Department of the Navy

Summary of Selection Process

Introduction

Building on the experience gained during previous rounds of BRAC, the Secretary of the Navy established policies, procedures, organizations, and internal controls that ensured that the process in the Department of the Navy (DoN) for making base closure and realignment recommendations to the Secretary of Defense was sound and in compliance with the Base Closure Act. The Secretary of the Navy established the Infrastructure Evaluation Group as the deliberative body responsible for the development of recommendations for closure and realignment of installations and the DoN Analysis Group as a subordinate deliberative body responsible for analyzing Department of the Navy unique functions. The Secretary of the Navy also established the Infrastructure Analysis Team to provide analytic and staff support to the Infrastructure Evaluation Group and DoN Navy Analysis Group.

Strategy

The Department of the Navy employed a multi-pronged strategy for BRAC 2005 that sought to rationalize and consolidate infrastructure capabilities to eliminate unnecessary excess, balance the effectiveness of fleet concentrations with anti-terrorism/force protection desires for dispersion of assets and redundancy of facilities, leverage opportunities for total force laydown and joint basing, accommodate changing operational concepts, and facilitate the evolution of force structure and infrastructure organizational alignment. In developing BRAC 2005 recommendations, the Department adhered to the principles that its recommendations must eliminate excess capacity, save money, improve operational readiness and jointness, and maintain quality of service.

Selection Process

Under the oversight and guidance of the Secretary of the Navy, the Infrastructure Evaluation Group had nine members consisting of senior DoN career civilians and Navy flag and Marine Corps general officers who were responsible for developing recommendations for closure and realignment of Navy and Marine Corps military installations or activities for approval by the Secretary of the Navy. The Infrastructure Evaluation Group was responsible for ensuring: that an equitable and complete evaluation of all Navy and Marine Corps installations was conducted in accordance with the Base Closure Act; that all recommendations were in compliance with the Base Closure Act and appropriate guidance from higher levels; that the procedures used could be appropriately reviewed and analyzed by the Comptroller General; and that factors of concern to the Navy and Marine Corps Operational Commanders were considered. In conducting its evaluation, the Infrastructure Evaluation Group applied the Secretary's selection criteria and based its recommendations on the

20-year Force Structure Plan and infrastructure inventory. The DoN evaluation also fully considered surge and homeland defense missions requirements.

The DoN Analysis Group had eleven members consisting of senior Department of the Navy career civilians and Navy flag and Marine Corps general officers who were responsible for conducting analyses and developing specific recommendations regarding closure and realignment of DoN military installations or activities for consideration by the Infrastructure Evaluation Group. The DoN Analysis Group was responsible for ensuring: that the process utilized and the conduct of the deliberations were in compliance with the Base Closure Act and appropriate guidance from higher levels; that the procedures used could be appropriately reviewed and analyzed by the Comptroller General; and that factors of concern to the Navy and Marine Corps Operational Commanders were considered.

The Infrastructure Analysis Team, composed of military and civilian analysts and supporting staff from throughout the DoN and from the Center for Naval Analysis, was responsible for providing intensive staff support to the Infrastructure Evaluation Group and the DoN Analysis Group. Additionally, the Naval Audit Service and the Office of General Counsel were integrally involved in the process. The Naval Audit Service reviewed the activities of the Infrastructure Evaluation Group, DoN Analysis Group, and Infrastructure Analysis Team to ensure compliance with the approved Internal Control Plan and audited the accuracy and reliability of data provided by Navy and Marine Corps activities. The Office of the General Counsel provided senior-level legal advice and counsel.

In compliance with the Internal Control Plan, a base structure database was developed that contained relevant information on all DoN military installations subject to the Base Closure Act. The DoN BRAC Information Transfer System, a secure web-based data collection and management tool, was the sole and authoritative base structure database. It served as the baseline for evaluation of all Department of the Navy installations leading to the development of BRAC 2005 recommendations for closure and realignment. Pursuant to the certification policy promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy in the Internal Control Plan to comply with the provisions of the Base Closure Act, data that was entered into the DoN BRAC Information Transfer System had to be certified as accurate and complete by the officer or civilian employee who initially generated data in response to a request for information, and then at each succeeding level in an established certification chain. In conjunction with the requirement to keep records of all meetings that were part of the decision making process, the DoN BRAC Information Transfer System and the certification process were designed to ensure the accuracy of the information upon which the recommendations were based.

The senior leadership of the Navy and Marine Corps was substantially involved in the process. Policy issues and basic principles that affect basing and infrastructure requirements were articulated, and comments were solicited from major “owner/operators” of Navy and Marine Corps installations on Fleet operations, support, and readiness impacts. Additionally, the relationship between the Military Departments and the Office of the Secretary of Defense for BRAC 2005 was more formalized and robust than in any prior round of BRAC. The Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Vice Chief of Naval Operations were members of the Infrastructure Executive

Council and the Infrastructure Steering Group and thus personally involved in all aspects of decision-making.

In order to comply with the requirements of the Base Closure Act relating to evaluation using the Force Structure Plan and selection criteria, the first step in the process was to categorize and aggregate activities for analysis. For BRAC 2005, the Secretary of Defense directed that the analysis would be divided into two categories of functions with seven Joint Cross-Service Groups (JCSGs) analyzing common business-oriented support functions and the Military Departments analyzing all Service unique functions. With regard to the DoN unique functions, the Infrastructure Evaluation Group approved Operations, Education and Training, Headquarters and Support, and Other Support as the major areas for analyses. These major areas were then further divided into functions to ensure that installations performing like functions were compared to one another and to allow identification of total capacity and military value for an entire category of installations, as follows: Operations (Surface/Subsurface Operations, Aviation Operations, Ground Operations, and Munitions Storage and Distribution); Education and Training (Recruit Training, Officer Accession Training, and DoN Unique Professional Military Education); Headquarters and Support (Reserve Centers, Recruiting Districts/Stations, and Regional Support Activities); and Other Support (Organizational Followers, Dependent Activities, Stand Alone Activities, and Specialized Functions Activities).

Of the 889 activities in the Navy and Marine Corps universe, 469 of these performed functions that were analyzed by one or more of the JCSGs. Thus, a significant portion of the universe was analyzed by the JCSGs in BRAC 2005. Of the 889 activities, 590 of these performed unique functions that were analyzed by the Department of the Navy. In some instances, an activity was analyzed by the DoN and one or more JCSGs. The universe of activities was carefully reviewed to ensure that every activity fell under the analytic purview of either the DoN or a JCSG. Finally, because the BRAC 2005 analysis was conducted on a functional rather than an installation basis, it was necessary to ensure that the totality of activities covered the universe of Department of the Navy bases.

The next step in the BRAC 2005 process was the development of requests for information, or data calls, for the purpose of collecting all types of information required for development of the base structure database and use in subsequent analyses. The JCSGs and Military Departments jointly developed an initial capacity data call that was sent to all Navy and Marine Corps activities. Supplemental capacity data calls were developed and issued in the same manner except that they were issued to a smaller or targeted group of activities. A second series of data calls was then issued to obtain information necessary to conduct military value and other selection criteria analyses. Like the supplemental capacity data calls, these data calls were issued to targeted DoN activities. Because most Department of the Navy activities perform more than one function, each activity normally received multiple data calls. Additional data calls were issued during the scenario analysis phase. The DoN BRAC Information Transfer System was used for the distribution of data calls and collection of activity responses and supporting documentation.

Capacity analysis compared the current base structure to the future force structure requirements to determine whether excess base structure capacity exists within a given functional area. Capacity analysis was conducted on a functional basis (e.g., ship berthing) rather than by installation category

(e.g., Naval Stations). For each function, measures of capacity were selected which reflected the appropriate "metric" for that function. For example, the metric used in the Aviation Operations Function was the Hangar Module, i.e., that amount of hangar, apron, maintenance, and administrative space necessary to support a squadron of aircraft. If total current capacity in a function was greater than the capacity required to support the future force structure, excess capacity was deemed to exist within a particular function. The other steps in the process were designed to allow the narrowing of focus to develop options for reducing that excess. Of the 14 functions evaluated, two (Ground Operations and Specialized Functions Activities) demonstrated either little or no excess capacity.

