



**Congressional
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC): Background and Issues for Congress

April 25, 2019

Congressional Research Service

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

R45705

Summary

Since 1977, statutory thresholds have effectively constrained the President's ability to close or realign major military installations in the United States. Congress has instead periodically granted temporary authorities—known as a Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)—that have established independent commissions for the review and approval of basing changes submitted by the Secretary of Defense. These unique and transient authorities last expired on April 16, 2006. There have been five rounds of base closures: 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 2005.

Though Congress has periodically adjusted the BRAC process to account for lessons learned, the modern framework has remained generally consistent with earlier rounds, and includes

- establishment of an independent commission;
- reliance on objective and uniform criteria;
- Government Accountability Office (GAO) review and certification of Department of Defense (DOD) data;
- deliberations designed to be transparent that include open hearings, solicitation of feedback, installation visits, and data available for public review; and
- requirement that the final list of closure and realignment recommendations be accepted or rejected in their entirety.

Congress has defined BRAC selection criteria in statute, thus requiring the Secretary to prioritize military value over cost savings. Additionally, Congress has required the Secretary to align the Department's recommendations with a comprehensive 20-year force structure plan. The commission may modify, reject, or add recommendations during its review before forwarding a final list to the President.

After receiving the Commission's list of recommendations, the President may either accept the report in its entirety or seek to modify it by indicating disapproval and returning it to the commission for further evaluation. If the President accepts the commission's recommendations, they are forwarded to Congress. BRAC implementation begins by default unless Congress rejects the recommendations in their entirety within 45 days by enacting a joint resolution. During the implementation phase, DOD is required to initiate closures and realignments within two years and complete all actions within six years.

The BRAC process represents a legislative compromise between the executive and legislative branches wherein each shares power in managing the closure and realignment of military bases. The imposition of an independent, third-party mediator was intended to insulate base closings from political considerations by both branches that had complicated similar actions in the past.

This report provides background on the development of BRAC, describes its major elements and milestones, and outlines issues frequently cited in the context of new rounds, such as potential savings.

Contents

Background	1
Major Elements of the Modern BRAC Process.....	2
BRAC Selection Criteria	3
Disposal of Real Property.....	5
BRAC Savings	7
Excess Infrastructure	9
Legacy of the 2005 BRAC Round.....	12
The Department of Defense Base Closure Account	13
Congressional Action on BRAC.....	15
Prohibition on Conducting a New Round	15
BRAC Legislation in the 115 th Congress	15
BRAC Legislation in the 116 th Congress	16

Figures

Figure 1. BRAC Acreage Disposed of and Not Yet Disposed.....	6
Figure 2. BRAC Major and Minor Actions	13
Figure 3. Historical View of BRAC Appropriations, FY2001-FY2020	14

Tables

Table 1. Infrastructure Capacity Reports; Interim and Final	10
Table B-1. Status of BRAC Acreage Disposal, By State/Territory and BRAC Round	20

Appendixes

Appendix A. Legislative References	17
Appendix B. BRAC Acreage Disposal Status, By State	20

Contacts

Author Information.....	42
-------------------------	----

Background

The U.S. Constitution does not clearly specify how military bases should be managed. Article II, Section 2, appoints the President as the commander-in-chief, with the implied power to deploy, and redeploy, the armed forces as necessary for national defense. In common practice, this has included the authority to create and close military installations needed to accommodate and train personnel under the President's command. However, Article I, Section 8, charges Congress with the responsibility to raise armies, maintain a Navy, and regulate the militia. Through annual authorization and appropriation legislation, Congress legislates policy for managing DOD real property assets and funds the construction, maintenance, operation, and disposal of military infrastructure.¹

Throughout most of American history, the President has exercised broad, relatively unchallenged authority for opening, closing, or realigning military installations. Congress largely deferred to the Executive branch primarily because the President, as commander-in-chief, is empowered with the responsibility of deploying military forces.²

Prompted by large-scale closures of World War II era infrastructure during the 1960s and 1970s, Congress enacted legislation in 1977 that effectively limited the Executive branch's ability to close or realign major military installations. The new statute, later codified as 10 U.S.C. 2687 (Section 612 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1978, P.L. 95-82), generally required DOD to conduct comprehensive and lengthy assessments of major basing decisions as part of a congressional report-and-wait process.³ These assessments could be challenged in court on environmental grounds or on questions related to their sufficiency, further lengthening delays.⁴ The new legislation effectively halted DOD's ability to close or realign domestic bases of significant size.⁵

In the decade that followed the passage of 10 U.S.C. 2687, congressional pressure grew to accommodate DOD basing priorities. By 1988, ongoing negotiations between the Secretary of Defense and the House and Senate Armed Service Committees led to new legislation (P.L. 100-526) that authorized a limited number of base closures based on the oversight of an independent panel.⁶ Though later modified, the effort marked the beginning of the first Base Realignment and

¹ "Real property includes lands, buildings, structures, utility systems, improvements, and appurtenances thereto. Includes equipment attached to and made part of buildings and structures (such as heating systems) but not movable equipment (such as plant equipment)." See Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "DOD Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms," April 2018. Available at <http://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Doctrine/pubs/dictionary.pdf#page=199>.

² Regarding overseas installations, Congress continues to defer to the President. Domestically, it has intervened more assertively to manage the process.

³ Other notifications include assessments by DOD of the economic and strategic consequences of basing actions.

⁴ For details, see Schlossberg, George, "How Congress Cleared the Bases," *Journal of Defense Communities*, Volume 1. Available at <https://www.defensecommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/FINALJournal1.pdf>.

⁵ In general terms, 10 U.S.C. 2687 establishes reporting thresholds based on the number of DOD civilians affected by the reduction. A second statute enacted later, 10 U.S.C. 993, establishes reporting thresholds based on the number of service members.

⁶ The statute authorized a panel appointed by and reporting to the Secretary of Defense to recommend a limited number of base closures.

Closure (BRAC) process, which was intended to insulate base closings from considerations such as favoritism or other political interference.⁷

Widely considered a success, the 1988 BRAC legislation was taken up again and modified in succeeding BRAC rounds; first in 1991, 1993, and 1995; and again in 2005.⁸

Major Elements of the Modern BRAC Process

The modern BRAC process refers to a temporary authority that amends the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-510), hereafter referred to as the *Base Closure Act*, and features a framework of elements that entrusts an independent commission with certifying closure and realignment recommendations made by the Secretary of Defense.

In general, the process has required the Secretary to submit a list of military installations recommended for closure or realignment to an independent, bipartisan BRAC commission. After analyzing the Secretary's recommendations, the commission may accept, reject, or modify the list.⁹ Upon completing its review, the commission forwards its final findings and recommendations to the President. Upon acceptance of commission's recommendations, the President then submits them to Congress. If the President does not submit the recommendations to Congress within the timeframe required under the Base Closure Act, the BRAC process is terminated. Upon receipt of the report from the President, Congress has the opportunity to disapprove of the recommendations *in toto* through the enactment of a joint resolution.

The hallmarks of this framework include

- establishment of an independent commission whose members are appointed by the President, in consultation with congressional leadership (and the advice and consent of the Senate);¹⁰

BRAC Authorization and Closure Rounds

1988 Round: The Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act, enacted October 24, 1988 (P.L. 100-526)

1991, 1993, 1995 Rounds: Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-510, Title XXIX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, enacted November 5, 1990)

2005 Round: National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, (P.L. 107-107; amended the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-510)

⁷ Earlier efforts at large-scale base closures were marked by accusations of such conduct.

⁸ Subsequent BRAC legislation required the Secretary of Defense to report to an independent commission. In the 1988 round, a commission chartered by Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci reported to him.

⁹ Commissioners are required to assess whether DOD recommendations deviate substantially from the Department's force structure plan and final selection criteria. Modifications to the list are prohibited in cases where recommendations do not deviate substantially. Installations added to the list require the commission to allow input from the Secretary and require additional conditions be met.

¹⁰ The 2005 BRAC process included nine commissioners (a tie-breaking number). Members were appointed by the President after consultation with Congress. Congressional leadership makes a total of six recommendations, with the number divided between: House speaker (2), House Minority Leader (1); Senate Majority Leader (2), and; Senate Minority Leader (1). The President transmits the final list of nominations to the Senate for its final consent. By statute, the process of congressional consultation is not mandatory. See BRAC amended legislation available at the BRAC commission (2005) official archive site at <https://www.brac.gov/docs/BRAC05Legislation.pdf>.

