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2005 COMMISSIONERS

- The Honorable Anthony J. Principi (Chairman)
- The Honorable James H. Bilbray
- The Honorable Philip E. Coyle, III
- Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret)
- The Honorable James V. Hansen
- General James T. Hill, USA (Ret)
- General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret)
- The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner
- Brigadier General Sue E. Turner, USAF (Ret)
COMMISSION POLICIES

- Commissioner visited every installation recommended for a major closure or realignment action (-300 or more civilians)
- Every affected community had a chance to be heard
- Regional hearings provided communities a forum
- All Commission documentation made available to public
- All Commission activities open to the press and the public
2005 COMMISSION PROCESS

- May 13 - Receive DoD report
- Throughout process - Investigative hearings
- May through July - Base visits/regional hearings
- July 1 - GAO report
- July 19 - Adds/substitutions hearing
- July and August - Adds base visits / regional hearings
- August 24-27 - Final deliberation hearings
- September 8 - Report to the President
COMMUNITY INTERACTION

- Held 20 regional hearings around the Nation and 20 exploratory hearings.
- Commission received over 300,000 pieces of written correspondence.
- Website (www.brac.gov) received over 25 million hits.
- Over 13,000 public comments were posted to the website.
The BRAC 2005 Strategic Context

- The first BRAC to be conducted in a decade
- The first to be conducted during a time when the United States military is heavily involved overseas in sustained battle.
- The first when defense spending was consistently increasing. During past BRAC rounds, defense spending was going down or scheduled to go down.
- The first since 9/11 and the first in the post-9/11 security environment.
- The first to be conducted under a National Defense Strategy and Quadrennial Defense Review that de-emphasizes conventional war fighting and emphasizes unconventional or asymmetric war fighting.
Initial Observations

- The 2005 BRAC was the largest and most complex BRAC in history.
- And produced the largest savings of any BRAC.
- The low and medium hanging fruit has been picked.
- DOD proposals that cost money were buried in larger DOD proposals that saved money.
- Larger bases got bigger; smaller installations were absorbed.
The DOD Proposals were characteristic of the Rumsfeld Pentagon

- Aggressive
- Far-reaching
- Complex
- Innovative
Section 5: Close Fort Monmouth - NJ

Associated Installations:

1. Close Fort Monmouth, NJ
2. Realign Undistributed Reductions
3. Realign 2511 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA
4. Realign Fort Belvoir, VA
5. Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL
6. Realign Fort Knox, KY
7. Gain at Fort Meade, MD
8. Gain at Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD
9. Gain at West Point, NY
10. Gain at Defense Supply Center, Columbus OH
SEC. 165: Reorganization of Naval Air Intermediate and Depot maintenance INTO Fleet Readiness Centers. (East Coast)

REDISTRIBUTION OF WORKLOAD AND EXPECTED CIVILIAN TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS

Realign NAS Jacksonville, FL
And Establish FRC SOUTHEAST ATLANTIC

11

Establish FRC Southeast, Site NAS Mayport, FL

Establish FRC Southeast, Site Cecil Field, FL

Establish FRC Southeast, Site Key West, FL

AIMD Brunswick

-169

Realign NAS Oceana, VA
And Establish FRC MID ATLANTIC

-338

Realign MCAS Cherry Point, NC
And Establish FRC EAST ATLANTIC

-190

Establish FRC Mid Atl., Site NAS Patuxent River, MD

Establish FRC East Site, MCAS Beaufort, SC

Establish FRC East Site, Quantico, VA.