Except for a limited number of activities in the “Other Support” area, each activity performing a given function was subjected to a military value analysis using a quantitative methodology that was as objective as possible. The foundation of the analysis was the Secretary’s selection criteria. The purpose of the military value analysis was to assess the relative military value of activities performing a given function. Information from the military value data call responses was displayed in a matrix and scored by the DoN Analysis Group according to its relative importance for a particular function. A military value score for a particular activity is a relative measure of military value only within the context of the function in which that activity was analyzed, in order to compare one activity within a function against another in that function.

The results of the capacity analyses and military value analyses were then combined in that stage of the process called configuration analysis. The purpose of configuration analysis was to identify for each function that set of activities that best meets the needs of the Navy and Marine Corps, in light of future requirements, while eliminating the most excess capacity. Configuration analysis used a mixed-integer linear programming solver, AMPL/CPLEX, to generate multiple solutions for an optimization model that allowed the DoN Analysis Group to explore tradeoffs between eliminating excess capacity and retaining sites having high military value.

The configuration analysis solutions were used by the DoN Analysis Group as the starting point for the development of potential closure and realignment scenarios that would undergo analysis to determine return on investment. Scenario development was an iterative process in which results of the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) analyses and inputs from senior Defense leadership were used to generate additional options. An integral part of scenario development was the input received from the Fleet, the major claimants (including the System Commands), and the Department’s civilian leadership. The Fleet Commanders and major claimants provided input both directly, during meetings, and indirectly, through scenario data call responses. As a result of the scenario development portion of the DoN BRAC 2005 process, the DoN Analysis Group/ Infrastructure Evaluation Group developed and analyzed 187 scenarios involving 344 activities.

COBRA analyses were conducted on all of these scenarios, using certified responses to scenario data calls from the chains of command of affected installations and their tenants. In analyzing these responses, the DoN Analysis Group aggressively challenged cost estimates to ensure both their consistency with standing policies and procedures and their reasonableness. With reductions in budgets and force structure, the DoN Analysis Group reviewed the data call responses to ensure that out year requirements were appropriately reduced in terms of personnel, facilities, and capacities of remaining facilities. The COBRA algorithms were used as a tool to ensure the recommendations

were cost effective. The DoN Analysis Group and the Infrastructure Evaluation Group were particularly sensitive to up-front costs and the length of time required to obtain a return on investment because of the difficulties in ensuring sufficient funding and resources to execute base closure. As a result, a significant majority of the Department of the Navy recommendations will obtain a return on investment within four years, with savings offsetting costs of closure within the closure implementation period.

The impact on the local economic area for each installation considered for closure or realignment was assessed during the scenario analysis process using an Economic Impact Tool that provided a uniform methodology for estimating the total direct and indirect job changes associated with a closure or realignment scenario. The DoN is very concerned about economic impact and has made every effort to fully understand all of the economic impacts its recommendations might have on local communities.

The Department of the Navy also assessed the ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel by analyzing infrastructure impacts of different scenarios in the following ten community attributes: demographics, child care, cost of living, education, employment, housing, medical providers, safety/crime, transportation, and utilities. No significant community infrastructure impediments were identified for any of the DoN proposed closure or realignment actions.

In order to assess and consider the environmental impacts of different closure and realignment scenarios, the following environmental resource areas were identified for consideration: air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands. For those scenarios for which COBRA analysis was completed and for which it was determined that a complete criteria review would be conducted, a Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts was prepared. The Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts consisted of an overview of the certified data, including the costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities, and summarized the environmental impacts associated with a particular scenario. To assist in the assessment of the cumulative environmental impacts from all scenarios at a particular installation, a Summary of Cumulative Environmental Impacts was also prepared for each gaining installation. The environmental impact analysis permitted the Department of the Navy to obtain a comprehensive picture of the potential environmental impacts arising from the recommendations for closure and realignment. No environmental impacts that would preclude implementation were identified for any scenario.

Finally, as noted above, the Secretary of Defense mandated in BRAC 2005 that the JCSGs would analyze common business-oriented functions. The Joint Cross-Service recommendations impacted numerous Navy and Marine Corps installations. In some instances, the Joint Cross-Service recommendation resulted in a realignment of the installation. In other cases, the recommendation or series of recommendations allowed for closure of the installation fenceline, thereby generating additional savings and reductions in excess capacity. Those recommendations are included within the Department of the Navy recommendations.
The recommendations approved by the Secretary of Defense follow:

Recommendation for Realignment
Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, CA

Recommendation: Realign Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA. Disestablish the depot maintenance of Aircraft Other Components, Aircraft Rotary, and Strategic Missiles. Consolidate depot maintenance of Engines/Transmissions, Other Components, and Small Arms/Personal Weapons at Anniston Army Depot, AL. Consolidate the depot maintenance of Conventional Weapons, Engines/Transmissions, Material Handling, Powertrain Components, Starters/ Alternators/Generators, Test Measurement Diagnostic Equipment, and Wire at Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Consolidate depot maintenance of Electronic Components (Non-Airborne), Electro-Optics/Night Vision/Forward-Looking-Infrared, Generators, Ground Support Equipment, Radar, and Radio at Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA. Consolidate depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles at Letterkenny Army Depot, PA. Realign Fleet Support Division Maintenance Center Barstow and Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow operations to increase efficiencies and reduce infrastructure.

Justification: This recommendation follows the strategy of minimizing sites using maximum capacity of 1.5 shifts while maintaining a west coast depot maintenance presence at Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow to provide west coast operating forces with a close, responsive source for depot maintenance support. Required capacity to support workloads and core requirements for the DoD is relocated to other DoD Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence, thereby increasing the military value of depot maintenance performed at these sites. This recommendation decreases the cost of depot maintenance operations across DoD through consolidation and elimination of 30 percent of duplicate overhead structures required to operate multiple depot maintenance activities. This recommendation supports transformation of DoD's depot maintenance operations by increasing the utilization of existing capacity by up to 150 percent while maintaining capability to support future force structure. This recommendation also results in utilization of DoD capacity to facilitate performance of interservice workload. In addition, based on present and future wartime surge projections, Marine Corps Logistics Center Barstow will establish an additional 428 thousand hours of amphibious vehicle capacity.

This recommendation along with other recommendations affecting supply and storage functions, optimizes the depot maintenance operations at Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $26.0M. The net of all costs and savings during the implementation period is a savings of $56.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $18.4M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $230.6M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 796 jobs (409 direct jobs and 387 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA Metropolitan Statistical

Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA, is in Attainment although Title V permit modifications will be required. There are potential impacts to cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; and wetlands. Anniston Army Depot, AL, is in Attainment. There are impacts anticipated for threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. Letterkenny Army Depot, PA is in Marginal Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour and 8-Hour) and an Air Conformity determination is required. Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA, is in Moderate Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour) and an Air Conformity determination is required. No impacts are anticipated for the remaining resource areas of dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; or water resources. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations, which report $0.9M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impacts of all the recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation have been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Naval Support Activity Corona, CA

Recommendation: Close Naval Support Activity Corona, CA. Relocate Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona, CA to Naval Base Ventura County (Naval Air Station Point Mugu), CA.

