value than the other two NTCs for these key reasons:

- Desirability of retaining the NTC in San Diego because of its collocation with major fleet concentrations.
- The very significant capital investment in complex, sophisticated and expensive training devices, systems and buildings at NTC Great Lakes.
- The expansion and surge capability at NTC Great Lakes, and the lack of surge or expansion capability at NTC Orlando.

The BSC concluded that NTC Orlando was the most likely candidate for closure. Given the support role relationship of naval hospitals to active duty military population in a given area (i.e., hospitals are "follower" installations), if NTC Orlando were to close, Naval Hospital Orlando would also close.

The BSC then considered other DOD selection criteria as they pertain to the closure to the Orlando complex. Closure of the Orlando Naval Complex will affect over 18,400 direct and indirect positions and reduce area employment by approximately 3.2%. The reduction is expected to be temporary because of the growth potential of the area. While NTC Orlando is not an industrial polluter, removal of the operation will improve environmental quality by reducing congestion. An increase of positions and students at Great Lakes, however, will not significantly contribute to environmental problems. NTC Orlando is not on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing this recommendation will cost about \$456 million. The anticipated land value is \$130 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$69 million.

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, Pennsylvania

Recommendation: Naval Shipyard (NSY) Philadelphia is recommended for closure and preservation for emergent requirements. The propeller facility (shops and foundry), Naval Inactive Ships Maintenance Facility, (NISMF), and Naval Ship System Engineering Station (NAVSSSES) will remain in active status on shipyard property.

Justification: Substantial ship reductions and changes in the planned force structure will lead to reductions in ship repair requirements and termination of the Carrier Service Life Extension Program (CV-SLEP). Closure of a NSY is necessary to balance the Navy's industrial workforce with this reduced workload.

The Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered all NSYs for closure on an equal basis in conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Initially, the military value of each NSY was evaluated, using the first four DOD selection criteria. However, because workload in the remainder of the century includes a large number of availabilities (inactivations, overhauls and refuelings) on nuclear ships, the nuclear-capable NSYs were excluded from further consideration at this time. Also, the need to preserve drydock capability on the West Coast for contingency or emergency work on nuclear carriers, and recurring availabilities for large surface ships, necessitated exclusion of NSY Long Beach, CA, from further consideration for closure. This left only NSY Philadelphia still under consideration for closure. Given excessive yard capability for non-nuclear work and the termination of the CV-SLEP, NSY Philadelphia was determined to be a likely candidate for closure. Additional study by the BSC determined that the propeller facility, NAVSSSES and NISMF should be retained.

The BSC then considered the other DOD selection criteria. Specifically, closure of the shipyard would result in the loss of nearly 31,000 direct and indirect positions, and 7000 additional ship-associated personnel. This, together with the job loss associated with closure of the Naval Station, equates to a 2.1% cumulative employment reduction in the metropolitan area. While causing an oversupply of housing in an already slow market, no additional impacts are anticipated. Termination of shipyard operations will reduce the source of potential pollution and will have a positive environmental effect. NSY Philadelphia is not on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing this recommendation will cost about \$130 million. The anticipated land value is \$10 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$36 million.

Philadelphia Naval Station, Pennsylvania

Recommendation: Naval Station (NAVSTA) Philadelphia is recommended for closure. Ships assigned to the Naval Station will be reassigned to other Atlantic Fleet homeports. COMNAVBASE Philadelphia will close. Naval Damage Control Training Center (NAVDAMCONTRACEN), a major tenant, will also close and move to Naval Training Center (NTC) Great Lakes, IL. Other tenants will transfer to other bases or remain in leased space. The regional brig will remain.

Justification: Substantial ship reductions in the planned force structure will result in excess berthing capacity and unneeded infrastructure. Berthing can be accomplished more economically and efficiently by consolidating remaining ships at other naval stations, enabling closure of some homeports.

The Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered all naval stations for closure on an equal basis in conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Initially, using the first four DOD selection criteria, the military value of all eighteen naval stations was evaluated. NAVSTA Philadelphia was graded lower in military value for these key reasons:

- Significant facility deficiencies exist at NAVSTA Philadelphia, which require construction to correct.
- Philadelphia is a high cost location.
- Mission reduction will occur at NAVSTA Philadelphia as a result of eliminated support requirements for the Naval shipyard, which is also recommended for closure.

The BSC concluded that NAVSTA Philadelphia was a likely candidate for closure, although the brig would remain. Additionally, because of its tenant relationship to the NAVSTA and the desirability of consolidating damage control training at NTC Great Lakes, if NAVSTA Philadelphia were closed, NAVDAMCONTRACEN would also be closed and relocated to Great Lakes.

The BSC then considered the other DOD selection criteria as they pertain to Philadelphia. Specifically, closure of NAVSTA and NAVDAMCONTRACEN Philadelphia would affect over 9100 direct and indirect positions. This employment loss, together with the loss associated with closure of the shipyard, is a 2.1% employment loss. In addition to employment impacts, a resultant over-abundance of housing is anticipated with the prospect of slow home sales. Since receiving stations have adequate capacity to accept the functions transferred from NAVSTA Philadelphia, and these assets will replace force structure losses, no environmental impacts are anticipated. NAVSTA Philadelphia is not on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing this recommendation will cost about \$53 million. The anticipated land value is \$20 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$40 million.

Sand Point (Puget Sound) Naval Station, Washington

Recommendation: Naval Station Puget Sound (Sand Point) is recommended for closure. A majority of the functions and activities will be relocated to Everett, WA. The regional brig and a small surrounding parcel of land will be retained. The Navy will dispose of the remainder of the property. This is a change to the 1988 Base Closure Commission recommendation to partially close this installation.

Justification: The Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered all naval stations for closure on an equal basis in conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Initially, using the first four DOD selection criteria, the military value of all eighteen naval stations was evaluated. NAVSTA Puget Sound (Sand Point) was graded low in military value for these key reasons:

- Previous reductions of missions and functions at Sand Point due to base realignments, culminating in loss of nearly one-half of the property from action by the 1988 Base Realignment and Closure Commission.
- Planned relocation of Commander, Naval Base Seattle, WA, who is the Navy's Pacific Northwest regional coordinator, to Submarine Base Bangor, consistent with his concurrent responsibilities as Commander, Submarine Group Nine.
- Need to eventually move Commanding Officer, NAVSTA Puget Sound from Sand Point to Everett as construction at Everett is completed.
- No other long term mission requirement for Sand Point property (except for the regional brig).

The BSC concluded that NAVSTA Puget Sound (Sand Point) was a likely candidate for closure, although the brig and a small surrounding parcel would be retained. The BSC then considered the other DOD selection criteria. Specifically, closure of NAVSTA Puget Sound (Sand Point) would affect almost 1800 direct and indirect positions. However, taking into account additional homeporting in Everett, there is a net increase of 860 positions in the metropolitan statistical area. This employment impact is less than 0.1%. No community impacts are anticipated at either Sand Point or the receiving base. The Sand Point property is not on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing this recommendation will cost about \$28 million. The anticipated land value is \$25 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$2 million.

Tustin Marine Corps Air Station, California

Recommendation: Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS), Tustin is recommended for closure. Family housing and related personnel support facilities will be retained in support of MCAS El Toro, CA, personnel. Marine Aircraft Group 16 (MAG-16), the air station's headquarters components and related units will be transferred to a new air station to be constructed at the Marine Air Ground Combat Center (MCAGCC), Twentynine Palms, CA. Prior to relocation, MAG-16 and MAG-39 at MCAS Camp Pendleton, CA, will be combined, mixing attack, light utility, and medium and heavy lift helicopters.

Justification: Current and projected requirements necessitate restructuring aviation support to complement combined arms training with today's faster, longer range and more lethal weapon systems. In conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Department of the Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered all domestic MCASs on an equal basis (except MCAS Yuma, AZ, which has a unique mission). Initially, military value was evaluated, using the first four DOD selection criteria. MCAS Tustin was graded lowest in military value because surrounding urban growth is causing incremental reductions in mission capability. Both the Air Station proper and air space used by low-flying helicopters are being encroached on by urbanized areas. Also, its facility plant is aging, with numerous deficiencies stemming from condition and configuration. MCAS Tustin was originally designed to support blimps during World War II and has limited potential for further adaptation to support future Marine Corps mission changes.