- reliance on objective and uniform criteria for evaluating basing recommendations;
- GAO review and certification of DOD data;
- deliberations that include open hearings, solicitation of feedback, installation visits, and data available for public review;
- requirement that the commission's final list of closure and realignment actions be accepted or rejected in its entirety; and
- presidential and congressional *off-ramps* that would terminate the BRAC process when certain conditions are not met.

The timeline to complete an entire BRAC round has varied; however, the most recent one conducted in 2005 took approximately 10 years, from authorization to completion (end of the six-year BRAC implementation period).

Key milestones of a typical BRAC timeline include

- DOD force structure plan, infrastructure inventory, and analysis of options (up to four years);¹¹
- nomination and confirmation of BRAC commissioners;
- DOD submission of BRAC recommendations (and associated reports) to the commission;
- commission deliberations (typically four months);
- final report sent to the President for approval;
- 45-day deadline for Congress to reject recommendations in their entirety (Joint Resolution of Disapproval) or allow implementation to begin;
- DOD implementation (two years to begin; six years to complete); and
- DOD disposal of real property (indeterminate).

BRAC Selection Criteria

BRAC is often characterized as a cost efficiency measure that enables DOD to more effectively manage its real property assets by allowing it to shed excess infrastructure, but historically, potential costs and savings have been a consideration that have ranked below military value.¹² No BRAC round has established cost savings targets, floors, or ceilings.

¹¹ DOD recommendations are based on certified data, a long-term force structure plan (20 years), and comprehensive inventory of DOD real estate.

¹² Prior to the 2005 BRAC round, however, cost savings and downsizing the military was an explicit goal.

Transformation Versus Cost Savings

“In previous rounds of BRAC, the explicit goal was to save money and downsize the military in order to reap a ‘peace dividend.’ It was clear from the Commission’s examination of the DoD 2005 BRAC list that the historical goal of achieving savings through eliminating excess capacity was not always the primary consideration for many recommendations. In fact, several DoD witnesses at Commission hearings made it clear that the purpose of many 2005 BRAC recommendations was to advance the goals of transformation, improve capabilities, and enhance military value. In some cases, accomplishing these new goals meant proposing BRAC scenarios that either never paid off (i.e., resulted in a net increased cost) or had very long payback periods ...”

—2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report, Chapter I: Commission Strategic Overview

During BRAC rounds in 1991, 1993, and 1995, Congress required the Secretary of Defense to develop and report a set of objective selection criteria that would be used for identifying bases for closure and realignment. For the 2005 round, Congress amended the BRAC statute to require the Secretary to regard military value (defined below) as the primary consideration.¹³ Other factors, such as potential costs and savings, were explicitly categorized as lower priority. Because the amended legislative language reflected longstanding DOD policy, the 2005 BRAC criteria appear almost identical when compared with previous versions, with additional language added for emphasis or included for explanatory examples.

The excerpt below indicates the 2005 BRAC selection criteria.¹⁴ Emphasized text (in italics) represents new language not included as part of the 1995 criteria.¹⁵

SEC. 2913. SELECTION CRITERIA FOR 2005 ROUND.

(a) FINAL SELECTION CRITERIA.—The final criteria to be used by the Secretary in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part in 2005 shall be the military value and other criteria specified in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) MILITARY VALUE CRITERIA.—The military value criteria are as follows:

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

¹³ Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, (P.L. 107-107).

¹⁴ Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended.

¹⁵ Comparison derived from Government Accountability Office, “Military Bases: Opportunities Exist to Improve Future Base Realignment and Closure Rounds (GAO-13-149),” March 2013. See **Figure 2**. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/660/652805.pdf#page=17>.

(c). OTHER CRITERIA.—The other criteria that the Secretary shall use in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part in 2005 are as follows:


- (1) The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.
- (2) The economic impact on *existing communities in the vicinity of military installations*.
- (3) The ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel.
- (4) The environmental impact, *including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities*.

Disposal of Real Property

The transfer and disposal of DOD real property made available following the implementation of a BRAC round is a complex process that may extend for years beyond the initial six-year implementation window. Disposal may be delayed or otherwise affected by the participation of local and state communities and the degree to which environmental remediation by federal authorities is necessary.¹⁶ The graph below shows the total acreage from previous BRAC rounds yet to be disposed.

¹⁶ As amended in 1986, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA, commonly referred to as Superfund) generally requires the clean-up of contaminated federal property prior to transfer out of federal ownership. For more information on CERCLA see CRS Report R41039, *Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act: A Summary of Superfund Cleanup Authorities and Related Provisions of the Act*, by David M. Bearden.

Figure I. BRAC Acreage Disposed of and Not Yet Disposed
Shown by Year of BRAC Round



Source: FY2017 data provided to CRS by the DOD Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), May 2017.

The Base Closure Act authorizes a variety of conveyance mechanisms not otherwise available for the transfer and disposal of federal property, a process typically performed by the General Services Administration (GSA).¹⁷ Under a BRAC, *conveyance* authority is delegated from GSA, through the Secretary of Defense to the various military departments, which receive special approval to supersede GSA regulations with BRAC specific regulations. The primary difference between the routine disposal of federal property and real property conveyed under a BRAC is the role of local communities.

Under normal (non-BRAC) circumstances, the General Services Administration (GSA) is directly responsible for disposing of any surplus federal real property, which includes defense property. A military department in possession would, for example, declare property as *excess* to its needs and turn over the administration of a site to the GSA. The GSA would then follow a number of consecutive steps for disposal of federal property laid out in statute. It would first offer the excess property to other federal agencies. If none expressed an interest, the excess property would be declared *surplus*. The GSA would then offer the surplus property to state or local governments and non-profits that might use it for a public benefit (*public benefit conveyance*), such as a homeless shelter or medical center. Finally, if the property has neither been transferred nor conveyed in the previous steps, the surplus property would be offered for sale to the public.¹⁸

Under a BRAC, local communities can significantly affect the BRAC property transfer and disposal decisions, which are managed by the Secretary of the responsible military department.¹⁹

¹⁷ A *conveyance* is the transfer of a property title.

¹⁸ The transfer or disposal of federal property is primarily performed by the General Services Administration (GSA) pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (FPASA) 40 U.S.C. 521-559.

¹⁹ The Base Closure Act directs the Administrator of the GSA to delegate specified transfer and disposal authorities to the Secretary of Defense for use at BRAC installations, and the secretary has, in turn, delegated this authority to the

Once approved for closure, communities around an installation typically organize a Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) for the purpose of creating and executing a redevelopment plan for the property. While the plan is not binding on DOD, the Department has been statutorily directed to give the plan considerable weight. DOD makes economic development grants and technical support available through its Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) to assist LRAs with the process.²⁰

In recent BRAC rounds, Congress has authorized a special transfer authority that has permitted DOD to transfer title to property at less than fair market value, or even at no cost, if the LRA agrees to certain conditions designed to create employment at the former defense facility. This has been referred to as an Economic Development Conveyance (EDC).

BRAC Savings

DOD has asserted that savings generated from BRAC are generally the result of avoiding the cost of retaining and operating unneeded infrastructure, with upfront costs eventually offset by annual savings. Between FY2012 and FY2018, the Department consistently argued for a new BRAC, asserting that “absent another BRAC round, the Department will continue to operate some of its installations sub-optimally as other efficiency measures, changing force structure, and technology reduce the number of missions and personnel.”²¹

Emphasizing the potential cost savings, DOD has suggested a new “efficiency-focused BRAC” could save the Department billions of dollars annually: “Savings from BRAC rounds are real and substantial. The last five BRAC rounds are collectively saving the Department \$12B annually. A new efficiency-focused BRAC could save the Department an additional ~\$2B annually (based on the ’93/’95 rounds).”²²

In its ongoing series of BRAC-related reports, the GAO has noted the unreliability of DOD cost savings estimates. In 2013, GAO concluded that, though the Department had achieved annual recurring savings as the result of the 2005 round, visibility into the outcome has been limited due to missing and inconsistent recordkeeping.²³ Similar studies have raised questions about the data DOD has used to predict and monitor BRAC effectiveness, long-term savings, and outcomes. For example:

secretaries of the various military departments.