Justification: The Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona performs three required missions for Department of the Navy (Independent Assessment Capability, Metrology and Calibration Laboratories, and Tactical Aircrew Combat Training System Ranges). It was analyzed under 11 Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation functions (Air Platforms Development & Acquisition; Air Platforms Test & Evaluation; Ground Vehicles Test and Evaluation; Information Systems Technology Development & Acquisition; Information Systems Technology Test & Evaluation; Sea Vehicles Development & Acquisition; Sea Vehicles Test & Evaluation; Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare Development & Acquisition; Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare Test & Evaluation; Weapons Technology Development & Acquisition; and Weapons Technology Test & Evaluation). In each functional area, Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona's quantitative military value scores fell in

the bottom half of facilities performing the same function, and thus were reviewed for relocation and/or consolidation with like functions. The Department of the Navy determined it would lose a critical capability if the 11 functions were relocated to a variety of locations, since this would fracture the full spectrum warfare center and independent assessment capability. Considering the overall military value and the fact that Naval Support Activity Corona was a single function facility, the Department reviewed the possibility of relocating the Naval Surface Warfare Center functions to a multi-functional location with the capability to host these functions. Relocation of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona to Naval Air Station Point Mugu collocates it with other Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation activities and with fleet assets at Naval Air Station Point Mugu. This consolidation of space will provide a more efficient organization with greater synergies and increased effectiveness.

Relocation of Naval Surface Warfare Center Division Corona Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation functions to Naval Air Station Point Mugu removes the primary mission from Naval Support Activity Corona and eliminates or moves the entirety of the workforce at Naval Support Activity Corona except for those personnel associated with the base operations support function. As a result, retention of Naval Support Activity Corona is no longer necessary.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $80.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $65.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $6.0M with a payback expected in 15 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $0.4M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,796 jobs (892 direct jobs and 904 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Air Station Point Mugu, CA, is in Severe Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour) but no Air Conformity Determination will be required. There are potential impacts for cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; threatened and endangered species; waste management and wetlands. No impacts are anticipated for dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise or water resources. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $410 thousand in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The

aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord, CA

Recommendation: Close the Inland area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment, Concord CA, except retain such property and facilities as are necessary to support operations in the Tidal area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord. The Tidal area of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord, along with the retained portion of the Inland area, shall be transferred to the Army.

Justification: While Department of the Navy weapons stations have no excess capacity for loading and distribution of munitions, there is an excess of munitions storage capacity. Because of the departure of Fleet units from the San Francisco area in the 1990s, Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord's Inland magazine field has been in a reduced operating status since 1999. At that time, the Inland area was retained in an effort to minimize risk should a future need develop to expand storage capacity. The Explosive Safety Quantity Distance arcs in the Inland area were available to allow safe, temporary holding of railcars with munitions destined for loading by the Army-managed Marine Ocean Terminal Concord (at the Tidal area) during high tempo operations. After consultation with Combatant Commanders, the Army Material Command and the Army component of the U.S. Transportation Command, the Department of the Navy has concluded this capability is no longer necessary. The Inland area is excess to Department of the Navy/DoD needs and is severable. The closure of the Inland area, therefore, will save money and have no impact on mission capability.

The City of Concord requested closure of both the Inland and Tidal portions of Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord. Munitions loading requirements preclude closing the Tidal area but the Inland area is excess and may be closed. Because Tidal area operations are in support of the Army component of the U.S. Transportation Command, transfer of the property to the Army aligns the property holder with the property user.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $14.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $43.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $16.4M with a payback expected in one year. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $199.7M.

Economic Impact on Communities: This recommendation will not result in any job reductions (direct or indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Oakland-Fremont-Hayward, CA, Metropolitan Division economic area. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach Detachment Concord, CA, is in Extreme Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour) but no Air Conformity Determination will be required. There are potential impacts for cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; and wetlands that may impact new construction. No impacts are anticipated for dredging, land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; waste management or water resources. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installation involved, which indicated $0.3M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Submarine Base New London, CT

Recommendation: Close Naval Submarine Base New London, CT. Relocate its assigned submarines, Auxiliary Repair Dock 4 (ARDM-4), and Nuclear Research Submarine 1 (NR-1) along with their dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Submarine Base Kings Bay, GA, and Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Relocate the intermediate submarine repair function to Shore Intermediate Repair Activity Norfolk, at Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA, and Trident Refit Facility Kings Bay, GA. Relocate the Naval Submarine School and Center for Submarine Learning to Submarine Base Kings Bay, GA. Consolidate the Naval Security Group Activity Groton, CT with Naval Security Group Activity Norfolk, VA at Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Consolidate Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory Groton, CT, with Naval Medical Research Center at Walter Reed Army Medical Center Forest Glenn Annex, MD. Relocate Naval Undersea Medical Institute Groton, CT to Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, and Fort Sam Houston, TX. Consolidate Navy Region Northeast, New London, CT, with Navy Region, Mid-Atlantic, Norfolk, VA.

Justification: The existing berthing capacity at surface/subsurface installations exceeds the capacity required to support the Force Structure Plan. The closure of Submarine Base New London materially contributes to the maximum reduction of excess capacity while increasing the average military value of the remaining bases in this functional area. Sufficient capacity and fleet dispersal is maintained with the East Coast submarine fleet homeports of Naval Station Norfolk and Submarine Base Kings Bay, without affecting operational capability. The intermediate submarine repair function is relocated to Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk at Norfolk Naval Shipyard, and the Trident Refit Facility Kings Bay, GA, in support of the relocating submarines. Consolidating the Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory

with assets at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center Forest Glenn Annex will create a DoD Center of Hyperbaric and Undersea Medicine that will increase synergy by consolidating previously separate animal and human research capabilities at a single location. The consolidation of Navy Region, Northeast with Navy Region, Mid-Atlantic is one element of the Department of the Navy efforts to reduce the number of Installation Management Regions from twelve to eight. Consolidation of the Regions rationalizes regional management structure and allows for opportunities to collocate regional entities to align management concepts and efficiencies.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $679.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $345.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $192.8M with a payback expected in three years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $1,576.4M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 15,808 jobs (8,457 direct jobs and 7,351 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Norwich-New London, CT Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 9.4 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Station Norfolk, VA is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-Hour) and Marginal Non-attainment for Ozone (8-Hour). An Air Conformity Determination may be required. There are potential impacts for dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species; and water resources. Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA, has the same air status as Naval Station Norfolk. There may be similar water resource impacts. Submarine Base Kings Bay, GA, is in Attainment. There are potential impacts for dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species; and water resources. Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, is in Attainment. There are potential impacts to cultural, archeological, tribal resources; waste management; and wetlands. Walter Reed Medical Center-Forrest Glen Annex, MD, is in Severe Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour and 8-Hour) and an Air Conformity Determination will be required. There are potential impacts to land use constraints or sensitive resources, and wetlands. Fort Sam Houston, TX, is in Attainment. There are potential impacts to cultural, archeological, tribal resources; threatened and endangered species; and water resources. No impacts are anticipated for the remaining resource areas of noise; or waste management. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $11.3M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Naval Submarine Base New London, CT, the closing installation, reports $23.9M in costs for environmental restoration. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an

installation is closed, realigned, or remains open, this cost is not included in the payback calculation. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Realignment
Officer Training Command, Pensacola, FL

Recommendation: Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL by relocating Officer Training Command Pensacola, FL to Naval Station Newport, RI, and consolidating with Officer Training Command Newport, RI.

Justification: Navy Officer Accession Training is currently conducted at three installations: (1) U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, MD hosts Midshipman Training; (2) Naval Station Newport hosts Naval Academy Preparatory School and Officer Training Command Newport, which includes Officer Indoctrination School and Seaman to Admiral-21 Program courses; and (3) Naval Air Station Pensacola hosts Officer Training Command Pensacola which includes Navy Officer Candidate School, Limited Duty Officer Course, Chief Warrant Officer Course, and the Direct Commissioning Program. Consolidation of Officer Training Command Pensacola and Officer Training Command Newport will reduce inefficiencies inherent in maintaining two sites for similar training courses through reductions in facilities requirements, personnel requirements (including administrative and instructional staff), and excess capacity. This action also supports the Department of the Navy initiative to create a center for officer training at Naval Station Newport.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $3.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $1.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.9M with a payback expected in 4 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $10.0M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 675 jobs (295 direct jobs and 380 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.3 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Station Newport, RI, is in Serious Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour) and in Moderate Non-attainment for Ozone (8-Hour) but no Air Conformity

Determination will be required. No impacts are anticipated for air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation does not impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA

Recommendation: Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA. Relocate its aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA; Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX; and Robins Air Force Base, Robins, GA. Relocate Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem, Forest Park, GA. Relocate depot maintenance Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication and Manufacturing, and Support Equipment in support of F/A-18, C-9 and C-12 aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX. Relocate intermediate maintenance in support of E-2C aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA. Consolidate the Naval Air Reserve Atlanta with Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Atlanta located at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Marietta, GA. Retain the Windy Hill Annex.