The BSC concluded that MCAS Tustin was a likely candidate for closure, moving helicopter support to MCAGCC Twentynine Palms to be integral with supported ground training at Camp Pendleton. Additionally, combining MAG-16 and MAG-39 at MCAS Camp Pendleton would be required because the greater distance from Camp Pendleton to Twentynine Palms than Tustin makes it uneconomic and impractical to maintain all West Coast light utility and attack assets in MAG-39, and all medium and heavy lift assets in MAG-16.

The BSC then considered the other DOD selection criteria as they pertain to closure of MCAS Tustin. Specifically, while almost 7,400 military and civilian positions would be directly and indirectly affected, the percentage of employment loss in the statistical area will be significantly below 1%. The gaining location will experience largely positive economic impacts through an increase in jobs. The same factors that limit its military value provide MCAS Tustin with an unusually high civil value for redevelopment. Adjacent finished lots have sold for in excess of \$1 million an acre, making a high-value sale of MCAS Tustin more likely than most locations.

MCAS Tustin is not on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities list.

Implementing this recommendation will cost about \$609 million. The anticipated land value is \$500 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$30 million.

Whidbey Island Naval Air Station, Washington

Recommendation: Naval Air Station (NAS) Whidbey Island and the supporting Naval Hospital Oak Harbor are recommended for closure. Aviation activities will be transferred to NAS Lemoore. The ranges will remain in Navy custody. Naval Facility Whidbey Island will remain. The Navy will dispose of other land and facilities.

Justification: Projected force structure reductions in aircraft carriers, carrier air wings, and A-6 aircraft will result in excess carrier aviation support shore infrastructure. This excess capacity equates to approximately one air station.

In conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered for closure, on an equal basis, all carrier aviation support installations along with all other air stations. Initially, using the first four DOD selection criteria, the military value of all carrier aviation support installations was evaluated. NAS Whidbey Island was graded low in military value for these key reasons:

- Available capacity at NAS Lemoore, CA.
- Single runway configuration at NAS Whidbey which limits operational flexibility and future growth.
- Encroachment at NAS Whidbey outlying field.
- Previous studies to relocate EA-6B squadrons to NAS Lemoore and eventually consolidate all West Coast attack squadrons at NAS Lemoore.
- Reduction of A-6 aircraft.
- Substantial reduction in maritime patrol aircraft which were previously planned to backfill A-6 mission reduction at NAS Whidbey Island.

The BSC concluded that NAS Whidbey Island was a likely candidate for closure. Given the support role relationship of naval hospitals to active duty military population in a given area (i.e., hospitals are "follower" installations), if NAS Whidbey Island were to close, Naval Hospital Oak Harbor also would close.

The BSC then considered other DOD selection criteria. Specifically, closure of NAS Whidbey Island and Naval Hospital Oak Harbor will precipitate the loss of over 11,700 direct and indirect positions. The cumulative effects will be a 58.3% loss of employment in the Island County area, and impacts on housing and schools. Additional facilities will be required at NAS Lemoore. The addition of almost 6000 positions at NAS Lemoore will tax housing and local school systems there. NAS Whidbey Island is on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing this recommendation will cost about \$492 million. The anticipated land value is \$33 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$76 million.

Midway Island Naval Air Facility, Midway

Recommendation: Naval Air Facility Midway Island is recommended for realignment. The mission of the Naval Air Facility would be eliminated. Currently it is operated under a Base Operating Support Contract with a minimum of military personnel providing contract surveillance. Only a caretaker presence of 48 personnel would remain.

Justification: The mission of NAF Midway Island will be eliminated. Although in a strategic geographic location, current Navy operations do not require its retention.

In conformance with the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) considered for closure or reduction, on an equal basis, all Naval Air Stations (including NAF Midway Island). Initially, the military value of each was evaluated, using the DOD selection criteria. NAF Midway Island was graded lower in military value for these key reasons:

- Reduced site-specific mission requirements of NAF Midway Island.
- The acceptable degradation to "Pony Express" joint operations.

The BSC concluded that NAF Midway Island is a likely candidate for closure, and then considered the other DOD selection criteria. Specifically, realignment of NAF Midway Island would result in the loss of 230 contractor direct and indirect positions, which is the entire civilian population of Midway Island. Environmental impacts at NAF Midway Island would be inconsequential since operations there will cease and there is no relocation. NAF Midway Island is not on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing this recommendation will cost virtually nothing. The anticipated land value is \$38 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$6.0 million.

Naval Air Warfare Center

Recommendation: As an integral part of the Navy's RDT&E, Engineering and Fleet Support Consolidation Plan, six realignments and one closure, as described in the accompanying table, are recommended in connection with establishment of the Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC).

Justification: Consolidation of the Navy's RDT&E, engineering and Fleet support activities is driven by Congressionally mandated reductions in the Navy's overall budget and acquisition workforce. These activities will be consolidated along mission and functional lines in four centers. The missions of the activities will be purified, so that each activity will be assigned unique technology leadership areas. All work tasked in these leadership areas will be performed only at the cognizant activity. The purification process will lead to development of critical mass technical capability in each area.

With headquarters in Washington, DC, NAWC will be the Navy's full spectrum center for air platforms and air warfare combat and weapons systems. NAWC will be organized into two major divisions:

- **Aircraft Division:** centered at Patuxent River, MD; primarily responsible for aircraft, engines, avionics and aircraft support; with activities located at Indianapolis, IN, and Lakehurst, NJ, and facilities at Trenton, NJ.
- **Weapons Division:** centered at China Lake, CA, and Pt. Mugu, CA; primarily responsible for aircraft weapons and weapons systems, simulators and targets; and with a facility at White Sands, NM.

In development and review of the plan, all RDT&E facilities were considered on an equal basis, in conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. The Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) validated the plan using the DOD selection criteria. For example, and most notably, Naval Air Development Center (NADC), Warminster, graded lower in military value, for these key reasons:

- NADC has no facilities that cannot be replicated elsewhere.
- Other activities are uniquely tied to their location.
- NADC has a constrained airspace over densely populated areas, which is not suitable for flight testing high performance aircraft.
- NADC has limited land for expansion to accommodate consolidation.

The BSC noted that almost 3300 eliminated positions at eight installations were directly attributable to site-specific workload reductions, rather than streamlining or consolidation. The BSC also considered the other DOD selection criteria. The economic and environmental issues associated with each site were evaluated. Exclusive of site-specific workload reductions, establishment of NAWC will result in elimination of approximately 910 positions and transfer of approximately 2020 positions. Details related to each site are summarized in the table below. Of the sites in question, NADC Warminster and Lakehurst are on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing these recommendations will cost about \$226 million. The anticipated land value is \$27 million. Annual savings after implementation is expected to be \$62 million.

**Table of Recommendations to Establish
Naval Air Warfare Center**

A. Realignments and Closures:

1. Naval Air Development Center (NADC), Warminster, PA, will be disestablished as a separate technical command and Aircraft Division. The bulk of its functions will be transferred to Patuxent River MD. Custody of, and personnel to sustain, unique navigation facilities will transfer to Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center. The airfield will close. Military family housing will be retained. A total of approximately 2250 positions will be either transferred or eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

2. Naval Air Propulsion Center (NAPC), Trenton, NJ, will be disestablished as a separate technical command and realigned to merge with the Aircraft Division. Engineering personnel will be transferred to Patuxent River. High altitude engine testing will be transferred to the U.S. Air Force. Unique engine test cells will be maintained and operated at the site. A total of approximately 360 positions will be transferred or eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

3. Naval Air Engineering Center (NAEC), Lakehurst, NJ, will be disestablished as a separate technical command and realigned to merge with the Aircraft Division. The Naval Air Engineering Station will be established to maintain the operating site. A total of approximately 460 positions will be eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

4. Naval Avionics Center (NAC), Indianapolis, IN, will be disestablished as a separate technical command and realigned to merge with the Aircraft Division. Naval Avionics Station, Indianapolis, will be established to maintain the operating site. A total of approximately 630 positions will be eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

5. Naval Weapons Center (NWC), China Lake, CA, will be disestablished as a separate technical command, realigned under Weapons Division. A net total of approximately 1110 positions will be either transferred or eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

6. Pacific Missile Test Center (PMTTC), Pt. Mugu, CA, will be disestablished as a separate technical command and realigned to merge with the Weapons Division. A net total of 820 positions will be eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

7. Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility (NWEF), Albuquerque, NM, will transfer functions to the Weapons Division and close. A total of approximately 110 positions will be transferred or eliminated.