²⁰ See the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (as amended), Section 2905, Implementation: “Before any action may be taken with respect to the disposal of any surplus real property or facility located at any military installation to be closed or realigned under this part, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Governor of the State and the heads of the local governments concerned for the purpose of considering any plan for the use of such property by the local community concerned.”

²¹ Department of Defense, *Infrastructure Capacity Report (Interim)*, March 2016. Provided to CRS.

²² Statement of Mr. Peter Potochney, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Energy, Installations, and Environment), Before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, FY2018, June 7, 2017. Available at <https://www.appropriations.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/060617-Potochney-Testimony.pdf>.

²³ Government Accountability Office, “Opportunities Exist to Improve Future Base Realignment and Closure Rounds (GAO-13-149)”, March 2013. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/660/652805.pdf> ; See page 33 “lack of consistent documentation;” page 32 “did not consistently document the assumptions;” page 43 “department does not have effective management controls in place to monitor leased space.”

- “... the services did not develop baseline operating costs before implementing the BRAC recommendations, which would have enabled it to determine whether savings were achieved.”²⁴
- “... We found that DOD’s process for providing the BRAC commission with cost and savings estimates was hindered by underestimating recommendation-specific requirements and that DOD did not fully anticipate information technology requirements for many of the recommendations.”²⁵
- “The department cannot provide documentation to show to what extent it reduced plant replacement value or vacated leased space as it reported in May 2005 that it was intended to do.... In addition, DOD bundled multiple closures ... thus limiting visibility into the estimated costs and savings for individual closures and realignments.”²⁶
- “... DOD has not reported to Congress how the cleanup of emerging contaminants, especially certain perfluorinated compounds, at installations closed under BRAC will significantly increase the estimated (BRAC) cleanup costs.”²⁷
- “... We found that OSD (Office of the Secretary of Defense) did not have a fully developed method for accurately collecting information on costs, savings, and efficiencies achieved specifically from joint basing, and that OSD had not developed a plan to guide joint bases in achieving cost savings and efficiencies ... ”²⁸
- “... DOD has not committed to take action on some of our recommendations related to implementing any future BRAC rounds, such as improving DOD’s ability to estimate potential liabilities, and savings to achieve desired outcomes.”²⁹

In its final report to the President, the 2005 BRAC commission noted DOD’s initial estimate of savings had been “vastly overestimated,” and suggested that the Department had claimed savings that were “not truly savings in the commonly understood sense of the term.”³⁰ Reflecting on the

²⁴ Government Accountability Office, “Military Base Realignments and Closures: More Guidance and Information Needed to Take Advantage of Opportunities to Consolidate Training (GAO-16-45), February 2016. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/675295.pdf#page=2>.

²⁵ Government Accountability Office, “Military Bases: More Guidance and Information Needed to Take Advantage of Opportunities to Consolidate Training (GAO-16-45)”, February 2016. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/680/675295.pdf#page=6>.

²⁶ Government Accountability Office, “Opportunities Exist to Improve Future Base Realignment and Closure Rounds (GAO-13-149)”, March 2013. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/660/652805.pdf#page=2>.

²⁷ Government Accountability Office, “Military Base Realignments and Closures: DOD Has Improved Environmental Cleanup Reporting but Should Obtain and Share More Information (GAO-17-151)”, January 2017. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/690/682204.pdf#page=27>.

²⁸ Government Accountability Office, “DOD Joint Bases: Implementation Challenges Demonstrate Need to Reevaluate the Program (GAO-14-577), September 2014, page 2. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/670/665964.pdf#page=7>.

²⁹ Government Accountability Office, “High-Risk Series: Progress on Many High-Risk Areas, While Substantial Efforts Needed on Others (GAO-17-317)”, February 15, 2017. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/690/682765.pdf#page=319>.

³⁰ See “2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report,” Volume 1, page 3. “However, as discussed elsewhere in this Report, the Commission noted in many cases that DoD claimed savings from proposals on the basis of eliminated military personnel. Yet, because total end strength was not being reduced proportionately, these so-called ‘savings’ will not actually reduce total DoD spending levels. Hence, they are not truly savings in the commonly

quality of cost estimates and savings associated with 2005 BRAC round, Anthony Principi, Chairman of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, has suggested opportunities exist for the DOD to improve its analysis by adopting more consistent accounting practices and inclusive metrics:

To start, DoD has to do a better job estimating the true cost of any closure or realignment ... Second, the cost of base realignment actions (COBRA) accounting procedure, used by DoD as a basis of comparison among scenarios, should include cost estimates for environmental restoration not just “clean to current use” standards. In addition, COBRA or some other cost evaluation process should also include transportation and infrastructure costs and burden sharing with the federal government ...³¹

In addition to refining DOD accounting metrics, some observers have suggested congressional visibility into BRAC cost and long-term effectiveness could be improved by amending the process to require the Department to disclose how closure and realignment recommendations meet expected cost saving and reduced infrastructure targets.

Excess Infrastructure

A BRAC process is the chief means by which DOD disposes of excess infrastructure. Each year between 2013 and 2017, the Department requested a new BRAC round as a means of realizing greater efficiency and reducing excess infrastructure. It has also attempted to allay concerns related to the 2005 BRAC experience - marked by unexpectedly high costs and complexity - by emphasizing cost savings and efficiencies rather than force transformation.

In April 2016, DOD submitted to the House Armed Services Committee an *Infrastructure Capacity Report* (interim version) that assessed 22% of the Department’s base infrastructure excess to its needs.³² The methodology used in the report—required by Section 2815 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY2016 (P.L. 114-92)—remained consistent with excess capacity reports submitted prior to the 1998 and 2005 BRAC rounds round.³³ The Department stated its purpose for obtaining “a sense of excess and whether excess remains after various changes, such as (prior) BRAC or force structure reductions.”³⁴ A final infrastructure capacity report, submitted to Congress in October 2017, modified the original excess capacity estimate to 19%.³⁵

understood sense of the term. No new equipment or increases in operations could be purchased with these ‘reductions’ in military personnel. Because these military personnel would not be eliminated, but merely reassigned to higher-priority tasks, the commission concluded that DoD’s initial estimates of \$49 billion in net savings over a 20-year period were vastly overestimated, although “military value”—the primary selection criterion—might be increased.

³¹ Anthony Principi, former Veterans Affairs Secretary and Chairman of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission, “BRAC Chair Reflects on Decisions, Offers Ideas for Future,” May 9, 2011. Available at <https://federalnewsradio.com/defense/2011/05/brac-chair-reflects-on-decisions-offers-ideas-for-future/>.

³² Department of Defense Infrastructure Capacity, March 2016. Available at <https://defensecommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/2016-4-Interim-Capacity-Report-for-Printing.pdf>.

³³ GAO, “DOD’s Excess Capacity Estimating Methods Have Limitations (GAO-13-535),” June 2013; “DOD continues to use the same methodology in 2017 that it has previously used to estimate excess capacity; thus these limitations continue...” GAO, “Defense Infrastructure: DOD needs to Improve the Accuracy of Its Excess Capacity Estimates,” May 2018. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/700/691990.pdf#page=14>.

³⁴ Department of Defense Infrastructure Capacity, March 2016. Available at <https://defensecommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/2016-4-Interim-Capacity-Report-for-Printing.pdf>.

³⁵ Department of Defense Infrastructure Capacity, October 2017. Available at <https://fas.org/man/eprint/infrastructure.pdf>.

Table I. Infrastructure Capacity Reports; Interim and Final
Percentage of Infrastructure Identified as Excess

Department	FY2016 Interim Report	FY2017 Final Report
Army	33%	29%
Navy	7%	6%
Air Force	32%	28%
Defense Logistics Agency	12%	13%
Total DOD	22%	19%

Source: Recreated from Table I, Department of Defense Infrastructure Capacity Report, October 2017.

Notes: The FY2016 report estimated excess infrastructure DOD would carry into FY2019, according to force structure plans. The FY2017 report measured the value according to FY2012 force structure. Both analyses used 1989 as a baseline. DLA

The Department concluded its infrastructure capacity analysis by arguing it had established sufficient justification for a new BRAC round, a process that would allow it to more effectively dispose of excess infrastructure and manage remaining real property assets.