Justification: This recommendation reduces excess capacity while maintaining reserve forces in regions with favorable demographics. The aviation assets will be located closer to their theater of operations and/or will result in increased maintenance efficiencies and operational synergies. Relocating Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem creates synergies with joint intelligence assets while maintaining the demographic base offered by the Atlanta area for this function. The Fleet Readiness Center portion of this recommendation realigns and merges depot and intermediate maintenance activities. It supports both DoD and Navy transformation goals by reducing the number of maintenance levels and streamlining the way maintenance is accomplished with associated significant cost reductions.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $43.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $289.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $66.1M with an immediate payback expected. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $910.9M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 2,186 jobs (1,420 direct jobs and 766 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate

economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, is in Serious Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour) and an Air Conformity Determination may be required. There are potential impacts to waste management. Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA is in Attainment. Robins Air Force Base, GA, is in Attainment. There are potential impacts to cultural, archeological, tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; water resources; and wetlands. No impacts are anticipated for the resource areas of dredging, marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or threatened and endangered species. For Fort Gillem, GA, and Dobbins Air Reserve Base, GA, there are no anticipated impacts regarding the resource areas of air quality; cultural, archeological, tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $0.2M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Navy Supply Corps School Athens, GA

Recommendation: Close the naval installation at Athens, GA. Relocate the Navy Supply Corps School and the Center for Service Support to Naval Station Newport, RI. Disestablish the Supply Corps Museum.

Justification: This recommendation closes a single-function installation and relocates its activities to a multi-functional installation with higher military value. Naval Station Newport has a significantly higher military value than Navy Supply Corps School and the capacity to support the Navy Supply Corps School training mission with existing infrastructure, making relocation of Navy Supply Corps School to Naval Station Newport desirable and cost efficient. Relocation of this function supports the Department of the Navy initiative to create a center for officer training at Naval Station Newport.

Center for Service Support, which establishes curricula for other service support training, is relocated to Naval Station Newport with the Navy Supply Corps School to capitalize on existing resource and personnel efficiencies.

Relocation of the Navy Supply Corps School and Center for Service Support to Naval Station Newport removes the primary mission from the naval installation at Athens and removes or relocates the entirety of the Navy workforce at the naval installation at Athens, except for those personnel associated with base support functions. As a result, retention of the naval installation at Athens is no longer required.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $23.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $13.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $3.5M with a payback expected in 7 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $21.8M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 831 jobs (513 direct jobs and 318 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Athens-Clark County, GA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.9 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Station Newport, RI, is in Serious Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour), however, an Air Conformity Determination will not be required. There are potential impacts for cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; and water resources. No impacts are anticipated for dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species; waste management; or wetlands. This recommendation will impact environmental costs at the installations involved, which reported $0.03M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA

Recommendation: Close Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA. Relocate the Navy Reserve Personnel Command and the Enlisted Placement and Management Center to Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN and consolidate with the Navy Personnel Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN. Relocate the Naval Reserve Recruiting Command to Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN and consolidate with the Navy

Recruiting Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington, TN. Relocate the Navy Reserve Command to Naval Support Activity Norfolk, VA, except for the installation management function, which consolidates with Navy Region Southwest, Naval Station San Diego, CA, Navy Region Northwest, Submarine Base Bangor, WA, and Navy Region Midwest, Naval Station Great Lakes, IL. Relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA, and consolidate with Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command, which is relocating from Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, MO. Relocate Naval Air Systems Command Support Equipment Facility New Orleans, LA, Navy Recruiting District New Orleans, LA, and the Navy Reserve Center New Orleans, LA, to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA. Relocate 8th Marine Corps District to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX. Consolidate Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA installation management function with Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA.

Justification: The collocation of the Navy Reserve Personnel Command, the Enlisted Placement Management Center, and Naval Reserve Recruiting Command at Naval Support Activity Mid-South, Millington creates a Navy Human Resources Center of Excellence, improves personnel life-cycle management, and furthers active and reserve component total force integration and effectiveness. This recommendation consolidates Reserve personnel and recruiting headquarters with like active component functions in a single location and eliminates stand-alone headquarters. In addition, activities of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Manpower Analysis Center and Navy Personnel Research and Development Center are currently located at Naval Support Activity Mid-South.

The relocation of the Navy Reserve Command comprised of Navy Reserve Forces Command, Navy Reserve Forces, and Naval Reserve Air Forces, to Naval Support Activity Norfolk, VA will enhance internal active and reserve component interoperability. By locating the reserve headquarters elements on the same base with Fleet Forces Command, its active component headquarters, this recommendation will significantly increase interaction between the two components, produce a reduction in force size by eliminating duplicative staff, and allow for further decrease in staffing size for common support functions. The consolidation of the Navy Reserve Command installation management functions with other Navy Regional organizations is part of the Department of the Navy efforts to streamline regional management structure and to institute consistent business practices.

The relocation of Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans maintains a central location for management of widely-dispersed Marine Corps Reserve elements and allows consolidation of Marine Reserve management functions. Marine Corps Reserve Support Command is currently the only geographically separated element of the Marine Forces Reserve. Consolidation with its Headquarters will significantly increase interaction and operational efficiency as well as eliminate duplicative staff. Location of this consolidated headquarters at a joint reserve base will enhance joint service interoperability concepts.

Relocation of 8th Marine Corps District to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth moves this management organization within their geographic area of responsibility. It also

places them at a major transportation node with reduced average distance to managed recruiting stations.

Relocating these functions removes the primary missions from Naval Support Activity New Orleans, and eliminates or moves the entirety of the workforce except for those personnel associated with the base operations support function and a number of smaller tenant activities. As a result, retention of Naval Support Activity New Orleans is no longer required. Accordingly, this recommendation closes the installation and eliminates or relocates the remaining base operations support personnel and tenant activities. Base operations support organizations and tenant activity services currently shared between Naval Support Activity New Orleans and Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans consolidate at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans to support the remaining area population.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $164.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $86.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $36.5M with a payback expected in three years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $276.4M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 2,096 jobs (1,192 direct jobs and 904 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner, LA Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.3 percent of the economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA is in Attainment. There are potential impacts to waste management and wetlands. Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX is in Serious Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour) and in Moderate Non-attainment for Ozone (8-Hour), however, no Air Conformity Determination will be required. No impacts are anticipated for air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species; or water resources. Naval Support Activity Mid-South Millington, TN, Naval Station San Diego, CA, Naval Submarine Base Bangor, WA, Naval Station Great Lakes, IL and Naval Support Activity Norfolk, VA report that there are no impacts anticipated for air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $0.3M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs

of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental restoration. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Realignment
Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME

Recommendation: Realign Naval Air Station Brunswick, ME to a Naval Air Facility and relocate its aircraft along with dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL. Consolidate Aviation Intermediate Maintenance with Fleet Readiness Center Southeast Jacksonville, FL.

Justification: The realignment of Naval Air Station Brunswick will reduce operating costs while single siting the East Coast Maritime Patrol community at Naval Air Station Jacksonville. This recommendation retains an operational airfield in the northeast that can be used to support the homeland defense mission, as needed, and maintains strategic flexibility. The Fleet Readiness Center portion of this recommendation realigns and merges depot and intermediate maintenance activities. It supports both DoD and Naval transformation goals by reducing the number of maintenance levels and streamlining the way maintenance is accomplished with associated significant cost reductions.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $147.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $112.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $34.9M with a payback expected in four years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $238.8M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 4,266 jobs (2,420 direct jobs and 1,846 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Portland-South Portland-Biddeford ME Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 1.3 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL, is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-Hour) and no Air Conformity Determination is required. This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; or water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation indicates

impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $0.2M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the cost of environmental restoration, waste management, or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO

Recommendation: Close Marine Corps Support Activity, Kansas City, MO. Relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA, and consolidate with Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve. Retain an enclave for the 9th Marine Corps District and the 24th Marine Regiment.