B. Others:

Although not falling into the categories of closure or realignment, the following installations are integral to the overall plan and success of the NAWC consolidation.

1. Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, MD, will be disestablished as a separate technical command and realigned to merge with the Aircraft Division. A net total of approximately 1300 positions will be gained at NATC Patuxent due to streamlining, net transfer and specific workload reductions.

2. Naval Ordnance Missile Test Station (NOMTS), White Sands, NM, will be downsized approximately 14 positions due to specific workload reductions, and realigned to operate as a facility of the Weapons Division.

Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center

Recommendation: As an integral part of the Navy's RDT&E, Engineering and Fleet Support Consolidation Plan, seven closures and one realignment, as described in the accompanying table, are recommended in connection with establishment of the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center (NCCOSC).

Justification: Consolidation of the Navy's RDT&E, engineering and Fleet support activities is driven by Congressionally mandated reductions in the Navy's overall budget and acquisition workforce. These activities will be consolidated along mission and functional lines in four centers. The missions of the activities will be purified, so that each activity will be assigned unique technology leadership areas. All work tasked in these leadership areas will be performed only at the cognizant activity. The purification process will lead to development of critical mass technical capability in each area.

With headquarters in Washington, DC, NCCOSC will be the Navy's full spectrum center for maritime command, control and communications and intelligence (C3I), ocean surveillance technology, and fleet and shore support. NCCOSC will be organized in three major divisions:

- **RDT&E Directorate:** primarily responsible for the development of C3I systems, ocean surveillance systems and navigation support; located at San Diego, with facilities in Warminster, PA.
- **West Coast In-Service Engineering (ISE) Directorate:** primarily responsible for shipboard satellite communications, navigation and Pacific ISE support; collocated with the RDT&E Directorate at San Diego, with an operating site at Pearl Harbor.
- **East Coast ISE Directorate:** primarily responsible for shore communications, air traffic control and Atlantic ISE support; solely located at Portsmouth, VA.

In development and review of the Plan, all RDT&E facilities were considered on an equal basis, in conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. The Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) validated the plan using the first four DOD selection criteria. For example, several activities were graded higher in military value, for these key reasons:

- Availability of land and facilities to accommodate consolidation.
- Proximity to Fleet concentrations.
- Greater difficulty to relocate larger rather than smaller activities.

The BSC noted that approximately 790 eliminated positions at three installations were directly attributable to site-specific workload reductions, rather than streamlining or consolidation. The BSC also considered the other DOD selection criteria. The economic and environmental issues associated with each site were evaluated. Exclusive of site-specific workload reductions, establishment of NCCOSC will result in elimination of approximately 46 positions and transfer of approximately 2310 positions. Details related to each site are summarized in the table. None of the sites in question is on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing the recommendations will cost about \$64 million. Annually, the recommendations will save about \$13 million.

**Table of Recommendations to Establish
the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center**

A. Realignments and Closures:

1. Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center (NESEC), Vallejo, CA, will transfer its functions to the West Coast ISE Directorate at San Diego, CA, and close. A total of approximately 310 positions will be transferred.
2. Naval Space Systems Activity (NSSA), Los Angeles, CA, will transfer all of its functions to the RDT&E Directorate at San Diego, and the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command in Washington, DC, and close. A total of approximately 30 positions will be transferred.
3. Naval Ocean Systems Center (NOSC) Detachment, Kaneohe, HI, will transfer the bulk of its functions to the RDT&E Directorate at San Diego, and remaining functions to the West Coast ISE Directorate operating site at Pearl Harbor, and close. A total of approximately 190 positions will be transferred.
4. Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center (NESEC), Charleston, SC, will transfer its functions to the East Coast ISE Directorate at Portsmouth, VA, and close. A total of approximately 360 positions will be transferred.
5. Naval Electronic Systems Security Engineering Center (NESSEC), Washington, DC, will transfer its functions to the East Coast ISE Directorate at Portsmouth, VA and close. A total of approximately 160 positions will be transferred.

6. Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity (NESEA), St. Inigoes, MD, will transfer its functions to the East Coast ISE Directorate at Portsmouth, VA and close. The property will be transferred to the Naval Air Warfare Center. A total of approximately 330 positions will be transferred.

7. Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center (NESEC), San Diego, CA, will transfer its functions to the West Coast ISE Directorate also in San Diego, and close. A total of approximately 620 positions will be either transferred or eliminated due to consolidation reductions.

B. Others:

Although not falling into the categories of closure or realignment, the following installations are integral to the overall plan and success of NAWP consolidation.

1. Naval Ocean System Center (NOSC), San Diego, CA, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the RDT&E Directorate, to be the center for both the RDT&E Directorate and the West Coast ISE Directorate.

Functions will be gained from NESEC, Vallejo NESEC San Diego, FCDSSA San Diego, NSSA Los Angeles and NOSC DET Kaneohe. Functions will be transferred to the Naval Undersea Warfare Center at Newport, RI, and to the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Dahlgren, VA. Positions will be gained and lost through transfers and eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions for a net gain of approximately 560 positions.

2. Naval Electronics Engineering Activity, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, HI, will be disestablished as a separate command and organizationally realigned with the West Coast ISE Directorate. It will gain functions from NOSC DET Kaneohe and remain a major operating site. Positions will be gained through transfers and eliminated due to specific workload reductions for a net loss of approximately 15 positions.

3. Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center (NESEC), Portsmouth, VA, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the East Coast ISE Directorate to be the center for the directorate. Functions will be gained from NESEC Charleston, NESEA St. Inigoes, and NESSEC Washington, DC. Positions will be gained through transfers and eliminated due to specific workload reductions for a net gain of approximately 570 positions.

Naval Surface Warfare Center

Recommendation: As an integral part of the Navy's RDT&E, Engineering and Fleet Support Consolidation Plan, six realignments and two closures, as described in the accompanying table, are recommended in connection with establishment of the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC).

Justification: Consolidation of the Navy's RDT&E, engineering and Fleet support activities is driven by Congressionally mandated reductions in the Navy's overall budget and acquisition workforce. These activities will be consolidated along mission and functional lines in four centers. The missions of the activities will be purified, so that each activity will be assigned unique technology leadership areas. All work tasked in these leadership areas will be performed only at the cognizant activity. The purification process will lead to development of critical mass technical capability in each area.

With headquarters in Washington, DC, NAWC will be the Navy's full spectrum center for surface platforms and surface warfare combat and weapons systems. It is also the focal point for all ship and submarine hull, mechanical and electrical programs. NSWC will be organized in four major divisions:

- **Combat and Weapons Systems R&D Division:** primarily responsible for surface combat, and weapons systems, mine and amphibious warfare, and mine countermeasures; centered at Dahlgren, VA with an operating site in Panama City, FL, and facilities at White Oak, MD.
- **Combat and Weapon System In-Service Engineering (ISE) Division:** primarily responsible for in-service engineering to surface ships and mines, underway replenishment and combat systems software; centered at Port Hueneme, CA, with an operating site in Dam Neck, VA.
- **Combat and Weapon System Engineering and Industrial Base Division:** primarily responsible for gun systems, ordnance and explosives; centered at Crane, IN with operating sites at Louisville, KY, and Indian Head, MD.
- **Hull, Mechanical, and Electrical (HM&E), R&D, and ISE Divisions:** primarily responsible for ship and submarine HM&E and propulsion; centered at Carderock, MD, with an operating site at Philadelphia, and facilities at Annapolis, MD.