Establish FRC East Site, Site NAS New Orleans, LA
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AIMD Atlanta

NAVAIRES WILLOW GROVE

AIMD CRISTI

-697

EXPECTED REDUCTIONS FROM REALIGNMENT
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SEC. 165: Reorganization of Naval Air Intermediate and Depot maintenance Into Fleet Readiness Centers. (West Coast)

REDISTRIBUTION OF WORKLOAD AND EXPECTED CIVILIAN TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS

- NAVSURFWARCN CRANE ALQ-99
- Realign NAS Whidbey Island, WA And Establish FRC NORTHWEST
- NAVAires Atlanta
- EXPECTED REDUCTIONS FROM REALIGNMENT -490
- Realign NAS Lemoore, CA And Establish FRC WEST
- Realign NB Coronado, CA And Establish FRC SOUTHWEST
- Establish FRC West, Site Fort Worth
- Establish FRC West, Site NAS Fallen, NV
- Establish FRC Southwest, Site MCAS Miramar, CA
- Establish FRC Southwest, Site MCAS, Pendleton, CA
- Establish FRC Southwest, Site NAS Yuma, AZ
- Establish FRC Southwest, Site Point Mugu, CA

Reductions:
-99 136 255 28 5 7 5
-26 21 5

Realign NAS Whidbey Island, WA And Establish FRC NORTHWEST

NAVSURFWARCN CRANE ALQ-99

-99 136 255 28 5 7 5
-26 21 5
DOD Deficiencies

- A lack of Jointness
- A lack of transformation, hidden costs, and misleading savings
- Access to DOD Justifications and Back-up Data
- Timing relative to the QDR and Overseas Basing Commission
- Coordination with States and other government agencies, especially DHS.
- Complex, intertwined recommendations of seemingly unrelated actions.
Air Force “Cat’s Cradle”
AIR NATIONAL GUARD ISSUES

- DoD recommendations driven by the reduction in aircraft inventory; need to man emerging missions; and desired optimal squadron sizes
- States concern was need of Air National Guard resources to perform state missions, such as homeland security and disaster relief
- Commission lay-down balanced DoD goals and state interests:
  - Established aircraft at nine Air National Guard installations that would have been left without aircraft by DoD recommendations
  - Reinstituted Air National Guard flying missions in three states that would have lost those missions in the DoD recommendations
  - Allowed for better support of recruiting and state mission needs
  - Realigned some flying missions Permanently based air intercept aircraft in a parts of the Country
## 2005 BRAC Recommendations Breakout by Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Group</th>
<th>Recommendation (Bill Section Number)</th>
<th>Total Recommendations</th>
<th>Total Actions (Close or Realign)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission Representation of OSD Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>1 – 56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>57 – 77</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Cross Service</td>
<td>120 – 190</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>78 - 119</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSD Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of BRAC 2005 with Previous Rounds (From GAO Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Major Closures</th>
<th>Major Realignments</th>
<th>Minor closures and realignments</th>
<th>Total actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Previous Rounds</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2005</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Commission Cost and Savings Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Costs*</th>
<th>Net Annual Recurring Savings*</th>
<th>20-Year Net Present Value Savings*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$6.8</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Previous Rounds</td>
<td>$22.4</td>
<td>$7.2</td>
<td>$73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2005</td>
<td>$21.0</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$35.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dollars in billions*
**2005 COBRA Data Update**

### Cost / (Savings) Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>DoD Baseline without Military Personnel Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Time Cost</td>
<td>$ 21.0</td>
<td>$ 21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Implementation Cost</td>
<td>$ 4.5</td>
<td>$ ??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Year Net Present Value (Savings)</td>
<td>($ 35.6)</td>
<td>($ 15.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dollars in billions*
The Joint Cross Service Team team supported direct analysis of those recommendations submitted by the SECDEF Joint Cross Service Sub-Groups

1. Education and Training
2. HQ and Support Activities
3. Industrial
4. Intelligence
5. Medical
6. Supply and Storage
7. Technical
McChord AFB/Fort Lewis, Washington

Fort Dix/NAES Lakehurst/McGuire AFB, New Jersey

Joint Base Andrews AFB/Naval Air Facility - Washington, MD.

Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling - D.C. (Bolling AFB+ Naval District of Washington)

Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall, Virginia

Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska

Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii

Installation Management Functions from Fort Sam Houston and Randolph AFB to Lackland AFB, Texas

Installation Management Functions from Naval Weapons Station Charleston to Charleston, AFB, South Carolina

Installation Management Functions from Fort Eustis to Langley AFB, Virginia

Installation Management Functions from Fort Story to Commander Naval Mid-Atlantic Region, Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia

Installation Management Functions from Andersen AFB to Commander US Naval Forces, Marianas Islands, Guam
CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE

Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (#179)

Maritime C4ISR Research, Development, Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (#181)

Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development, Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (#184)

Air Integrated Weapons & Armaments Research, Development, Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (#185)

Integrated Weapons and Armaments Site for Guns and Ammunition (#186)

Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development, Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (#188)

Rotary Wing Air Platform Research, Development, Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (#189)

Navy Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research, Development, Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (#190)
Sec. 179: Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation

Rejected by the Commission
Sec. 181: Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation

Modified by the Commission
Sec. 181: Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation

- SPAWAR Systems Center Detachment, San Diego, CA
- Naval Center for Tactical Systems Interoperability, CA
- SPAWAR Systems Command Pacific, Point Loma, CA
- NSWC Division, Dahlgren, VA
- NB Ventura County, CA
- NS Newport, RI

Modified by the Commission
Sec. 182: Consolidate Navy Strategic Test & Evaluation

Naval Ordnance Test Unit, Patrick AFB, FL

Strategic Weapons Facility Annex, Kings Bay, GA

Rejected by the Commission
Sec. 184: Create a Naval Integrated Weapons & Armaments RD&A, T&E Center

Naval Air Station Patuxent River, MD
Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane, IN
Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, CA
Fleet Combat Training Center, CA
Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren, VA
Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA
Naval Base Ventura County Port Hueneme, CA
Naval Surface Warfare Center Indian Head, MD
Naval Surface Warfare Center Yorktown, VA

Approved with Concerns
Sec. 187: Defense Research Service Led Laboratories

Air Force Research Laboratory, Mesa City, AZ

Rome Laboratory, NY

Air Force Research Laboratory, Hanscom, MA

Wright Patterson AFB, OH

Kirtland AFB, NM

Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD

Army Research Laboratory Langley, VA

Army Research Laboratory Glenn, OH

Army Research Laboratory White Sands Missile Range, NM
Sec. 188: Establish Centers for Fixed Wing Air Platform Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation

Approved by the Commission
NAWC, Weapons Division, Point Mugu, CA

NAWC, Weapons Division, China Lake, CA

Rejected by the Commission
KEY ACTIONS

– Final Report delivered to the President on September 8th.
– The President had 15 days to review the final Report and decide to accept or reject in its entirety – Accepted September 15.
– If rejected the BRAC Commission would have had 45 days to amend and resubmit the report to the President – Not necessary.
– Congress now has 45 days to disapprove the final Report.
– The BRAC Commission final Report becomes federal law if not rejected by Congress.
Lessons Learned

- The next BRAC could be equally far-reaching and complex.
- Excess capacity can be an advantage, e.g. Aberdeen.
- But "excess-excess" capacity is not.
- Military value, military value, military value.
- If the military value is sufficient, BRAC proposals can cost money, not save it.
- Success is determined years before BRAC starts, e.g. China Lake; Corona, L.A. AFB.
Lessons Learned (continued)

- Commissioners may be chosen for political or military experience, but typically Commissioners do not have RDAT&E backgrounds, and are not particularly interested in RDAT&E per se.
- RDAT&E, and its components, are difficult for Commissioners to penetrate.
- Jointness may actually be key in the next BRAC. Even if not, Jointness is always an asset.
- BRAC proposals don't have to save the tax payers money to be viable.
- BRAC is a way to achieve change.
Getting Ready for a Future BRAC

- Start now
- Develop your strengths
- Modern facilities sell; old run-down facilities don't sell.
- Face up to your weaknesses
- Face up to your weaknesses and correct them. This takes years.
Conclusions

- There will be future BRACs
- The Commission recommends every 8 to 12 years.
- Congress probably would not support a BRAC in 2009.
- The next BRAC is recommended to begin in 2013 immediately following the 2013 QDR
- Sooner than 2013 is unlikely because of the QDR schedule and the presidential election cycle.
- 2013 may seem like a long way off, but it takes years to position a base for success, e.g. Los Angeles AFB, China Lake.