Justification: The relocation of Marine Corps Reserve Support Command and its parent command, Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans maintains a central location for management of widely dispersed Marine Corps Reserve elements and allows consolidation of Marine Reserve management functions. Marine Reserve Support Command is currently the only geographically separated element of the Marine Forces Reserve. Consolidation with its headquarters will significantly increase interaction and operational efficiency as well as eliminate duplicative staff. Location of this consolidated headquarters at a joint reserve base will enhance joint service interoperability concepts.

Relocating these functions removes the primary missions from Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City and eliminates or moves the entirety of the workforce except for those personnel associated with the 9th Marine Corps District and 24th Marine Regiment. This recommendation closes the Marine Corps Support Activity but retains an enclave for these organizations.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $23.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $8.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $5.8M with a payback expected in three years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $49.8M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 583 jobs (333 direct jobs and 250 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Kansas City, MO-KS, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and

personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA, is in Attainment. There are potential impacts to water resources. No impacts are anticipated for air quality; cultural, archeological or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species; waste management; or wetlands. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $0.2M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Naval Station Pascagoula, MS

Recommendation: Close Naval Station Pascagoula, MS. Relocate its ships along with dedicated personnel, equipment, and support to Naval Station Mayport, FL. Relocate the ship intermediate repair function to Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity Mayport, FL.

Justification: This recommendation will reduce excess berthing capacity while allowing for consolidation of surface ships in a fleet concentration area. Sufficient capacity and fleet dispersal is maintained with East Coast surface fleet homeports of Naval Station Norfolk and Naval Station Mayport, FL. Gulf Coast presence can be achieved as needed with available Navy ports at Naval Air Station Key West, FL, and Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL. The Guided Missile Cruisers (CG-47 Class) at Naval Station Pascagoula are scheduled for decommissioning prior to FY 2006 and will not relocate. This recommendation also supports mission elimination at Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity Pascagoula and reduces excess repair capacity. The Defense Common Ground Station-Navy 2 facility can be relocated to another Naval activity or remain in its present location as a tenant of the U.S. Coast Guard, if the Coast Guard elects to assume property ownership of some or all of the Pascagoula facility.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $17.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $220.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $47.4M with an immediate payback expected. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $665.7M.

This recommendation affects the U.S. Coast Guard, a non-DoD Federal Agency. In the absence of access to credible cost and savings information for that agency or knowledge regarding whether the agency will remain on the installation, the Department assumed that the non-DoD Federal agency will be required to assume new base operating responsibilities on the affected installation. The Department further assumed that because of these new base-operating

responsibilities, the effect of the recommendation on the non-DoD agency would be an increase in its costs. As required by Section 2913(d) of the BRAC statute, the Department has taken the effect on the costs of this agency into account when making this recommendation.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,762 jobs (963 direct jobs and 799 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Pascagoula, MS, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 2.6 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Station Mayport, FL, is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-Hour), but an Air Conformity Determination is not required. No impacts are anticipated for cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $0.02M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure and Realignment
Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA, and
Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA

Recommendation: Close Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA. Relocate all Navy and Marine Corps squadrons, their aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to McGuire Air Force Base, Cookstown, NJ. Relocate the minimum amount of manpower and equipment to support intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Tire and Wheel, non-destruction inspections, and Aviation Life Support System equipment to McGuire Air Force Base. Relocate intermediate maintenance workload and capacity for Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication & Manufacturing, and Support Equipment to Fleet Readiness Center East, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC. Deactivate the 111th Fighter Wing (Air National Guard) and relocate assigned A-10 aircraft to the 124th Wing (Air National Guard), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, ID (three primary aircraft authorized); 175th Wing (Air National Guard), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, MD, (three primary aircraft authorized); 127th Wing (Air National Guard), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, MI (three primary aircraft authorized) and retired (six primary aircraft

authorized). Relocate Armed Forces Reserve Center Expeditionary Combat Support manpower to Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Relocate Co A/228th Aviation to Fort Dix, Trenton, NJ. Relocate Reserve Intelligence Area 16 to Fort Dix. Establish an enclave for the Army Reserve units remaining on or relocating to Willow Grove and the Air National Guard 270th Engineering Installation Squadron. Realign Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, PA, by relocating Marine Light Attack Helicopter Squadron 775 Detachment A, to include all required personnel, equipment, and support, to McGuire Air Force Base.

Justification: This recommendation will reduce excess capacity while creating new joint opportunities in the McGuire Air Force Base/Fort Dix/Naval Aviation Engineering Station Lakehurst military concentration area. This recommendation leverages maintenance and operational efficiencies within Marine Corps Reserve Aviation and maintains reserve forces in areas with favorable demographics. Inclusion of the realignment of Cambria Regional Airport in this recommendation allows the assets currently housed there to be collocated with their headquarters at McGuire Air Force Base. The major intermediate maintenance functions are consolidated into a Fleet Readiness Center, which reduces the number of maintenance levels and streamlines the way maintenance is accomplished with associated significant cost reductions.

This recommendation enables Air Force Future Total Force transformation by consolidating the A-10 fleet at installations of higher military value, and contributes to Army's establishment of the Northeast Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

The USAF KC-135E model aircraft (16 primary aircraft authorized) at McGuire Air Force Base, NJ, retire. The capacity created by the Air Force force structure retirement of KC-135Es (16 primary aircraft authorized) from McGuire Air Force Base enables the execution of this recommendation.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $126.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $134.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $60.6M with a payback expected in two years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $710.5M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,805 jobs (1,142 direct, 663 indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Philadelphia, PA Metropolitan Division, which is 0.08 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 138 jobs (86 direct jobs and 52 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Johnstown, PA Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and

personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: McGuire Air Force Base, NJ, is in Severe Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour). The Air Force indicates that no Air Conformity Determination is required, but an air permit revision may be required. There are potential impacts for cultural, archeological, tribal resources; noise; waste management; water resources; and wetlands. Fort Dix, NJ, is in Severe Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour and 8-Hour) and Air Conformity analysis will be required. There are potential impacts to cultural, archeological, tribal resources. Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, ID, is in Attainment. There are potential impacts to cultural, archeological, tribal resources; and land use constraints or sensitive resource areas. Martin Airport Air Guard Station, MD, is in Moderate Non-attainment for Ozone (8-Hour) and an Air Conformity Determination may be required. There are potential impacts to wetlands. For Eglin Air Force Base, FL, the Air Force indicates a significant air permit revision may be required. There are potential impacts for cultural, archeological, tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; and wetlands. No impacts are anticipated for the resource areas of dredging; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries. Selfridge Army National Guard Base, MI, is in Marginal Non-attainment for Ozone and an Air Conformity Determination will be required as well as permit revisions. There are potential impacts to cultural, archeological, tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; and wetlands. No impacts are anticipated for the resource areas of marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; and dredging. Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC, is in Attainment. There are no anticipated impacts for the resource areas of air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $2.5M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Willow Grove, the closing installation, reports $10.3M in environmental restoration costs. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an installation is closed, realigned, or remains open, this cost is not included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME

Recommendation: Close the Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME. Relocate the ship depot repair function to Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA, Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility Pearl Harbor, HI and Naval Shipyard Puget Sound, WA. Relocate the Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning and Procurement Command to Naval Shipyard Norfolk.

Justification: This recommendation retains one nuclear-capable shipyard on each coast, plus sufficient shipyard capacity to support forward deployed assets. There are four Naval Shipyards performing depot-level ship refueling, modernization, overhaul and repair work. There is sufficient excess capacity in the aggregate across the four shipyards to close either Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor or Naval Shipyard Portsmouth. There is insufficient excess capacity to close any other shipyard or combination of shipyards. Naval Shipyard Portsmouth was selected for closure, rather than Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor, because it is the only closure which could both eliminate excess capacity and satisfy retention of strategically-placed shipyard capability. Planned force structure and force positioning adjustments reflected in the 20-year Force Structure Plan led to the selection of Naval Shipyard Portsmouth as the preferred closure candidate between the two sites. Additional savings, not included in the payback analysis, are anticipated from reduced unit costs at the receiving shipyards because of the higher volume of work.