In development and review of the Plan, all RDT&E facilities were considered on an equal basis, in conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. The

Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) validated the plan using the first four DOD selection criteria. For example, and most notably, both the David Taylor Research Center (DTRC) Annapolis Laboratory Detachment and the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) detachment White Oak, graded lower in military value for these key reasons:

- Ample space to expand to accommodate consolidation (Annapolis constrained and only 730 acres at White Oak vs 43,000 acres at Dahlgren).
- Lack of availability or proximity to suitable overwater test ranges (none at White Oak).
- Duplicative engineering capability to that existing elsewhere (Annapolis vs Naval Ship System Engineering Station Philadelphia).
- Availability to operate on a reduced basis due to proximity to a larger laboratory (Annapolis and Carderock; White Oak and Dahlgren).

The BSC noted that approximately 3980 eliminated positions at eleven installations were directly attributable to site-specific workload reduction, rather than streamlining or consolidation. The BSC also considered the other DOD selection criteria. The economic and environmental issues associated with each site were evaluated. Exclusive of site-specific workload reductions, establishment of NSWC will result in elimination of approximately 600 positions and transfer of approximately 2100 positions. Details related to each site are summarized in the table below. None of the sites in question is on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing the recommendations will cost about \$181 million. Annually, the recommendations will save about \$29 million.

**Table of Recommendations to Establish the
Naval Surface Warfare Center**

A. Realignments and Closures:

1. Integrated Combat Systems Test Facility (ICSTF), San Diego, CA, will transfer its functions to the Combat and Weapon System In-service Engineering (ISE) Division at Port Hueneme, CA and close. A total of approximately 46 positions will be transferred or eliminated due to consolidation.

2. **Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity (NMWEA), Yorktown, VA,** will transfer its functions to the Combat and Weapon Systems ISE Division at Dam Neck, VA and close. A total of approximately 230 positions will either be transferred or eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.
3. **Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) Detachment White Oak, MD,** will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned. The bulk of its functions will be transferred to the Combat and Weapon Systems R&D Division at Dahlgren, VA. Custody of and the personnel to sustain unique facilities will be retained. A total of approximately 1255 positions will either be transferred or eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.
4. **Naval Coastal Systems Center (NCSC) Panama City, FL,** will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the Combat and Weapon Systems R&D Division as a major operating site at Panama City, FL. There will be a minor transfer of functions to the Naval Undersea Warfare Center at Newport, RI and to the Combat and Weapon Systems R&D Division at Dahlgren, VA. A total of approximately 285 positions will either be transferred or eliminated due to consolidation.
5. **David Taylor Research Center (DTRC), Annapolis Laboratory, MD,** will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the Hull, Mechanical, and Electrical (HM&E) R&D and ISE Division. The majority of its functions will be transferred to the HM&E R&D and ISE Division at Philadelphia and to DTRC, Carderock, MD. Unique facilities and the personnel to sustain them will be retained. A total of approximately 655 positions will either be transferred or eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.
6. **Naval Ordnance Station (NOS) Indian Head, MD,** will be disestablished as a separate command and organizationally realigned with the Combat and Weapon Systems Engineering and Industrial Base Division at Crane, IN. It will remain as a major operating site. A total of approximately 610 positions will be eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.
7. **Naval Ordnance Station (NOS) Louisville, KY,** will be disestablished as a separate command and organizationally realigned with the Combat and Weapon Systems Engineering and Industrial Base Division at Crane, IN. It will remain as a major operating site. Positions will be gained and lost through transfers and eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions for a net loss of approximately 600 positions.

8. **Naval Weapons Support Center, Crane, IN**, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned with the Combat and Weapon Systems Engineering and Industrial Base Division at Crane, IN as the center for the division. Positions will be gained and lost through transfers and eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions for a net loss of approximately 1065 positions.

B: Others:

Although not falling into the categories of closure or realignment, the following installations are integral to the overall plan and success of the NAWC consolidation.

1. **Fleet Combat Direction Systems Support Activity, (FCDSSA), Dam Neck, VA**, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the Combat and Weapon Systems ISE Division at Dam Neck, VA. Functions will be gained from NMWEA Yorktown and the Naval Undersea Warfare Center. Positions will be gained from transfers and eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions for a net gain of approximately 350 positions.

2. **Naval Ship Weapons Systems Engineering Station (NSWSES), Port Hueneme, CA**, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the Combat and Weapon Systems ISE Division at Port Hueneme, CA as the center for the division. Positions will be gained from transfers and eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions for a net loss of approximately 25 positions.

3. **Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC), Dahlgren, VA**, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the Combat and Weapon Systems R&D Division at Dahlgren, VA as the center for the division. Positions will be gained from transfers and eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions for a net gain of approximately 480 positions.

4. **Naval Ship Systems Engineering Station (NAVSSSES) Philadelphia, PA**, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the Hull, Mechanical, and Electrical (HM&E) R&D and ISE Division as a major operating site at Philadelphia, PA. There will be a minor gain of functions from DTRC, Annapolis, MD. Positions will be gained from transfers and eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions for a net loss of approximately 255 positions.

5. David Taylor Research Center (DTRC), Carderock, MD, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the HM&E R&D and ISE Division at Carderock, MD as the center for the division. There will be a gain of functions from DTRC, Annapolis, MD. Positions will be gained from transfers and eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions for a net gain of approximately 105 positions.

Naval Undersea Warfare Center

Recommendation: As an integral part of the Navy's RDT&E, Engineering and Fleet Support Consolidation Plan, four realignments, as described in the accompanying table, are recommended in connection with establishment of the Naval Undersea Warfare Center (NUWC).

Justification: Consolidation of the Navy's RDT&E, engineering and Fleet support activities is driven by Congressionally mandated reductions in the Navy's overall budget and acquisition workforce. These activities will be consolidated along mission and functional lines in four centers. The missions of the activities will be purified, so that each activity will be assigned unique technology leadership areas. All work tasked in these leadership areas will be performed only at the cognizant activity. The purification process will lead to development of critical mass technical capability in each area.

With headquarters in Washington, DC, NUWC will be the Navy's full spectrum center for submarine sensors and submarine combat and weapons systems. NUWC will be organized into two major divisions:

- **Combat and Weapons Systems Divisions:** primarily responsible for submarine combat and weapon systems and combat systems in-service engineering (ISE); and centered at Newport, RI, with an operating site at Norfolk, and facilities at New London, CT.
- **Weapons Systems ISE Divisions:** primarily responsible for ISE and depoting of weapons, targets, counter measures and non-expendable equipment, and management of Pacific ranges; and centered at Keyport, WA.

In development and review of the plan, all RDT&E facilities were considered on an equal basis, in conformance with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. The Navy's Base Structure Committee (BSC) validated the plan using the first four DOD selection criteria. For example, and most notably, Naval Underwater Systems Center (NUSC) Detachment, New London, CT.

- Very limited land for expansion to accommodate consolidation (189 acres at Newport vs 28 acres at New London).
- Approximately 1.2 million square feet of space at Newport, over one-third of which has been constructed in the last 15 years, vs approximately 740,000 square feet of space in New London.
- Avoid \$12.6 million construction project at New London.

The BSC noted that approximately 1410 eliminated positions at five installations were directly attributable to site-specific workload reduction, rather than streamlining or consolidation. The BSC also considered the other DOD selection criteria. The economic and environmental issues associated with each site were evaluated. Exclusive of site-specific workload reductions, establishment of NUWC will result in elimination of approximately 250 positions and transfer of approximately 1080 positions. Details related to each site are summarized in the table below. None of the sites in question is on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

Implementing the recommendations will cost about \$71 million. Annually, the recommendations will save about \$11 million.

**Table of Recommendations to Establish
the Naval Undersea Warfare Center**

A. Realignments:

1. Naval Underwater Systems Center (NUSC) Detachment New London, CT, will be disestablished as a separate command. The bulk of its functions will be transferred to the Combat and Weapon Systems Division (CWSD), Newport, RI. Personnel involved with unique facilities will remain and be realigned under CWSD Newport. A total of approximately 1070 positions will either be transferred or eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

2. Naval Sea Combat Systems Engineering Station (NSCSES) Norfolk, VA, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with CWSD as a major operating site at Norfolk. There will be a transfer of functions to the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Dam Neck and Norfolk. A total of approximately 530 positions will either be transferred or eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

3. Trident Command and Control Systems Maintenance Activity, (TRICCSMA), Newport, RI, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the Combat and Weapon Systems Division at Newport, RI. A total of approximately 40 positions will be eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

4. Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station (NUWES), Keyport, WA, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the Weapon Systems ISE Division at Keyport, WA, as the center for the division. A total of approximately 700 positions will be eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

B. Other:

Although not falling into the categories of closure or realignment, the following installation is integral to the overall plan and success of the NUWC consolidation.