The Department believes we have addressed all congressional concerns ... The time to authorize another BRAC round is now. The BRAC process requires considerable time to analyze and develop recommendations, have those recommendations reviewed by the independent BRAC Commission, and then implemented over a six-year period of time. The longer authorization is delayed, the longer the Department will be forced to expend valuable resources on unnecessary facilities instead of weapons systems, readiness, and other national security priorities.³⁶

Critics of the Department's methodology for estimating excess infrastructure have asserted it includes unreasonable research assumptions and metrics, undermining the basis for DOD's conclusion. For example, observers have cited the report's reliance on Cold War baseline values to establish excess capacity, inconsistent application of existing metrics for measuring capacity shortfalls, and overly broad categorization schemes.³⁷ Some observers have also cited longstanding data management challenges that continue to affect the Department's ability to measure current excess facility inventory and utilization rates.³⁸ Others have noted the dearth of data that support DOD claims related to BRAC effectiveness and the disposal of excess property.³⁹

³⁶ Department of Defense, "Infrastructure Capacity Report," October 2017. Available at <https://fas.org/man/eprint/infrastructure.pdf#page=35>.

³⁷ GAO, "Defense Infrastructure: DOD Needs to Improve the Accuracy of its Excess Capacity Estimates (GAO-18-230), May 2018. For example, "DOD's excess capacity methodology and analysis has limitations that affect the accuracy and analytical sufficiency of the estimate. Specifically, DOD's use of a 1989 baseline for excess capacity results in inaccurate estimates of excess capacity; DOD's methodology included assumptions that were not always reasonable; and DOD's approach to estimating excess capacity is not always sufficient or implemented consistently across the military departments." Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/700/691990.pdf#page=11>.

³⁸ GAO, "DOD Needs to Improve its Efforts to Identify Unutilized and Underutilized Facilities (GAO-14-538)," September 2014.

³⁹ See GAO, "DOD Should Address Challenges with Communication and Mission Changes to Improve Future Base Realignment and Closure Rounds (GAO-18-231), March 2018. "In reviewing DOD's data we found that the department ultimately did not have the needed data to calculate excess infrastructure disposed of during BRAC 2005."

During a news briefing on the FY2019 defense budget, Undersecretary of Defense (Comptroller) David L. Norquist noted that the Department had declined to propose a BRAC round that year, stating that it would work instead to focus on internal reforms while preparing for a financial audit.

And so, I think we're looking at doing two things, going forward. One is, working with Congress to find common areas where we can make reforms and changes that don't create the same types of obstacles. The other is that we are undergoing a financial-statement audit that includes a look at property, and assets and investments and improving the accuracy of the data behind it. And as a view of being able to take advantage of the data coming out of that process, to help us make better decision-making on real property. But, yes, you are correct, there is not (a) request for another BRAC round in this budget.⁴⁰

In testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, Lucian Niemeyer, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations and Environment, indicated DOD would be working in FY2019 to improve its excess infrastructure accounting processes and demolish unneeded infrastructure:

In lieu of another request for legislation in FY 2019 to authorize an additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round, we will review our facilities, to include facility usage optimization review to ensure we have a better accounting of excess infrastructure. We also have proposed for FY 2019 increased efforts to demolish unneeded or obsolete facilities over the course of this year.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Department of Defense News Briefing on the President's Fiscal Year 2019 Defense Budget, Undersecretary of Defense (Comptroller) David L. Norquist, February 12, 2018. Available at <https://www.defense.gov/News/Transcripts/Transcript-View/Article/1439782/departments-of-defense-news-briefing-on-the-presidents-fiscal-year-2019-defense/>.

⁴¹ Senate Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, "Statement of Honorable Lucian Niemeyer (Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations and Environment)," April 26, 2018. Available at <https://www.acq.osd.mil/eie/Downloads/Testimony/FY19%20EI&E%20Posture%20Statement%20-%20SAC-M.pdf#page=18>.

Legacy of the 2005 BRAC Round

The 2005 BRAC round was unique among all previous rounds due to its relative size, scope and complexity. (See **Figure 2** for comparison of major and minor BRAC actions between rounds.)⁴² Colloquially called “the mother of all BRACs,” the objectives of the 2005 round were primarily about transforming military infrastructure; however, unanticipated expenses have played a role in shaping subsequent congressional views of the BRAC process and, according to many observers, dampened support for consideration of a new round.

Savings estimates submitted during the 2005 round were overvalued by as much as 67%, according to GAO analysis, with one-time implementation costs rising from \$21 to \$35.1 billion.⁴³ GAO found that the \$14.1 billion increase was due primarily to the rising cost of new construction associated with subsidiary projects not included in the original BRAC implementation plan.⁴⁴

Context of the 2005 BRAC Round

“Prior BRAC rounds occurred at the dusk of the Cold War, when military budgets and force structure were shrinking. The 2005 BRAC round occurred in a post-9/11 environment with our armed forces deployed in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan with stable or increasing force structure and defense budgets. During the 2005 BRAC implementation period, the armed forces expect to relocate 70,000 servicemembers from overseas to installations within the United States. Prior BRAC rounds took place in the context of military doctrine and force structure shaped by the Cold War. The 2005 BRAC round occurred during the transformation of military doctrine and force structure to meet the needs of an entirely new threat and security environment ...”


—2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report, Chapter 1: Commission Strategic Overview

⁴² Quantifying BRAC complexity can be difficult. During the 2005 BRAC round, DOD defined major closures as those that had a plant replacement value (PRV) of greater than \$100 million. Major realignments qualified as those that had a net loss of 400 or more military or civilian personnel. In earlier rounds, DOD did not use compatible definitions for BRAC actions. See **Figure 2** for results of GAO analysis.

⁴³ GAO, *Military Bases: Opportunities Exist to Improve Future Base Realignment and Closure Rounds* (GAO-13-149), March 2013, page 3. Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/660/652805.pdf#page=3>.

⁴⁴ GAO, “Military Base Realignments and Closures: Updated Costs and Savings Estimates from BRAC 2005 (GAO-12-709R),” June 29, 2012, page 34. “DOD’s own data confirmed that the majority of the \$14 billion in the BRAC 2005 cost increase was related to military construction... construction of additional facilities to enhance capabilities, address deficiencies—BRAC as a recapitalization engine—and construction industry inflation since 2005 (\$11 billion) ...” Available at <https://www.gao.gov/assets/660/652805.pdf#page=34>.

Figure 2. BRAC Major and Minor Actions
Base Closures and Realignments



Source: GAO-13-149, “Military Bases: Opportunities Exist to Improve Future Base and Realignment and Closure Rounds,” March 2013.

Notes: For the 2005 BRAC round, major and minor actions are based on DOD defined values. Actions during previous rounds represent GAO estimates.

Referring to the implementation of the 2005 round, Assistant Secretary Niemeyer, noted, “BRAC legislation effectively limited the ability of Congress to oversee BRAC implementation costs and the Department made deliberate decisions to use BRAC implementation as a recapitalization tool, expanding facility requirements and associated costs.”⁴⁵


To address congressional concerns about spiraling costs in new BRAC rounds, DOD has periodically proposed legislative language that would constrain the Secretary’s ability to recommend BRAC actions that would not yield savings within 20 years and to emphasize recommendations that would yield net savings within five years.⁴⁶

The Department of Defense Base Closure Account

Each year, Congress appropriates funding for the Department of Defense Base Closure Account, part of the Military Construction Defense-Wide appropriation. With no BRAC round authorized or underway, the primary purpose of continuing BRAC appropriations is to fund the environmental cleanup and caretaker functions at bases that were closed under prior rounds (See **Figure 3**).

⁴⁵ Advance Policy Questions for Lucian Niemeyer, Nominee for Assistant Secretary of Defense of Energy, Installations and Environment, July 18, 2017. Available at https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Niemeyer_APQs_07-18-17.pdf.

⁴⁶ See Office of Legislative Council (website), FY2018 DOD Legislative Proposals, “First Package of Legislative Proposals Sent to Congress for Inclusion in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018—Consolidated Section-by-Section Analysis (Sent to Congress on May 25, 2017).” Available at <http://ogc.osd.mil/olc/docs/25May2017NDAASectionalAnalysis.pdf#page=70>.