Relocating the ship depot repair function and Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning and Procurement Command removes the primary missions from Naval Shipyard Portsmouth and eliminates or moves the entirety of the workforce at Naval Shipyard Portsmouth except for those personnel associated with the base operations support function. Naval Shipyard Portsmouth had a low military value compared to operational homeports, and, its berthing capacity is not required to support the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, closure of Naval Shipyard Portsmouth is justified.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $448.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $21.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $128.6M with a payback expected in four years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $1,262.4M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 9,166 jobs (4,510 direct jobs and 4,656 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Portland-South Portland-Biddeford, ME, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 2.8 percent of the economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA, is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-Hour) and Marginal Non-attainment for Ozone (8-Hour). An Air Conformity Determination is required. There are potential impacts for cultural, archeological or tribal resources; waste management; and water resources. Naval Station Bremerton, WA, is in Attainment. There are potential impacts for cultural, archeological or tribal resources; waste management; and wetlands. Naval Station Pearl Harbor, HI, is in Attainment. No impacts are anticipated for the

environmental resource areas of dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resources; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; or threatened and endangered species. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $4.9M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, the closing installation, reports $47.1M in costs for environmental restoration. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an installation is closed, realigned, or remains open, this cost is not included in the payback calculation. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Realignment
Naval Station Newport, RI

Recommendation: Realign Naval Station Newport, RI by relocating the Navy Warfare Development Command to Naval Station Norfolk, VA.

Justification: Navy Warfare Development Command performs the functions of warfare innovation, concept development, fleet and joint experimentation, and the synchronization and dissemination of doctrine. Relocating the Navy Warfare Development Command to Norfolk better aligns the Navy's warfare development organization with those of the other joint force components and Joint Forces Command, as well as places Navy Warfare Development Command in better proximity to Fleet Forces Command and the Second Fleet Battle Lab it supports, resulting in substantial travel cost savings to conduct experimentation events. Location of Navy Warfare Development Command in Hampton Roads area places it in proximity to Army Training and Doctrine Command, Fort Monroe, VA and Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, VA, as well as in closer proximity to the Air Force Doctrine Center at Maxwell Air Force Base, AL, which furthers joint interoperability concepts.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $11.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $8.3M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $1.0M with a payback expected in 13 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over the next 20 years is a savings of $2.1M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 490 jobs (200 direct, and 290 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and

personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Station Norfolk, VA, is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-Hour) and Marginal Non-attainment for Ozone (8-Hour) but an Air Conformity Determination is not required. There are potential impacts for the environmental resource areas of cultural, archeological, or tribal resources and wetlands. No impacts are anticipated for dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resources areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $0.075M in costs for environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure and Realignment
Naval Station Ingleside, TX and
Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX

Recommendation: Close Naval Station Ingleside, TX. Relocate its ships along with dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Station San Diego, CA. Relocate the ship intermediate repair function to Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity San Diego, CA. Consolidate Mine Warfare Training Center with Fleet Anti-submarine Warfare Training Center San Diego, CA. Realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX. Relocate Commander Mine Warfare Command and Commander Mobile Mine Assembly Group to Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Center, Point Loma, CA. Relocate Helicopter Mine Countermeasures Squadron 15 (HM-15) and dedicated personnel, equipment and support to Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Disestablish Commander Helicopter Tactical Wing U.S. Atlantic Fleet Aviation Intermediate Maintenance Detachment Truax Field at Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX and relocate its intermediate maintenance function for Aircraft Components, Fabrication & Manufacturing, and Support Equipment to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site Norfolk, VA.

Justification: This recommendation moves mine warfare surface and aviation assets to major fleet concentration areas and reduces excess capacity. Gulf Coast presence can be achieved as needed with available Navy ports at Naval Air Station Key West, FL, and Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL. The Minehunter Coastal ships at Naval Station Ingleside are scheduled for decommissioning between FY 2006 and FY 2008 and will not relocate. Additionally, U.S. Coast Guard presence is expected to remain in the Gulf Coast region. Relocation of Commander Mine Warfare Command and the Mine Warfare Training Center to San Diego, CA, creates a center of excellence for Undersea Warfare, combining both mine warfare and anti-submarine warfare disciplines. This reorganization removes the Mine Warfare community from a location remote from the fleet thereby better supporting the shift to organic mine warfare. This recommendation also supports mission elimination at Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity Naval Reserve

Maintenance Facility Ingleside, TX, and Aviation Intermediate Maintenance Detachment Truax Field at Naval Air Station Corpus Christi and reduces excess repair capacity. The relocation of Helicopter Mine Countermeasures Squadron 15 (HM-15) to Naval Station Norfolk single sites all Mine Warfare Aircraft in a fleet concentration area. This location better supports the HM-15 mission by locating them closer to the C-5 transport Air Port of Embarkation for overseas employment and mine countermeasures ship and helicopter coordinated exercises.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $178.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $100M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $75.6M with a payback expected in two years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $822.2M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 6,864 jobs (3,184 direct jobs and 3,680 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Corpus Christi, TX, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 3.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Station San Diego, CA, is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-Hour), but an Air Conformity Determination is not required. There are potential impacts for dredging and wetlands. Anti-Submarine Warfare Center Point Loma is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-Hour), but an Air Conformity Determination will not be required. There are potential impacts to the resource areas of land use constraints or sensitive resources. Naval Station Norfolk, VA is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-Hour) and Marginal Non-attainment for Ozone (8-Hour) and no Air Conformity Determination is required. No impacts are anticipated regarding the other resource areas of cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species; waste management; or water resources. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $1.0M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Engineering Field Division/Activity

Recommendation: Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South leased space in Charleston, SC. Consolidate Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South, Charleston, SC, with Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Southeast, Jacksonville, FL, at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL; Naval Facilities Midwest, Great Lakes, IL, at Naval Station Great Lakes, IL; and Naval Facilities Atlantic, Norfolk, VA at Naval Station Norfolk, VA. Close Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast leased space in Lester, PA. Consolidate Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast, Philadelphia, PA, with Naval Facilities Atlantic, Norfolk, VA at Naval Station Norfolk, VA and relocate Navy Crane Center Lester, PA, to Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, VA.

Justification: This recommendation enhances the Navy's long-standing initiative to accomplish common management and support on a regionalized basis by consolidating and collocating Naval Facilities commands with the installation management Regions in Jacksonville, FL, Great Lakes, IL and Norfolk, VA. This collocation aligns management concepts and efficiencies and may allow for further consolidation in the future.

Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South, Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast and Navy Crane Center are located in leased space, and this recommendation will achieve savings by moving from leased space to government-owned space. Naval Facilities Engineering Command is undergoing organizational transformation, and this recommendation facilitates the evolution of organizational alignment. This recommendation will result in an increase in the average military value for the remaining Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division/Engineering Field Activity activities, and it relocates the Navy Crane Center to a site with functional synergy.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $37.9M. The net of all costs and savings during the implementation period is a cost of $9.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $9.3M with a payback expected in four years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $81.8M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,433 jobs (543 direct jobs and 890 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Charleston-North Charleston, SC Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.43 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 447 jobs (247 direct jobs and 200 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Philadelphia, PA Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-Hour) and Attainment for all other criteria pollutants. No Air Conformity determination will be required. There are potential impacts for cultural, archeological and tribal resources; and wetlands. Naval Station Great Lakes, IL is in Severe Non-Attainment for Ozone (1-Hour) and Moderate Non-Attainment for Ozone (8-Hour). An Air Conformity Determination is not required. Naval Shipyard Norfolk, VA is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-Hour) and Marginal Non-Attainment for Ozone (8-Hour). An Air Conformity Determination is not required. Water Resources will be impacted. There are no anticipated impacts for air quality; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $0.008M in costs for environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers

Recommendation:

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Encino, CA and relocate the Marine Corps units to Marine Corps Reserve Center Pasadena, CA.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Moundsville, WV and relocate the Marine Corps units to Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Pittsburgh, PA.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Reading, PA and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers Lehigh Valley, PA.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Los Angeles, CA and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Bell, CA.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Akron, OH and Navy Reserve Center Cleveland, OH and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Akron, OH.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Madison, WI, Navy Reserve Center Lacrosse, WI and Navy Reserve Center Dubuque, IA and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Madison, WI.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA and relocate the Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Tulsa, Ok and relocate the Navy and Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Broken Arrow, OK.