1. Naval Underwater Systems Center (NUSC), Newport, RI, will be disestablished as a separate command and realigned to merge with the CWSO Newport, as the center for the division. Functions will be gained from NUSC Det New London, the Naval Surface Warfare Center, and the Naval Command, Control and Ocean Surveillance Center. A net total of approximately 1120 positions will be gained from transfers and eliminated due to consolidation and specific workload reductions.

Department of the Air Force

Summary of Selection Process**Introduction**

The Air Force will reduce its active component force structure by 29% across the Future Years Defense Program. This reduction spans the spectrum of Air Force active missions and includes a commensurate reduction in manpower. The resulting smaller force necessitates a reduction in Air Force base structure, both overseas and stateside. In determining base structure needs, the Air Force focused on both the Active and Air Reserve Component to ensure a Total Force approach to the process.

The Selection Process

The Air Force used a structured process that treated all bases equally, without regard to past studies or announcements. The basis for selection was the Force Structure Plan and the eight final criteria established under Public Law 101-510.

The Secretary of the Air Force appointed a Base Closure Executive Group of five general officers and five SES-level career civilians with expertise across a wide range of disciplines. This Group reviewed all bases with more than 300 civilians authorized. Major Command and reserve component representatives served as advisors to the group. Data was collected directly from the bases and validated by the Major Commands, Air Staff and Air Force Audit Agency.

The Executive Group placed all bases in categories and conducted a capacity analysis based on the Force Structure Plan. Categories and subcategories having no significant excess capacity were excluded from further study. These categories and subcategories were flying/mobility, flying/other, the support category including depots, and product divisions/laboratories and test facilities. All remaining bases were evaluated on the basis of military requirements. As a result, certain bases having unique missions not affected by the Force Structure Plan, in geographic locations where a base was required, or otherwise militarily needed, were excluded from further study.

All Active Component bases not excluded were individually examined on the basis of the eight final criteria, and on approximately 80 sub-elements. The sub-

elements were developed by the Air Force to provide specific data points for each criterion. They vary somewhat by category. Each sub-element for each base was individually coded and the Group agreed to an overall coding for each criterion.

For the tactical subcategory five options were developed, with six developed for the strategic subcategory. Each option assigned bases to three groups, in order of desirability for retention. The basic scoring employed all eight final criteria, with priority to the first four. Other options were developed by applying all eight criteria, but rescoring all bases in the category with added weight placed on specified factors.

The Air Reserve Component Category required a slightly different approach. Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Component bases do not readily compete against each other. Air Reserve Component units enjoy a special relationship with their respective states and local communities. Further, the recruiting needs of these units must be considered. The Executive Group first identified those realignments which would achieve reasonable savings. Then, the final criteria were applied to assure that the realignment would be cost effective, consistent with military requirements, and otherwise sound.

Intercommand and interservice utilization analysis was also accomplished. The Directors of Plans and Programs from the Major Commands met on several occasions with the Executive Group. Also, consultations with Army and Navy base closure representatives occurred regarding potential interservice asset sharing.

The Secretary of the Air Force, with the advice of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and in consultation with the Base Closure Executive Group, nominated bases to the Secretary of Defense for closure and realignment based on the force structure plan and the final criteria established under Public Law 101-510. The Secretary of Defense recommends the following Air Force bases for closure or realignment:

Recommendations and Justifications

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas

Recommendation: Bergstrom AFB, Texas, is recommended for closure. All active RF-4s will be retired. The 67th Tactical Reconnaissance Wing will inactivate. The corrosion control facility will remain if it continues to be economical to operate there. The Air Force Reserve units will remain in a cantonment area if the base is converted to a civil airport. If no decision on a civil airport is reached by June of 1993, the units will be redistributed as directed by the Secretary of the Air Force. If units stay but the airport is not an economically viable entity by the end of 1996, these units would also be redistributed. The Twelfth Air Force Headquarters; 12th TAC Intelligence Squadron; and the 602nd Tactical Air Control Center Squadron will relocate to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona. The 712th Air Support Operations Center Squadron will relocate to Fort Hood, Texas. All other personnel will depart. The 41st Electronic Combat Squadron (ECS) (EC-130H aircraft) will remain in place at Davis-Monthan AFB rather than move to Bergstrom AFB as recommended by the 1988 Base Closure Commission.

Justification: The Air Force has five more tactical bases than needed to support the number of fighter aircraft in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All tactical bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Bergstrom AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All tactical bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Bergstrom AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other fifteen bases in the tactical subcategory and is recommended for closure. While Bergstrom AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. The overall long term military value of Bergstrom AFB suffered because of local/regional encroachment and a lack of suitable ranges/airspace. Additionally, the cost to close Bergstrom AFB is low and the savings are high.

The closure of Bergstrom AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 17,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of just over 10,600 jobs, and regional income loss of 175 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of nearly 600,000, available jobs of just over 388,000, and regional annual income approaching 9 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$121M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$36.3M.

Carswell Air Force Base, Texas

Recommendation: Carswell AFB, Texas, is recommended for closure. The 7th Bombardment Wing will inactivate. The B-52H aircraft will transfer to Barksdale AFB, Louisiana. The KC-135 aircraft will transfer to the Air Reserve Component (ARC). The 301st Tactical Fighter Wing (AFRES), 73rd Aerial Port Squadron (AFRES), 457th Tactical Fighter Squadron (AFRES) and the 20th Medical Services Squadron (AFRES) will remain at Carswell AFB in an efficient cantonment area containing only the direct support facilities. The 436th Strategic Training Squadron (SAC) will relocate to Dyess AFB, Texas. All other active duty personnel will depart.

Justification: The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Carswell AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Carswell AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory and is recommended for closure. While Carswell AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. The long term military value of Carswell AFB is impacted by severe local and regional encroachment. Carswell AFB also ranked below average in wartime tanker utility. The cost to close Carswell AFB is relatively low.

The closure of Carswell AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 20,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of just over 12,000 jobs, and regional income loss of nearly 212 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of over 1,200,000, available jobs just over 600,000, and regional annual income of 17 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$156M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$45.5M.

Castle Air Force Base, California

Recommendation: Castle AFB, California, is recommended for closure. The 93rd Bombardment Wing will inactivate. The bomber and tanker Combat Crew Training missions will transfer to Fairchild AFB, Washington. The B-52G conventional aircraft will transfer to KI Sawyer AFB, Michigan. The KC-135 aircraft will transfer to the Air Reserve Component and other active units. All other active duty personnel will depart.

Justification: The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Castle AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Castle AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory, and is recommended for closure. While Castle AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. Peacetime and wartime tanker utility negatively impact the long term military value of Castle AFB. Also, encroachment on the base and flight patterns is significant. The condition of the facilities at Castle AFB is below average in the Strategic subcategory, and the housing deficit is much greater than average. Additionally, the cost to close Castle AFB is relatively low and the savings are favorable.

The closure of Castle AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 16,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of nearly 9,000 jobs, and regional income loss approaching 162 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of just over 492,000, available jobs close to 216,000, and regional annual income

of 6.5 billion dollars. Castle AFB is on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$63M. This savings could be increased by approximately \$27M in land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$52.7M.

Eaker Air Force Base, Arkansas

Recommendation: Eaker AFB, Arkansas, is recommended for closure. The 97th Bombardment Wing will inactivate. The B-52G Air Launched Cruise Missile aircraft will retire. The KC-135 aircraft will transfer to other KC-135 units. All other active duty personnel will depart.

Justification: The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Eaker AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Eaker AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory, and is recommended for closure. While Eaker AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. The long term military value of Eaker AFB ranked below average because of both peacetime and wartime tanker utility and access to bombing ranges. Also, the cost to close Eaker AFB is very low and the savings are very high.