Figure 3. Historical View of BRAC Appropriations, FY2001-FY2020

Source: CRS Compilation of annual DOD Comptroller, C-I Military Construction Appropriations.

Notes: Amounts reflect budget execution in “APPN” column of annual C-I spreadsheets and include all BRAC accounts. FY2020 represents the Administration’s current request.

In FY2020, the Trump Administration has requested \$278.5 million for BRAC continuing environmental and caretaker costs, with \$158.3 million provided for the Navy (57%), \$66.1 million for the Army (24%), and \$54 million for the Air Force (19%).⁴⁷ The total request represents a \$63 million decrease (19%) from FY2019 enacted levels (\$342 million).

In FY2018, Congress urged DOD to accelerate environmental remediation at BRAC sites. In report language, appropriators stated that additional funds were provided to speed environmental remediation at installations closed under previous rounds.

Accelerated cleanup.—The agreement includes additional funding to accelerate environmental remediation at installations closed during previous Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) rounds. Priority should be given to those sites with newly identified radiological cleanup cost. There are many factors hindering the cleanup of BRAC sites. However, strategic investments can lead to quicker clean-ups and faster turnover of DOD property to the local community. Therefore, the Department is directed to submit to the congressional defense committees a spend plan for the additional BRAC funds not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ Department of Defense, “DOD Base Realignment and Closure Executive Summary Program Year 2020: Justification Data Submitted to Congress.” March 2019. Available at http://comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/defbudget/fy2019/budget_justification/pdfs/05_BRAC/BRAC_Exec_Sum_J-Book_FINAL.pdf#page=8.

⁴⁸ See Explanatory Statement to Accompany H.R. 1625 (P.L. 115-141), Committee Print Book 2 of 2, Division J. Available at <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CPRT-115HPRT29457/pdf/CPRT-115HPRT29457.pdf#page=509>; See also Hpt 115-188, House Appropriations Committee Report to accompany H.R. 2998, “Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2018.” Available at <https://www.congress.gov/115/crpt/hrpt188/CRPT-115hrpt188.pdf#page=34>.

Congressional Action on BRAC

Prohibition on Conducting a New Round

Congressional authorizers and appropriators have regularly inserted language into annual defense legislation that would disallow the use of funds for the purpose of a new BRAC round. In FY2019, for example, though DOD did not propose a BRAC, authorizers inserted language into the annual NDAA that prohibited a new round:

SEC. 2703. Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.⁴⁹

A similar provision was included in the final FY2019 defense appropriations bill:⁵⁰

SEC. 8122. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute a new or additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.⁵¹

BRAC Legislation in the 115th Congress

In 2017, Members in both chambers proposed legislation that would have authorized a new round of base closures.⁵² Though no legislation for a full BRAC was enacted, a provision included the following year in the final FY2019 NDAA.

Under the new scenario described by Section 2702 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (H.R. 5515, P.L. 115-232), BRAC-like actions are authorized within the confines of a state based on the recommendation of the governor and support of local communities affected by the proposed actions. Unlike a traditional BRAC process, the new authorities would forgo the creation of an independent review panel. The Secretary of Defense is, instead, required to deliver a report of planned BRAC actions to congressional defense committees and, following a 90-day waiting period, begin implementation. For details, please refer to “Proposed In-State BRAC” in **Appendix A** of this report.

The BRAC related legislative proposals above illustrate the flexibility Congress has for amending or adopting the template of past BRAC processes that DOD has called “the only fair, objective, and comprehensive process to achieve these goals (eliminating excess infrastructure).”⁵³ Congress

⁴⁹ National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, H.R. 5515, Available at <https://www.congress.gov/115/bills/hr5515/BILLS-115hr5515rh.pdf#page=841>.

⁵⁰ Department of Defense and Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act, 2019 and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.R. 6157, H.R. 245).

⁵¹ Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, Division C, (H.R. 1625, P.L. 115-141), Available at <https://www.congress.gov/115/bills/hr1625/BILLS-115hr1625enr.pdf#page=144>.

⁵² On January 31, 2017, Representative Adam Smith, then Ranking Member of the House Armed Services Committee, submitted the Military Infrastructure Consolidation and Efficiency Act of 2017 (H.R. 753), which would have reauthorized a BRAC that would have begun in FY2019 with a framework similar to previous rounds. A second proposal, drafted by Senator John McCain, then Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and submitted as an amendment to the annual NDAA for FY2018 (H.R. 2810), would have taken a different approach. By omitting the appointment of a BRAC commission charged with reviewing recommendations made by the Secretary of Defense, Senator McCain’s amendment would have altered what long-time observers had considered the basic tenets of the modern BRAC framework (third party appraisal by an independent commission, and expansive opportunity for public comment by affected communities and other stakeholders).

⁵³ “The Department must be able to eliminate excess infrastructure to avoid wasting resources maintaining unneeded

may consider whether future legislative proposals for base closures and realignments will adopt the lessons learned from previous rounds while retaining the basic framework, or fundamentally alter the process.

BRAC Legislation in the 116th Congress

No BRAC legislation has so far been proposed in the 116th Congress. Additionally, the Department has asserted that it does not intend to use the new BRAC-like authorities authorized by Section 2702 of the FY2019 NDAA.⁵⁴ To date, DOD has received no state requests under this authority.

facilities - resources that that could be much better spent on readiness. BRAC provides the only fair, objective, and comprehensive process to achieve these goals.” See Data Submitted to Congress, “DoD Base Realignment and Closure: BRAC Rounds (BRAC 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995 & 2005),” May 2017. Available at http://comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/defbudget/FY2018/budget_justification/pdfs/05_BRAC/FINAL_FY18_BRAC_Summary_Book.pdf#page=8.

⁵⁴ In official correspondence, DOD has stated, “The Department does not intend to use section 2702 because it undermines the Department’s ability to prioritize the military value of an installation as informed by the National Defense Strategy, instead substituting the judgment of a Governor based on economic value.” Department of Defense Response to Congressional Research Service Request for Information, April 11, 2019.

Appendix A. Legislative References

BRAC Authorizing Legislation

1988 Round

The Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act, enacted October 24, 1988 (P.L. 100-526)

1991, 1993, 1995 Rounds

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, enacted November 5, 1990 (P.L. 107-107, Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Title XXIX)

2005 Round

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, (P.L. 107-107; amended the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-510))

10 U.S.C. 2687, 10 U.S.C. 993 Summary

In 1977, Congress enacted 10 U.S.C. 2687, the first statutory restriction on the President's ability to close or realign military installations. Amended over the years, the statute has retained its essential elements, establishing procedures the Secretary of Defense must follow before closing a military installation where a threshold number (currently 300) of civilian personnel are authorized to be employed, or realigning an installation that involves a reduction by more than 50% (or 1,000) of civilian workers. A more recent statute, 10 U.S.C. 993, introduced additional reporting requirements that would restrict the Secretary's ability to realign installations if the plan would affect more than 1,000 assigned members of the Armed Forces.

In-State BRAC

Section 2702 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (H.R. 5515, P.L. 115-232) authorizes new in-state BRAC authorities. Text of the provision is included below in its entirety.

SEC. 2702. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY TO REALIGN OR CLOSE CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) Authorization.—Notwithstanding sections 993 or 2687 of title 10, United States Code, and subject to subsection (d), the Secretary of Defense may take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the realignment or closure of a military installation in a State during a fiscal year if—

(1) the military installation is the subject of a notice which is described in subsection (b); and

(2) the Secretary includes the military installation in the report submitted under paragraph (2) of subsection (c) with respect to the fiscal year.

(b) Notice From Governor of State.—A notice described in this subsection is a notice received by the Secretary of Defense from the Governor of a State (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia) in which the Governor recommends that the Secretary carry out the realignment or closure of a military installation located in the State, and which includes each of the following elements:

(1) A specific description of the military installation, or a specific description of the relevant real and personal property.

(2) Statements of support for the realignment or closure from units of local government in which the installation is located.

(3) A detailed plan for the reuse or redevelopment of the real and personal property of the installation, together with a description of the local redevelopment authority which will be responsible for the implementation of the plan.