Close Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Mobile, AL and relocate the Marine Corps units to Armed Forces Reserve Center Mobile, AL.

Close Inspector-Instructor West Trenton, NJ and relocate Marine Corps reserve units and support staff to Navy Reserve Center Ft. Dix, NJ.

Close Inspector-Instructor Rome, GA, and relocate Marine Corps reserve units and support staff to Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Atlanta, GA.

Justification: This recommendation will reduce excess capacity through the consolidation of 12 Navy Reserve Centers and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers with other reserve centers in the effected areas or into Armed Forces Reserve Centers. Nine of 12 of the reserve center closures are joint actions with the Department of the Army that support relocation into Armed Forces Reserve Centers. This recommendation will also relocate two Inspector-Instructor activities to existing reserve facilities aboard active duty bases. Sufficient capacity for drilling reserves is maintained throughout the United States, and all states will continue to have at least one Navy/Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center. This recommendation reduces excess capacity in the Department of the Navy reserve center functional area, but existing capacity in support of the Department of the Navy Reserve component continues to be in excess of force structure requirements. This recommendation is part of the closure of 37 Department of the Navy reserve centers, which includes 35 Navy centers (Navy Reserve Centers, Navy Reserve Facilities and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers) and two Marine Corps centers (Inspector-Instructor activities). The closure of 35 Navy centers will result in a capacity reduction of 12.7 percent of total current square footage. The closure of two Marine Corps centers will result in a capacity reduction of 5.5 percent of total current square footage.

Payback: The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Encino, CA, is $0.1M. The net of all costs and savings during the implementation period is a savings of $4.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.8M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $12.3M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Moundsvillle, WV, is $0.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $4.7M. Annual recurring

savings to the Department after implementation are $0.9M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $13.0M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Reading, PA, is $9.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $5.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $1.0M with a payback expected in 12 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $4.1M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Los Angeles, CA, is $12.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $8.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.9M with a payback expected in 18 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $0.5M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Akron, OH, and Navy Reserve Center Cleveland, OH, is $11.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $4.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $1.7M with a payback expected in 7 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $11.8M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Madison, WI and Navy Reserve Center Lacrosse, WI, and Navy Reserve Center Dubuque, IA, is $10.2M. The net of all costs and savings during the implementation period is a cost of $3.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $1.8M with a payback expected in 6 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $13.6M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA, is $3.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $0.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $1.0M with a payback expected in 3 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $10.2M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Tulsa, OK, is $5.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $3.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.5M with a payback expected in 14 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $1.1M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Mobile, AL, is $8.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a cost of $4.6M. Annual recurring savings to

the Department after implementation are $0.7M with a payback expected in 12 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $2.4M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Inspector-Instructor West Trenton, NJ, is $1.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $1.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after the implementation period are $0.5M with a payback expected in 3 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $5.9M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Inspector-Instructor Rome, GA, is $0.05M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $0.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.1M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $1.9M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Encino, CA will result in a maximum potential reduction of 12 jobs (8 direct jobs and 4 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale, CA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Moundsville, WV, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 21 jobs (16 direct jobs and 5 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Wheeling, WV-OH, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Reading, PA, could result in a maximum potential reduction of 25 jobs (18 direct jobs and 7 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Reading, PA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Los Angeles, CA, will not result in any job reductions (direct or indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale, CA, Metropolitan Division. Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Los Angeles and Armed Forces Reserve Center Bell are in the same Metropolitan Division.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Akron, OH, and Navy Reserve Center Cleveland, OH will result in a maximum potential reduction of 34 jobs (25 direct jobs and 9 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Akron and Armed Forces Reserve Center Akron are in the same Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Madison, WI, and Navy Reserve Center Lacrosse, WI, and Navy Reserve Center Dubuque, IA, will result

in a maximum potential reduction of 9 jobs (7 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the LaCrosse, WI-MN, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Madison, WI, and Navy Reserve Center Lacrosse, WI and Navy Reserve Center Dubuque, IA, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 32 jobs (24 direct jobs and 8 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Dubuque, IA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Madison and Armed Forces Reserve Center Madison are in the same Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 10 jobs (7 direct jobs and 3 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Baton Rouge, LA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Tulsa, OK, will not result in any job reductions (direct or indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Tulsa, OK, Metropolitan Statistical Area. Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Tulsa and Armed Forces Reserve Center Broken Arrow are in the same Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Mobile, AL, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 7 jobs (5 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Mobile, AL, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Mobile and Armed Forces Reserve Center Mobile are in the same Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Inspector-Instructor West Trenton, NJ, could result in a maximum potential reduction of 16 jobs (12 direct jobs and 4 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Trenton-Ewing, NJ, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Inspector-Instructor Rome, GA, could result in a maximum potential reduction of 12 jobs (9 direct jobs and 3 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Rome, GA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened or endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $0.1M in costs for environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Navy Recruiting Districts

Recommendation: Close the following Navy Recruiting Districts:

Montgomery, AL
Indianapolis, IN
Kansas City, MO
Omaha, NE
Buffalo, NY

Justification: This recommendation achieves economies of scale and scope by reducing excess capacity in management overhead and physical resources in the Navy Recruiting District functional area. Through the elimination of leased space, the recommendation results in an annual lease savings of over $0.7M. The recommendation is consistent with the Commander, Navy Recruiting Command's Transformation Plan, which envisions consolidation of active and reserve recruiting functions, and supports the reallocation of management oversight over all Navy recruiting functions. This recommendation involves the closure of the specified Navy Recruiting Districts only and does not impact the storefront recruiting offices currently assigned to the closing Navy Recruiting Districts. The recruiting offices and associated personnel and resources will be reassigned to the remaining 26 Navy Recruiting Districts.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $2.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $78.3M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $14.5M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $214.5M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 68 jobs (41 direct and 27 indirect) over the 2006–2011 period in the Montgomery, AL, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 54 jobs (38 direct jobs and 16 indirect jobs) over the 2006–2011 period in the Indianapolis, IN, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 64 jobs (38 direct and 26 indirect) over the 2006–2011 period in the Kansas City, MO-KS, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 60 jobs (32 direct jobs and 28 indirect jobs) over the 2006–2011 period in the Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 53 jobs (37 direct and 16 indirect) over the 2006–2011 period in the Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation does not impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Navy Regions

Recommendation: Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by consolidating Navy Region Gulf Coast, with Navy Region Southeast at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL. Realign Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX by consolidating Navy Region South with Navy Region Midwest at Naval Station Great Lakes, IL and Navy Region Southeast at Naval Station Jacksonville, FL.

Justification: In conjunction with other recommendations that consolidate Navy Region Commands, this recommendation will reduce the number of Installation Management regions from twelve to eight, streamlining the regional management structure and allowing for opportunities to collocate other regional entities to further align management concepts and efficiencies. Sufficient Installation Management capability resides within the remaining regions. As part of the closures of Naval Support Activity New Orleans, LA, and Submarine Base New London, CT, the Navy Reserve Forces Command installation management function and Navy Region Northeast are also consolidated into the remaining regions, significantly increasing operational efficiency.