The closure of Eaker AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 9,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of nearly 4,600 jobs, and regional income loss of just over 83 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of over 202,000, available jobs close to 99,000, and regional annual income of 2.2 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$221M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$52.9M.

England Air Force Base, Louisiana

Recommendation: England AFB, Louisiana, is recommended for closure. The 23rd Tactical Fighter Wing will inactivate. Assigned aircraft will be retired or redistributed among remaining active and reserve component units. One active A/OA-10 squadron will be realigned to Eglin AFB, Florida and one to McChord AFB, Washington. All other personnel will depart.

Justification: The Air Force has five more tactical bases than needed to support the number of fighter aircraft in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All tactical bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close England AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All tactical bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. England AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other fifteen bases in the tactical subcategory and is recommended for closure. While England AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. The long term military value of England AFB is limited by weather and available airspace for training. England AFB has the least suitable weather of all bases ranked within this category. Although its location relative to Fort Polk is an asset, adequate Air Force support can be provided from Barksdale AFB, Louisiana. Additionally, the cost to close England AFB is low and the savings are very high.

The closure of England AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 10,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of just over 5,700 jobs, and regional income loss of nearly 97 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of 139,600, available jobs just over 60,000, and regional annual income of 1.5 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$176M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$47.2M.

Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana

Recommendation: Grissom AFB, Indiana, is recommended for closure. The 305th Air Refueling Wing will inactivate. The KC-135 aircraft will transfer to the Air Reserve Component (ARC). The EC-135 aircraft will retire. The 434th Air Refueling Wing (AFRES), the 930th Tactical Fighter Group (AFRES), and the 930rd Civil Engineering Squadron (AFRES) will remain. The 930th Tactical Fighter Group will convert to the KC-135 and that unit's A-10s will retire. The Air Force Reserve units will be grouped in an efficient cantonment area containing only the essential direct supporting facilities. The Air Force Reserve will operate the airfield unless the local/state authorities decide to convert to a civil airport. The airfield and all operational facilities will be retained and those facilities not required by the Reserves will be mothballed for future contingencies. However, the airfield and these facilities would be made available as required to support joint civil use. All family housing and community support facilities including the hospital, base exchange, commissary and all morale and welfare facilities not authorized for Reserve units will be declared excess and made available for disposal. All other active duty personnel will depart.

Justification: The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Grissom AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Grissom AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory, and is recommended for closure. While Grissom AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. As an active base, Grissom AFB ranked lower in long term military value because of peacetime and wartime tanker utility as well as access to bombing ranges.

Additionally, the cost to close Grissom AFB Base is low and the savings are substantial. The condition of the existing facilities at Grissom AFB is ranked well below the average.

The closure of Grissom AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 9,700 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of just over 5,200 jobs, and regional income loss of nearly 88 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of just over 197,000, available jobs close to 101,000, and regional annual income of 2.6 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$157M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$48.3M.

Loring Air Force Base, Maine

Recommendation: Loring AFB, Maine, is recommended for closure. The 42nd Bombardment Wing will inactivate. The B-52G conventional aircraft will transfer to KI Sawyer AFB, Michigan. The KC-135 aircraft will realign to the Air Reserve Component (ARC) and other active units. All remaining personnel will depart.

Justification: The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Loring AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Loring AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory, and is recommended for closure. While Loring AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. Loring AFB ranked lower in long term military value due to limited peacetime tanker utility and access to bombing ranges. The condition of the existing facilities at Loring AFB is well below average. The cost to close Loring AFB is low and the savings are the highest of the bases considered in this subcategory.

The closure of Loring AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 22,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of nearly 9,900 jobs, and regional income loss of just over 92 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of over 49,100, available jobs close to 33,320, and regional annual income of 755 million dollars. Loring AFB is on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$182M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$61.8M.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado

Recommendation: Lowry AFB, Colorado, is recommended for closure. The Lowry Technical Training Center will inactivate. Courses currently conducted at Lowry AFB will be consolidated at remaining Technical Training Centers, contracted, or relocated to other locations. The 1001st Space Systems Squadron, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, and Air Force Reserve Personnel Center will remain at Lowry AFB in cantonment areas. No housing (unaccompanied and family), community support, recreation, or other base support facilities will be retained. Major tenant units relocating are: 3320th Correctional Squadron to Lackland AFB, Texas; and the U.S. Army instructor and support cadre to Keesler AFB, Mississippi. All other personnel will depart. Courses from Chanute AFB, Illinois, realigned to Lowry by the 1988 Base Closure Commission will, instead, realign to various other locations.

Justification: The Air Force has one more Technical Training Center base than needed to support reduced Air Force enlisted accessions (30,000 per year). All Technical Training Center bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. The selection process involved the evaluation of a large number of subelements of the criteria by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Lowry AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All Technical Training Center bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Lowry AFB ranked low and is recommended for closure. While Lowry AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. Lowry AFB's facilities ranked below the category average. The lack of a runway limited this base's overall long term military value and its ability to accept additional missions across a broad spectrum. Although not part of the cost analysis, Lowry AFB has one of the highest potentials to return substantial proceeds from property disposal to the Base Closure Account. Finally, the closure of Lowry AFB would reduce excess capacity with favorable savings.

The closure of Lowry AFB will have an impact on the local economy, although it is relatively the least severe of any of the Technical Training Center bases. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 9,500 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of nearly 12,000 jobs, and regional income loss of nearly 295 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of nearly 1,600,000, available jobs of nearly 1,000,000, and regional annual income of approximately 28 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net cost of implementing this recommendation is about \$48M. This cost could be reduced by approximately \$100M in land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$42M.

Moody Air Force Base, Georgia

Recommendation: Moody AFB, Georgia, is recommended for closure. The 347th Tactical Fighter Wing will inactivate. Assigned aircraft will be redistributed to modernize other active and reserve component units. All other personnel will depart.

Justification: The Air Force has five more tactical bases than needed to support the number of fighter aircraft in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All tactical bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Moody AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All tactical bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Moody AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other fifteen bases in the tactical subcategory and is recommended for closure. While Moody AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. The long term military value of Moody AFB, when compared to the other bases in its category, suffered because of weather, and its location in a region where special use airspace is being stressed increasingly by a growth in air traffic. Additionally, it is the least costly base to close of all bases in this subcategory.

The closure of Moody AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 9,300 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of just over 4,800 jobs, and regional income loss of nearly 98 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of 106,000, available jobs of just over 54,000, and regional annual income of just over 1.2 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$143M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$45.1M.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, South Carolina

Recommendation: Myrtle Beach AFB, South Carolina, is recommended for closure. The 354th Tactical Fighter Wing will inactivate. Assigned aircraft will be retired or redistributed among remaining active and reserve component units. One active A/OA-10 squadron will be realigned to Shaw AFB, South Carolina and one to Pope AFB, North Carolina. All other personnel will depart.

Justification: The Air Force has five more tactical bases than needed to support the number of fighter aircraft in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All tactical bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Myrtle Beach AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All tactical bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Myrtle Beach AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other fifteen bases in the tactical subcategory and is recommended for closure. While Myrtle Beach AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. Incompatible development within the clear zone and accident potential zone, as well as local and regional airspace encroachment, and weather all negatively impact the long term military value of Myrtle Beach AFB. Additionally, the cost to close Myrtle Beach AFB is low and the savings are high.

The closure of Myrtle Beach AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 20,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of nearly 10,000 jobs, and regional income loss of just over 97 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of just over 183,000, available jobs approaching 100,000, and regional annual income of just over 2.1 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$76M. This savings could be increased by approximately \$15M in land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$30.2M.

Richards-Gebaur Air Reserve Station, Missouri

Recommendation: Richards-Gebaur Air Reserve Station, Missouri, is recommended for closure. The 442nd TFW, consisting of A-10 aircraft and associated support units will realign to Whiteman AFB, Missouri. Remaining major tenant units consist of the 36th Aeromedical Evacuation Squadron, 77th Aerial Port Squadron, and the 78th Aerial Port Squadron which realign to Peterson AFB, Colorado. All remaining Air Force, Air Force Reserve, and Air National Guard personnel will depart.