(c) Response to Notice.—

(1) Mandatory response to governor and congress.—Not later than 1 year after receiving a notice from the Governor of a State (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, from the Mayor of the District of Columbia), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a response to the notice to the Governor and the congressional defense committees indicating whether or not the Secretary accepts the recommendation for the realignment or closure of a military installation which is the subject of the notice.

(2) Acceptance of recommendation.—If the Secretary of Defense determines that it is in the interests of the United States to accept the recommendation for the realignment or closure of a military installation which is the subject of a notice received under subsection (b) and intends to carry out the realignment or closure of the installation pursuant to the authority of this section during a fiscal year, at the time the budget is submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for the fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees which includes the following:

(A) The identification of each military installation for which the Secretary intends to carry out a realignment or closure pursuant to the authority of this section during the fiscal year, together with the reasons the Secretary of Defense believes that it is in the interest of the United States to accept the recommendation of the Governor of the State involved for the realignment or closure of the installation.

(B) For each military installation identified under subparagraph (A), a master plan describing the required scope of work, cost, and timing for all facility actions needed to carry out the realignment or closure, including the construction of new facilities and the repair or renovation of existing facilities.

(C) For each military installation identified under subparagraph (A), a certification that, not later than the end of the fifth fiscal year after the completion of the realignment or closure, the savings resulting from the realignment or closure will exceed the costs of carrying out the realignment or closure, together with an estimate of the annual recurring savings that would be achieved by the realignment or closure of the installation and the timeframe required for the financial savings to exceed the costs of carrying out the realignment or closure.

(d) Limitations.—

(1) Timing.—The Secretary may not initiate the realignment or closure of a military installation pursuant to the authority of this section until the expiration of the 90-day period beginning on the date the Secretary submits the report under paragraph (2) of subsection (c).

(2) Total costs.—Subject to appropriations, the aggregate cost to the government in carrying out the realignment or closure of military installations pursuant to the authority of this section for all fiscal years may not exceed \$2,000,000,000. In determining the cost to the government for purposes of this section, there shall be included the costs of planning and design, military construction, operations and maintenance, environmental restoration, information technology, termination of

public-private contracts, guarantees, and other factors contributing to the cost of carrying out the realignment or closure, as determined by the Secretary.

(e) **Process for Implementation.**—The implementation of the realignment or closure of a military installation pursuant to the authority of this section shall be carried out in accordance with section 2905 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (title XXIX of P.L. 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) in the same manner as the implementation of a realignment or closure of a military installation pursuant to the authority of such Act.

(f) **State Defined.**—In this section, the term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(g) **Termination of Authority.**—The authority of the Secretary to carry out a realignment or closure pursuant to this section shall terminate at the end of fiscal year 2029.

Appendix B. BRAC Acreage Disposal Status, By State

Table B-1. Status of BRAC Acreage Disposal, By State/Territory and BRAC Round

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Exceeded
Alabama	1988	Major Closure	COOSA RIVER STORAGE ANNEX(ANNISTON)	2,834	0	2,834
		Minor Closure	ALABAMA AAP	2,235	0	2,235
	1993	Major Closure	MOBILE - NS	0	0	0
		Minor Closure	GADSDEN - NRC/AFRC	0	0	0
			MONTGOMERY - NRC	0	0	0
	1995	Major Closure	FORT MCCLELLAN	18,431	12	18,443
		Minor Closure	HUNTSVILLE AL - NAVRESCEN	3	0	3
	2005	Minor Closure	BG WILLIAMS P. SCREWS USARC	5	0	5
			CLEVELAND LEIGHT ABBOT USARC	6	0	6
			FAITH WING USARC	2	0	2
			Finnell AFRC & AMSA#154	5	0	5
			HARRY L. GARY, JR. USARC	0	0	0
			MOBILE - NMCRC	0	0	0
			NRC TUSCALOOSA	0	0	0
			PFC GRADY C. ANDERSON USARC	0	0	0
WRIGHT USARC			0	0	0	
Alabama Total			23,521	12	23,533	
Alaska	1995	Major Closure	ADAK - NAF	0	0	0
		Major Realignment	FORT GREELY	0	0	0

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
	2005	Minor Closure	GALENA AIRPORT	0	0	0
			KULIS AGS	0	0	0
Alaska Total				0	0	0
Arizona	1988	Minor Closure	CAMP NAVAJO	0	0	0
	1991	Major Closure	WILLIAMS AFB	3,878	144	4,021
	2005	Minor Closure	AFRL MESA	7	0	7
			ALLEN HALL USARC	4	0	4
			DEER VALLEY USARC #2	0	0	0
Arizona Total				3,888	144	4,032
Arkansas	1991	Major Closure	EAKER	3,401	0	3,401
	1993	Minor Closure	FAYETTEVILLE - NRC	0	0	0
			FORT SMITH - NRC	0	0	0
	1995	Major Closure	FORT CHAFFEE	7,050	0	7,050
	2005	Minor Closure	ARKADELPHIA USARC	0	0	0
			ECS-15/ERA/ARLOG	39	0	39
			HOT SPRINGS USARC	1	0	1
			LEROY R. POND USARC	4	0	4
			MALVERN USARC OMS	0	0	0
			RUFUS GARRETT JR. USARC	3	0	3
			SAMUEL STONE JR USARC	0	0	0
			USARC CAMDEN	2	0	2
			USARC JONESBORO	3	0	3
Arkansas Total				10,503	0	10,503

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
California	1988	Major Closure	GEORGE	4,196	866	5,062
			HAMILTON ARMY AIR FIELD	659	0	659
			MATHER	5,661	0	5,661
			NORTON	2,221	0	2,221
			PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO	1,480	0	1,480
	1991	Minor Closure	SALTON SEA TEST RANGE	5,877	0	5,877
		Major Closure	CASTLE	2,777	0	2,777
	FT ORD		19,301	7,778	27,080	
	LONG BEACH - NH		31	0	31	
	LONG BEACH - NS		413	56	469	
	LONG BEACH - NSY		351	0	351	
	MOFFETT FIELD - NAS		2,951	0	2,951	
	Tustin MCAS		1,341	233	1,574	
	Minor Closure		SACRAMENTO AD	406	0	406
		TREASURE ISLAND NS HUNTERS PT ANNEX	89	846	935	
	1993	Major Closure	ALAMEDA - NAS	2,392	256	2,649
			El Toro MCAS	4,402	292	4,694
			MARE ISLAND NSY	1,201	415	1,617
			NOVATO DOD HOUSING FACILITY	551	0	551
			OAKLAND - NH	182	0	182
PORT HUENEME CA ENGRVCEN			33	0	33	
SAN DIEGO - NTC			380	51	431	
TREASURE ISLAND - NS			917	161	1,077	

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
		Major Realignment	MARCH	4,441	0	4,441
		Minor Closure	PACIFIC GROVE - NRC	4	0	4
	1995	Major Closure	MCCLELLAN	2,995	457	3,452
			OAKLAND - FISC	697	0	697
			OAKLAND ARMY BASE	377	18	395
		Major Realignment	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT BRAC	0	0	0
			SIERRA ARMY DEPOT	4,999	4,488	9,487
		Minor Closure	EAST FORT BAKER	91	0	91
			LOMPOC BRANCH DISCIPLINARY BARRACKS	2,457	0	2,457
			ONTARIO	8	0	8
			POMONA - NRC	0	0	0
			RIO VISTA RES TRNG AREA	28	0	28
			STOCKTON - NRC	0	0	0
		Minor Realignment	ONIZUKA	0	0	0
	2005	Major Closure	ONIZUKA AFS	20	0	20
			RIVERBANK AAP	0	172	172
		Major Realignment	CONCORD NWS	59	4,972	5,031
		Minor Closure	ARNG RC BELL	0	0	0
			DESIDERIO HALL USARC	5	0	5
			HAZARD PARK	0	0	0
			MOFFETT FIELD USARC	0	0	0
			PVT GEORGE L. RICHEY USARC	9	0	9
			SCHROEDER HALL USARC	5	0	5