This recommendation supports the Department of the Navy establishment of Commander, Navy Installations in order to align shore assets in support of Navy requirements, to find efficiencies through common business practices, and to provide consistent shore installation services to allow the operational commander and major claimants to focus on their primary missions. Consolidating Navy Regions allows for more consistency in span of responsibility and better enables Commander, Navy Installations to provide operational forces support, community support, base support, and mission support to enhance the Navy's combat power.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $3.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $8.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $2.7M with a payback expected in one year. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $34.6M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 65 jobs (24 direct jobs and 41 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 144 jobs (59 direct jobs and 85 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Corpus Christi, TX, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation does not impact

the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Closure
Navy Reserve Centers

Recommendation: Close the following Navy Reserve Centers:

Tuscaloosa, AL
St. Petersburg, FL
Pocatello, ID
Forest Park, IL
Evansville, IN
Cedar Rapids, IA
Sioux City, IA
Lexington, KY
Bangor, ME
Adelphi, MD
Duluth, MN
Cape Girardeau, MO
Lincoln, NE
Glens Falls, NY
Horseheads, NY
Watertown, NY
Asheville, NC
Central Point, OR
Lubbock, TX
Orange, TX

Close the following Navy Reserve Facility:

Marquette, MI

Close the following Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers:

Grissom Air Reserve Base, Peru, IN
Tacoma, WA

Justification: This recommendation will reduce excess capacity through the consolidation of 23 Navy Reserve Centers/Navy Reserve Facilities and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers with other reserve centers in the effected areas. These reserve centers will close and their drilling population supported by other existing centers; thereby reducing management overhead. Sufficient capacity for drilling reserves is maintained throughout the United States, and all states will continue to have at least one Navy Reserve Center/Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center. This recommendation reduces excess capacity in the Department of the Navy Reserve Center functional area, but existing capacity in support of the Department of the Navy Reserve

component continues to be in excess of force structure requirements. This recommendation is part of the closure of 37 Department of the Navy reserve centers, which includes 35 Navy centers (Navy Reserve Centers, Navy Reserve Facilities and Navy Marine Corps Reserve Centers) and two Marine Corps centers (Inspector-Instructor activities). The closure of 35 Navy centers will result in a capacity reduction of 12.7 percent of total current square footage. The closure of two Marine Corps centers will result in a capacity reduction of 5.5 percent of total current square footage.

Payback: The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Tuscaloosa, AL, is $0.05M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $4.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.8M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $11.4M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center St. Petersburg, FL, is $0.09M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $4.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.8M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $12.1M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Pocatello, ID, is $0.04M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $3.3M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.6M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $9.0M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Forest Park, IL, is $0.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $7.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $1.4M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $20.4M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Evansville, IN, is $0.06M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $2.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.5M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $8.0M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Cedar Rapids, IA, is $0.05M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $2.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.5M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $7.2M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Sioux City, IA, is $0.05M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department

during the implementation period is a savings of $3.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.6M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $8.5M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Lexington, KY, is $0.05M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $2.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.5M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $7.0M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Bangor, ME, is $0.04M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $3.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.7M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $10.5M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Adelphi, MD, is $0.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $5.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.9M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $13.5M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Duluth, MN, is $0.07M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $4.8M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.9M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $13.1M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Cape Girardeau, MO, is $0.06M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $2.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.5M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $7.2M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Lincoln, NE, is $0.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $3.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.7M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $9.6M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Glens Falls, NY, is $0.04M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $4.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.8M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $12.3M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Horseheads, NY, is $0.05M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $2.3M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.4M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $6.2M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Watertown, NY, is $0.06M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $2.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.4M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $6.0M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Asheville, NC, is $0.07M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $3.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.5M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $8.0M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Central Point, OR, is $0.04M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $2.8M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.5M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $7.7M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Lubbock, TX, is $0.08M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $3.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.7M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $10.0M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Center Orange, TX, is $0.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $6.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $1.3M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $18.3M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Reserve Facility Marquette, MI, is $0.05M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $2.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.5M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $6.9M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Grissom Air Reserve Base, IN, is $0.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $3.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $0.6M with an immediate payback.

The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $8.5M.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Tacoma, WA, is $0.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $5.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $1.0M with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $15.2M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Tuscaloosa, AL will result in a maximum potential reduction of 10 jobs (7 direct jobs and 3 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Tuscaloosa, AL, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center St. Petersburg, FL will result in a maximum potential reduction of 22 jobs (12 direct jobs and 10 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Pocatello, ID will result in a maximum potential reduction of 10 jobs (7 direct jobs and 3 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Pocatello, ID, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Forest Park, IL, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 20 jobs (15 direct jobs and 5 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL, Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Evansville, IN will result in a maximum potential reduction of 9 jobs (7 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Evansville, IN-KY, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Cedar Rapids, IA will result in a maximum potential reduction of 9 jobs (7 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Cedar Rapids, IA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Lexington, KY, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 12 jobs (9 direct jobs and 3 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Lexington-Fayette, KY, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Bangor, ME, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 9 jobs (7 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011

period in the Bangor, ME, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Adelphi, MD will result in a maximum potential reduction of 28 jobs (17 direct jobs and 11 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV, Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Duluth, MN, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 11 jobs (8 direct jobs and 3 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Duluth, MN-WI, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Cape Girardeau, MO, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 8 jobs (7 direct jobs and 1 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Cape Girardeau-Jackson, MO-IL, Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Lincoln, NE, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 11 jobs (7 direct jobs and 4 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Lincoln, NE, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Glens Falls, NY, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 9 jobs (7 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Glen Falls, NY, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Horseheads, NY, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 14 jobs (7 direct jobs and 7 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Elmira, NY, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Watertown, NY, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 15 jobs (9 direct jobs and 6 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Watertown- Fort Drum, NY, Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Asheville, NC, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 9 jobs (7 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Asheville, NC, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Central Point, OR, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 9 jobs (7 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the

2006-2011 period in the Medford, OR, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Lubbock, TX, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 10 jobs (7 direct jobs and 3 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Lubbock, TX, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Orange, TX, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 17 jobs (11 direct jobs and 6 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Center Sioux City, IA, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 10 jobs (7 direct jobs and 3 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Sioux City, IA-NE-SD, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Reserve Facility Marquette, MI, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 9 jobs (7 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Marquette, MI, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Grissom Air Reserve Base, IN, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 9 jobs (7 direct jobs and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Peru, IN, Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, the closure of Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Tacoma, WA, will result in a maximum potential reduction of 35 jobs (20 direct jobs and 15 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Tacoma, WA, Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened or endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation does not impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance

activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation for Realignment
Navy Reserve Readiness Commands

Recommendation: Realign Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, by consolidating Navy Reserve Readiness Command South with Naval Reserve Readiness Command Midwest at Naval Station Great Lakes, IL. Realign Naval Station Newport, RI, and the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC, by consolidating Naval Reserve Readiness Command Northeast with Naval Reserve Readiness Command Mid-Atlantic and relocating the consolidated commands to Naval Station, Norfolk, VA.

Justification: This recommendation enhances the Navy's long-standing initiative to accomplish common management and support on a regionalized basis, by consolidating and collocating reserve readiness commands with the installation management Regions. This collocation aligns management concepts and efficiencies and ensures a reserve voice at each region as well as enabling future savings through consolidation of like functions. This recommendation will result in an increase in the average military value for the remaining Naval Reserve Readiness Commands and ensures that each of the installation management Regions has an organization to manage reserve matters within the region.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $2.6M. The net of all costs and savings during the implementation period is a savings of $30.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $6.5M with a payback expected immediately. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $91.7M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 95 jobs (59 direct jobs and 36 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Fort Worth-Arlington, TX, Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 114 jobs (49 direct jobs and 65 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA, Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 62 jobs (37 direct jobs and 25 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV, Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on these economic regions of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: A review of community attributes indicates there are no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no know community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: Naval Station Great Lakes, IL, is in Severe Non-Attainment for Ozone (1-hour) and Moderate Non-Attainment for Ozone (8-hour). An Air Conformity Determination is not required. Naval Station Norfolk, VA, is in Maintenance for Ozone (1-hour) and Marginal Non-Attainment for Ozone (8-hour). An Air Conformity Determination is not required. This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation does not impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.