Justification: Analysis of the DoD Force Structure Plan does not reveal a significant reduction in Air Reserve Component force structure. However, realignments of Air Reserve Component (ARC) units onto active bases could, potentially, be cost effective. Therefore, the Air Force decided to continue examination of the ARC category for cost effective realignments to other bases. The evaluation of the Air Reserve Component category recognized that ARC bases do not readily compete against each other. Air Reserve Component units enjoy a special relationship with their respective states and local communities. Further, consideration must be given to the recruiting needs of these units. A Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians, was appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The BCEG first identified those realignments which could achieve reasonable savings. Then, the eight DoD selection criteria were considered to assure that the realignment would be cost effective, consistent with military requirements, and otherwise sound. The recommendation to close Richards-Gebaur ARS was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

For many years, the Air Force Reserve has borne a substantial portion of the operating costs of this airfield even though it is operated by the Kansas City Department of Aviation and Transportation. When the joint use arrangement was initiated in the late 1970's, the Air Force anticipated that an economically viable civil airport would develop and cost to the Air Force would be reduced dramatically over time. That has not occurred; therefore, relocation of the Air Force Reserve activities to an active Air Force base would achieve significant cost savings. Attention was focused on nearby Whiteman AFB, Missouri since the 442nd Tactical Fighter Wing could be relocated within the same recruiting area and, thus, avoid substantial loss of assigned personnel. The long term operational impact to this unit is minimal since Whiteman AFB has similar access to training ranges, low level routes, and Army exercise areas.

Realignment of the 442nd Tactical Fighter Wing to Whiteman AFB can be accomplished at low cost and the return on investment will be less than five years.

The closure of Richards-Gebaur Air Reserve Station will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of 4,600 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of 2,600 jobs, and regional income loss of 26.9 million dollars. The losses are in contrast to a regional population of over 702,200, available jobs of 461,000, and regional annual income approaching 11 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net cost of implementing this recommendation is about \$4M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$12.9M.

Rickenbacker Air Guard Base, Ohio

Recommendation: Rickenbacker Air Guard Base, Ohio is recommended for closure. The 160th Air Refueling Group (ANG) will move to Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio with 20 KC-135 aircraft. The 121st Tactical Fighter Wing will inactivate. The 907th Tactical Airlift Group (AFRES) will become the 907th Military Airlift Group and relocate with 10 C-141 aircraft to Wright-Patterson AFB. The remaining 6 C-141 aircraft currently projected for this unit will be assigned to the 445th Military Airlift Wing (AFRES) at March AFB, California. The 4950th Test Wing, currently located at Wright-Patterson AFB, will move to Edwards AFB, California. Remaining major tenant units consist of the Naval Air Reserve Center and Army Aviation Facility. Both may move to locations as determined by those Services or may remain in cantonment at this location and the Air Force will transfer the necessary property to the Army and Navy as required. All remaining Air Force, Air Force Reserve, and Air National Guard personnel will depart.

Justification: Analysis of the DoD Force Structure Plan does not reveal a significant reduction in Air Reserve Component force structure. However, realignments of Air Reserve Component (ARC) units onto active bases could, potentially, be cost effective. Therefore, the Air Force decided to continue examination of the ARC category for cost effective realignments to other bases. The evaluation of the Air Reserve Component category recognized that ARC bases do not readily compete against each other. Air Reserve Component units enjoy a special relationship with their respective states and local communities. Further, consideration must be given to the recruiting needs of these units. A Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians, was appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The BCEG first identified those realignments which could achieve reasonable savings. Then, the eight DoD selection criteria were considered to assure that the realignment would be cost effective, consistent with military requirements, and otherwise sound. The recommendation to close Rickenbacker AGB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

Since the reserve units at Rickenbacker Air Guard Base, Ohio are the predominate users of the airfield, the support costs for these activities are high. Therefore, it was apparent the relocation to an active base could achieve significant cost savings. Thus, attention was focused on Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio in order to keep the Guard unit in the State of Ohio. Also, because of the relative short distance (70 miles) between Columbus and Dayton, Ohio, it was considered likely that most of the personnel currently in

these units would remain in a move to Wright-Patterson AFB. In addition, this would move those units closer to the centroid of a very large demographic area which would enhance recruiting potential. This resulted in the recommended realignments. The cost to realign the 160th Air Refueling Group and the 907th Tactical Airlift Group to Wright-Patterson AFB is low since the facilities to be vacated by the 4950th Test Wing are designed for aircraft similar to the 20 KC-135 and 10 C-141 aircraft which will be used by the Air Force Reserves and Ohio Air Guard. Although the Air Force Reserve unit was scheduled to receive 16 C-141 aircraft, the number was reduced to 10 in order to avoid costly MILCON of parking ramps and hangars that would be required to accommodate all the aircraft. The remaining 6 C-141 aircraft will be assigned to the Air Force Reserve unit at March AFB, California. The realignment of the 4950th Test Wing and its consolidation with the Air Force Flight Test Center at Edwards AFB, California will result in a more economical and efficient operation and the cost of transfer is moderate. The return on investment will be less than five years. In addition to the substantial recurring cost savings, this realignment enhances the total force concept through a closer association of active and reserve forces.

The closure of Rickenbacker Air Guard Base will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of 13,100 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of 6,700 jobs, and regional income loss of 41 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of over 1,071,000, available jobs of 677,000, and regional annual income of 15.5 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net cost of implementing this recommendation is about \$16M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$22.7M.

Williams Air Force Base, Arizona

Recommendation: Williams AFB, Arizona, is recommended for closure. All aircraft will be retired or redistributed. The 82nd Flying Training Wing will inactivate. Major tenant unit relocating is: Aircrew Training Research Facility to Orlando, Florida. All other personnel will depart.

Justification: The Air Force has one more Training subcategory base than needed to support reduced Air Force force structure. All Training subcategory bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. The selection process involved the evaluation of a large number of subelements of the criteria by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Williams AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All Training subcategory bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Williams AFB ranked low in this process and is recommended for closure. While Williams AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. Williams AFB ranked lowest in its category for airspace encroachment both now and in the future, directly impacting its long term military value. Additionally, it ranked lowest in condition of base facilities. The cost to close Williams AFB is low and savings are favorable.

The closure of Williams AFB will have an impact on the local economy; however, it is the least severe of any of the Training subcategory bases. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 7,700 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of nearly 6,000 jobs, and regional income loss of nearly 130 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of just over 2,000,000, available jobs of nearly 1,200,000, and regional annual income of nearly 33 billion dollars. Williams AFB is on the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$222M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$54.1M.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan

Recommendation: Wurtsmith AFB, Michigan, is recommended for closure. The 379th Bombardment Wing will inactivate. The B-52G Air Launched Cruise Missile aircraft will retire. The KC-135 aircraft will relocate and transfer to the Air Reserve Component (ARC). All other personnel will depart.

Justification: The Air Force has six more strategic bases than are needed to support the number of bombers and tankers in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All strategic bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against the eight DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to close Wurtsmith AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All strategic bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and Air Force subelements. Wurtsmith AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other twenty bases in the strategic subcategory, and is recommended for closure. While Wurtsmith AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. The long term overall military value of Wurtsmith AFB is below average because of distance to low altitude training routes, and poor peacetime tanker utility. The cost to close Wurtsmith AFB is very low and the savings very high.

The closure of Wurtsmith AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 9,400 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of just over 4,600 jobs, and regional income loss of nearly 94 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional population of 87,600, available jobs close to 34,800, and regional annual income of 987 million dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$256M. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$63.3M.

MacDill Air Force Base, Florida

Recommendation: MacDill AFB, Florida, is recommended for realignment and partial closure. Realign the 56th Tactical Training Wing's F-16s from MacDill AFB, to Luke AFB, Arizona. The Joint Communications Support Element will move to Charleston AFB, South Carolina. The airfield at MacDill AFB will close, those facilities that support flying operations will be disposed of and the remainder of MacDill AFB will become an administrative base.

Justification: The Air Force has five more tactical bases than needed to support the number of fighter aircraft in the DoD Force Structure Plan. All tactical bases were considered for closure equally in a process that conformed to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 and the Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD) guidance. Each base was evaluated against all eight of the DoD selection criteria and a large number of subelements specific to Air Force bases and missions. Data were collected and the eight criteria and subelements of the criteria applied by the Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG), a group of five general officers and five senior civilians appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The recommendation to partially close MacDill AFB was made by the Secretary of the Air Force with advice of the Air Force Chief of Staff and in consultation with the BCEG.