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
			USARC MOUNTAIN VIEW	7	0	7
California Total				74,016	21,062	95,078
Colorado	1988	Major Realignment	PUEBLO AD	0	15,953	15,953
		Minor Closure	BENNETT ARNG TRNG SITE	242	0	242
	1991	Major Realignment	LOWRY	1,786	0	1,786
	1995	Major Closure	U.S. ARMY OPERATIONS FITZSIMONS	558	0	558
	2005	Major Closure	BUCKLEY ANNEX	70	0	70
Colorado Total				2,656	15,953	18,609
Connecticut	1995	Minor Closure	NEW LONDON - NUSC/NUWC DET	32	0	32
			STRATFORD ARMY ENGINE PLANT	1	77	78
	2005	Minor Closure	AMSA 69	3	0	3
			AMSA 72 USARC	0	0	0
			MIDDLETOWN USARC/OMS	24	0	24
			SGT LIBBY USARC/OMS	6	0	6
Connecticut Total				65	77	142
Delaware	2005	Minor Closure	MAJ ROBERT KIRKWOOD MEMORIAL USARC	10	0	10
Delaware Total				10	0	10
District of Columbia	2005	Major Closure	WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	110	0	110
		Minor Closure	POTOMAC ANNEX	8	0	8

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
District of Columbia Total				118	0	118
Florida	1988	Minor Closure	CAPE ST. GEORGE	6	0	6
			COCONUT GROVE - NRC	3	0	3
	1993	Major Closure	CECIL FIELD - NAS	17,061	0	17,061
			ORLANDO - NTC	2,070	0	2,070
			ORLANDO FL NAVAL HOSPITAL	44	0	44
			Major Realignment	HOMESTEAD	976	0
	1995	Major Realignment	KEY WEST - NAS	176	0	176
		Minor Closure	Big Coppit Key	0	0	0
			ORLANDO - NRL (USR DET)	18	0	18
2005	Minor Closure	ST. PETERSBURG - NRC	4	0	4	
Florida Total				20,359	0	20,359
Georgia	2005	Major Closure	ATLANTA - NAS	0	0	0
			FORT GILLEM	772	399	1,171
			FORT MCPHERSON	474	14	487
		Minor Closure	ATHENS NAVSCSCOL	56	0	56
			COLUMBUS USARC #1	2	0	2
			ROME - MCRC	0	0	0
Georgia Total				1,304	412	1,717
Guam	1993	Major Closure	AGANA - NAS	1,819	0	1,819
	1995	Major Closure	GUAM - SHIP REPAIR FACILITY	0	0	0
		Minor Closure	GUAM - PWC	979	0	979
		Minor Realignment	GUAM - NAVACTS	1,805	0	1,805

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
Guam Total				4,604	0	4,604
Hawaii	1988	Minor Closure	KAPALAMA MIL RESERVATION	21	0	21
	1993	Major Closure	BARBERS POINT - NAS	2,290	217	2,507
	2005	Minor Closure	HILO KUNIEDA USARC	0	0	0
Hawaii Total				2,311	217	2,528
Idaho	2005	Minor Closure	NRC POCATELLO	0	0	0
Idaho Total				0	0	0
Illinois	1988	Major Closure	CHANUTE	1,799	401	2,200
			FORT SHERIDAN	386	0	386
	1993	Major Closure	GLENVIEW - NAS	1,196	0	1,196
			O'HARE	274	0	274
			SAVANNA DEPOT ACTIVITY	4,994	7,890	12,884
	2005	Minor Closure	COPPLE USARC	4	0	4
			FOREST PARK - NRC	0	0	0
			PFC R. G. WILSON USARC	3	0	3
			SSG R. E. WALTON USARC	5	0	5
WAUKEGAN AFRC			4	0	4	
Illinois Total				8,665	8,291	16,956
Indiana	1988	Major Closure	INDIANA AAP	859	0	859
			JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND	3,113	1,122	4,235
	1991	Major Closure	FT BEN HARRISON	2,331	60	2,391
			Major Realignment	GRISSOM	1,345	0
	1993	Minor Closure	FORT WAYNE IN NMRC	4	0	4
		TERRE HAUTE - NRC	0	0	0	

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
	1995	Major Closure	INDIANAPOLIS - NAWC-AD	163	0	163
	2005	Major Closure	NEWPORT CHEMICAL DEPOT	7,241	0	7,241
		Minor Closure	EVANSVILLE NRC	0	0	0
			HALLIDAY USARC	0	0	0
			NMCRC GRISSOM ARB	0	0	0
Indiana Total				15,055	1,183	16,238
Iowa	1988	Minor Closure	FORT DES MOINES	51	0	51
	2005	Minor Closure	BURLINGTON MEMORIAL USARC/AMSA	11	0	11
			CEDAR RAPIDS AFRC	6	0	6
			DUBUQUE - NRC	0	0	0
			SIOUX CITY NRC	0	0	0
			USARC MUSCATINE	0	0	0
Iowa Total				68	0	68
Kansas	1993	Minor Closure	HUTCHINSON - NRC/AFRC	0	0	0
	1995	Minor Closure	OLATHE - NARC	0	0	0
	2005	Major Closure	KANSAS AAP	13,951	0	13,951
Kansas Total				13,951	0	13,951
Kentucky	1988	Major Closure	LEXINGTON (BLUE GRASS) ARMY DEPOT	777	0	777
	1995	Major Closure	LOUISVILLE - NOS	142	0	142
	2005	Minor Closure	LOUISVILLE - NOS	0	0	0
			MG BENJAMIN J. BUTLER USARC	7	0	7
			NRC LEXINGTON	0	0	0
			PADUCAH MEMORIAL USARC	4	0	4

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
			PADUCAH USARC #2	3	0	3
			USARC MAYSVILLE	0	0	0
			USARC RICHMOND	0	0	0
Kentucky				933	0	933
Total						
Louisiana	1988	Minor Closure	MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL,NEW ORLEANS	18	0	18
	1991	Major Closure	ENGLAND	2,351	0	2,351
	1993	Minor Closure	LAKE CHARLES - NS	0	0	0
			MONROE LA NAVRESCEN	3	0	3
	1995	Minor Closure	NEW ORLEANS - NAVBIOLAB	0	0	0
	2005	Major Closure	NEW ORLEANS - NSA	149	0	149
		Minor Closure	BATON ROUGE - NMCRC	0	0	0
			ROBERTS USARC	0	0	0
			SHREVEPORT USARC	0	0	0
			USARC BOSSIER CITY	0	0	0
Louisiana				2,521	0	2,521
Total						
Maine	1991	Major Closure	LORING	9,276	0	9,276
	2005	Major Closure	BRUNSWICK - NAS	2,777	578	3,355
Maine Total				12,053	578	12,631
Maryland	1988	Major Realignment	FORT GEORGE G. MEADE	8,452	13	8,465
		Minor Closure	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	0	0	0
			GAITHERSBURG RES FACILITY	23	0	23
		Minor Realignment	FORT HOLABIRD (88)	7	0	7

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
	1995	Major Closure	FT RITCHIE	590	0	590
			WHITE OAK - NSWC DAHLGREN DIV DET	662	0	662
		Minor Closure	ANNAPOLIS - NSWC CARDEROCK DIV DET	68	0	68
			FORT HOLABIRD	13	0	13
	2005	Minor Closure	ADELPHI - NRC	0	0	0
			NGA DALECARLIA SITE, BETHESDA, MD	0	0	0
			SUMNER SITE (NGA)	39	0	39
Maryland Total				9,854	13	9,867
Massachusetts	1988	Major Closure	ARL - WATERTOWN	47	0	47
	1991	Major Closure	FORT DEVENS	3,982	138	4,120
	1993	Minor Closure	LAWRENCE - NMCRC/AFRC	0	0	0
			NEW BEDFORD - NRC	2	0	2
			PITTSFIELD - NRC	11	0	11
	1995	Major Closure	SOUTH WEYMOUTH - NAS	1,983	113	2,097
		Minor Closure	HINGHAM ANNEX	125	0	125
			SUDBURY TRAINING ANNEX	2,277	0	2,277
	2005	Minor Closure	ARTHUR MACARTHUR USARC	5	0	5
			WESTOVER USARC	0	0	0
Massachusetts Total				8,432	252	8,684
Michigan	1988	Minor Closure	PONTIAC STORAGE ACTIVITY	29	0	29
	1991	Major Closure	Wurtsmith AFB	1,696	274	1,969
	1993	Major Closure	K.I. SAWYER	2,857	0	2,857