As with the other categories, it was difficult to select closure candidates. All tactical bases are in generally good condition with strong community support. Distinctions can be drawn, however, when the data are evaluated against the criteria. MacDill AFB ranked low in this process compared to the other fifteen bases in the tactical subcategory and is recommended for realignment and partial closure. While MacDill AFB's ranking rests on the combined results of applying the eight DoD selection criteria, rather than one or two specific deficiencies, a few points stand out. With the planned F-16 aircraft reductions, there is no longer a requirement to maintain two F-16 training locations (MacDill and Luke AFBs) and Luke AFB will have excess capacity due to redistribution of F-15 and F-16 aircraft. The long term military value of MacDill AFB is low due to significant impacts of current/potential local and regional land use and airspace encroachment. This realignment is low cost and the savings are substantial. Although not part of the cost analysis, MacDill AFB has one of the highest potentials to return substantial proceeds from property disposal to the Base Closure Account. By consolidating F-16 training at one base, the Air Force will save a minimum of \$20 million annually.

The closure of MacDill AFB will have an impact on the local economy. It is projected to result in a population loss of approximately 6,000 persons, direct and indirect employment loss of 4,500 jobs, and regional income loss of 96 million dollars. These losses are in contrast to a regional

population of just over 1.6 million, available jobs of just over 915,000, and regional annual income of nearly 26 billion dollars.

By the end of FY 97, the net savings from implementing this recommendation are about \$53M. This savings could be increased by approximately \$50M in land value. Annual savings after implementation are expected to be \$20.4M.

Beale Air Force Base, California

Recommendation: Instead of sending the 323rd Flying Training Wing (FTW) and Undergraduate Navigator Training (UNT) to Beale AFB, California, as recommended by the 1988 Base Closure Commission as part of the closure of Mather AFB, California, realign these activities to Randolph AFB, Texas.

Justification: The Air Force has identified six Strategic Air Command bases for closure under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Beale AFB was identified as a location for realigning force structure from these closing bases. The excess capacity identified by the 1988 Commission at Beale can better be utilized by operational strategic force structure instead of navigator training.

Also, based on the DoD Force Structure Plan, the requirements for Undergraduate Navigator Training have reduced substantially from the level projected at the time of the 1988 Commission. As a result, Randolph AFB has the capacity to absorb the 323rd FTW at reduced cost while maintaining a quality training environment. The MILCON avoidance totals approximately \$31.5M.

Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas

Recommendation: As part of the closure of Chanute AFB, Illinois, realign the fuels training to Sheppard AFB, Texas, and realign the technical training fire course to Goodfellow unless a satisfactory and cost effective contract can be arranged. The 1988 Base Closure Commission recommended that both of these courses be realigned to Goodfellow AFB, Texas.

Justification: The Air Force would like the opportunity to explore more cost effective ways to conduct fire training. However, realignment to Goodfellow AFB would proceed if a satisfactory and cost effective alternative cannot be arranged.

Based upon the DoD Force Structure Plan and the base structure review, the Air Force identified excess dormitory/dining hall capacity at Sheppard AFB that can accommodate the fuels training courses. Moving fuels training to Sheppard AFB, taking advantage of excess facilities, will result in MILCON cost avoidance of approximately \$2.6M.

March Air Force Base, California

Recommendation: As a part of the closure of Norton AFB, California, realign 45 Headquarters Air Force Audit Agency (AFAA) manpower authorizations (out of 184 total positions) to the National Capital Region (NCR). The remaining 139 HQ AFAA positions remain at March AFB, as recommended by the Commission. The 1988 Base Closure Commission recommended that the AFAA realign to March AFB, California.

Justification: On February 4, 1991, a restructuring of HQ USAF was announced. In that restructuring, the Auditor General position, along with six other AFAA positions were transferred to the manpower rolls of the Air Force Secretariat. This action formally recognized that the Auditor General would be both a member of the Secretariat and the manager of the AFAA. It is imperative that, in his dual role, the Auditor General have sufficient staff in the NCR to establish Air Force policy and direct AFAA operations.

Mather Air Force Base, California

Recommendation: As part of the closure of Mather AFB, California, realign the 940th Air Refueling Group (ARG) (Air Force Reserve) to McClellan AFB, California, and leave the 323rd FTW Hospital open as an annex to McClellan AFB. The 1988 Base Closure Commission recommended realignment of the 940th ARG (AFRES) to McClellan AFB if local authorities did not elect to operate the Mather facility as an airport.

Justification: During the Air Force review of the DoD Force Structure Plan and its base structure, sufficient capacity at McClellan AFB, which is only 10 miles from Mather AFB, was identified to support the 940th Air Refueling Group (AFRES). This move to McClellan AFB will enhance operational capability because of the active duty infrastructure to support the unit and will save annual base operating costs of \$9M. In addition, the move could enhance the viable reuse of Mather AFB by the local community since this refueling unit occupies the primary flightline space at the air base. Also, the Sacramento community has not, to date, committed to the reuse of Mather AFB as a civil airport. Finally, the Commission did not specifically address where, or if, the 323rd FTW hospital would realign. The Air Force implementation plan associated with the 1988 Base Closure Commission closes the hospital at Mather and converts a clinic to a hospital at McClellan AFB at a cost of approximately \$34M. After review, it is appropriate to keep this forty-five bed hospital at Mather AFB open as an annex to McClellan AFB. This will save construction costs of expanding the existing medical facility at McClellan AFB and be responsive to all medical requirements in the Sacramento area. The MILCON avoidance is approximately \$9.5M.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho

Recommendation: As a part of the closure of George AFB, California, realign some F-4Gs to the Idaho and Nevada Air National Guard squadrons at Boise and Reno respectively; inactivate the 35th TTW; keep the 41st ECS (EC-130H aircraft) in place at Davis-Monthan AFB; realign Mountain Home AFB EF-111 aircraft to Cannon AFB, New Mexico; and establish a composite wing at Mountain Home AFB. The 1988 Base Closure Commission recommended that the 35th Tactical Training Wing (TTW) and the 37th Tactical Fighter Wing (TFW) (F-4E/G aircraft) realign to Mountain Home AFB, Idaho. These aircraft were to be consolidated with the Mountain Home AFB's EF-111 electronic warfare aircraft. To accommodate the move of the F-4E/Gs into Mountain Home AFB, the Commission recommended realigning part of the 366th Tactical Fighter Wing (F-111E and F-111A aircraft) from Mountain Home AFB to Cannon AFB, New Mexico. Additionally, the Commission recommended realigning the 27th Tactical Air Support Squadron (OV-10 aircraft) to Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona where other OV-10 aircraft were already located. To accommodate the additional OV-10 aircraft at Davis-Monthan AFB, the 41st Electronic Combat Squadron (ECS) (EC-130H aircraft) would realign from Davis-Monthan AFB to Bergstrom AFB, Texas.

Justification: The force structure upon which the 1988 Base Closure Commission based its realignment recommendations is significantly different than the current and projected force structure in the DoD Force Structure Plan. The Air Force, in its FY92 budget, programmed for the retirement of all F-4E/G aircraft assigned to George AFB. However, as a result of Operation Desert Storm, the Air Force has validated an operational requirement to maintain some total force F-4G capability into the future. The Reno and Boise units present a cost effective solution since they currently fly the RF-4 and are well located to support Red Flag operations and the Mountain Home AFB composite wing. The George AFB OV-10s have retired, therefore eliminating the need to realign the 41st ECS. Additionally, Bergstrom AFB is now recommended for closure. Realigning Mountain Home AFB EF-111s to Cannon AFB will collocate all CONUS based F-111 type aircraft at a single base, enhancing logistics support. These actions created capacity at Mountain Home AFB to support a new composite wing equipped with a variety of fighter, tanker, and potentially, bomber aircraft realigning from other bases. The MILCON avoidance is approximately \$10.6M.

[FR Doc. 91-8863 Filed 4-12-91; 2:04 pm]

BILLING CODE 3810-01-C