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
	1995	Major Realignment	DETROIT ARSENAL & DETROIT TANK PLT	152	0	152
		Minor Closure	CADILLAC MI NAVRESCEN	0	0	0
	2005	Major Closure	USAG SELFRIDGE	0	103	103
		Minor Closure	MARQUETTE NRF	0	0	0
			STANFORD C. PARISIAN USARC	0	0	0
Michigan Total				4,735	376	5,111
Minnesota	2005	Minor Closure	CAMBRIDGE MEMORIAL USARC	4	0	4
			DULUTH - NRC	2	0	2
			GEN BEEBE USARC/AMSA 111	6	0	6
		Minor Realignment	FORT SNELLING USARC/AMSA 22	0	0	0
Minnesota Total				11	0	11
Mississippi	2005	Major Closure	NS PASCAGOULA	0	0	0
		Minor Closure	MISSISSIPPI AAP	0	0	0
			VICKSBURG USARC	0	0	0
Mississippi Total				0	0	0
Missouri	1988	Minor Closure	NIKE KANSAS CITY 30	24	0	24
	1991	Major Closure	RICHARDS-GEBAUR	196	0	196
	1993	Minor Closure	JOPLIN - NRC	0	0	0
			ST JOSEPH - NRC	0	0	0
	2005	Minor Closure	CAPE GIRARDEAU - NRC	0	0	0
			GREENTOP USARC	0	0	0

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
			KANSAS CITY - MCSA	27	0	27
Missouri Total				247	0	247
Montana	1993	Minor Closure	GREAT FALLS MT NAVRESCEN	0	0	0
	2005	Minor Closure	FORT MISSOULA	21	0	21
			GALT HALL USARC	0	0	0
			USARC HELENA	0	0	0
			VEUVE HALL USARC/AMSA #75 (G)	12	0	12
Montana Total				33	0	33
Nebraska	2005	Minor Closure	COLUMBUS USARC	0	0	0
			HASTINGS USARC	0	0	0
			LINCOLN NRC	0	0	0
			MCCOOK USARC	0	0	0
			USARC KEARNEY	0	0	0
			USARC WYMORE	0	0	0
Nebraska Total				0	0	0
New Hampshire	1988	Major Closure	PEASE	4,037	0	4,037
New Hampshire Total				4,037	0	4,037
New Jersey	1991	Major Realignment	FORT DIX	0	0	0
	1993	Major Closure	TRENTON NAWC	529	0	529
		Major Realignment	FT MONMOUTH	220	0	220
		Minor Closure	ATLANTIC CITY - NRC	0	0	0

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
			PERTH AMBOY - NRC	3	0	3
	1995	Major Closure	MILITARY OCEAN TERMINAL, BAYONNE	679	0	679
		Major Realignment	FORT DIX BRAC	235	0	235
		Minor Closure	Camp Kilmer	48	0	48
			Camp Pedricktown	47	0	47
	2005	Major Closure	FORT MONMOUTH	998	128	1,126
		Minor Closure	INSPECTOR-INSTRUCTOR WEST TRENTON	8	0	8
			KILMER/AMSA 2I	22	2	24
			SFC NELSON V. BRITTIN USARC/S-S	8	0	8
New Jersey Total				2,797	130	2,927
New Mexico	1988	Major Closure	FT WINGATE	8,350	6,318	14,669
	2005	Minor Closure	JENKINS AFRC	0	0	0
			MCGREGOR RANGE USARC/ECS 87	0	0	0
New Mexico Total				8,350	6,318	14,669
New York	1988	Minor Closure	BROOKLYN, NY - NAVSTA	34	0	34
	1993	Major Closure	PLATTSBURGH	3,463	0	3,463
			STATEN ISLAND - NS	246	0	246
		Major Realignment	GRIFFISS	3,314	0	3,314
		Minor Closure	JAMESTOWN - NRC/AFRC	2	0	2
			NIAGARA FALLS - DOD FAMILY HOUSING	44	0	44
			POUGHKEEPSIE - NRC	0	0	0

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
New York	1995	Major Closure	ROSLYN	52	0	52
			SENECA AD	10,035	652	10,687
		Minor Closure	FORT TOTTEN	95	0	95
			NEW YORK NS FORT WADSWORTH	0	0	0
			STATEN ISLAND - NRC	0	0	0
	2005	Minor Closure	USA BELLMORE MAINT. FACILITY	17	0	17
			2LT GLEN CARPENTER USARC	3	0	3
			AMITYVILLE USARC	16	0	16
			BUFFALO - NRD	0	0	0
			FORT TILDEN USARC	0	10	10
			HORSEHEAD NRC	0	0	0
			MCDONALD USARC	0	0	0
			MULLER USARC	1	0	1
			NIAGRA FALLS USARC/AMSA 76	0	22	22
			NRC GLENS FALLS	0	0	0
	ROOSEVELT USARC	4	0	4		
	STEWART NEWBURGH USARC	17	0	17		
	WATERTOWN NRC	0	0	0		
	New York Total			17,344	683	18,027
	North Carolina	1995	Minor Closure	Recreation Center #2 Ft Bragg (91)	4	0
2005		Minor Closure	ADRIAN B. RHODES AFRC	4	0	4
			ASHEVILLE - NRC	0	0	0

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
			JESSE F. NIVEN JR., USARC	4	0	4
North Carolina Total				13	0	13
North Dakota	2005	Minor Closure	JOHNSON USARC	0	0	0
North Dakota Total				0	0	0
Not Applicable	1988	Minor Closure	53 Stand Alone Family Housing Areas	399	0	399
	1993	Major Closure	MIDWAY NAF	1,535	0	1,535
Not Applicable Total				1,934	0	1,934
Ohio	1991	Major Realignment	RICKENBACKER	1,764	0	1,764
	1993	Major Closure	NEWARK	70	0	70
		Minor Closure	GENTILE	164	0	164
	2005	Minor Closure	ARNG RC OXFORD	0	0	0
			FT HAYES MEMORIAL USARC	11	0	11
			LT JACOB PARROTT USARC	4	0	4
			NMCRC AKRON	3	0	3
			NMCRC CLEVELAND	0	0	0
			SFC M. L. DOWNS USARC/AMSA 58	3	0	3
			SSG ROY CLIFTON SCOUTEN USARC	4	0	4
			WHITEHALL MEMORIAL USARC	5	0	5
Ohio Total				2,027	0	2,027
Oklahoma	2005	Minor Closure	ASHWORTH USARC	0	0	0
			BURRIS USARC	0	0	0
			DONALD A. ROUSH USARC	5	0	5
			FARR USARC	0	0	0

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
			JOE A. SMALLEY USARC	4	0	4
			KEATHLEY USARC	0	0	0
			KROWSE USARC	0	0	0
			NMCRC TULSA	11	0	11
			PARKER USARC	0	0	0
			PEREZ USARC	0	0	0
			ROBBINS USAR	0	0	0
			TWADDLE USARC	0	0	0
			USARC BROKEN ARROW	0	0	0
Oklahoma				20	0	20
Total						
Oregon	1988	Major Closure	UMATILLA AD	0	0	0
	2005	Major Closure	UMATILLA CD	0	12,229	12,229
		Minor Closure	2LT ALFRED SHARFF USARC	5	0	5
			NRC CENTRAL POINT	0	0	0
			SGT JEROME SEARS USARC	4	0	4
Oregon				9	12,229	12,238
Total						
Pennsylvania	1988	Major Closure	PHILADELPHIA - NH	49	0	49
		Minor Closure	TACONY WAREHOUSE	14	0	14
	1991	Major Closure	PHILADELPHIA - NS	910	0	910
			WARMINSTER - NAWC	757	0	757
	1993	Major Closure	DSC PHILADELPHIA	86	0	86
		Minor Closure	ALTOONA - NRC	6	0	6
	1995	- Select One -	CHARLES KELLY SUPPORT FACILITY	31	0	31

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
		Major Realignment	LETTERKENNY AD	917	212	1,129
		Minor Closure	FORT INDIANTOWN GAP	0	0	0
			ORELAND - NAWC-AD (OWTC)	14	0	14
		Minor Realignment	PHILADELPHIA - NSY	270	0	270
	2005	Major Closure	WILLOW GROVE - NASJRB	32	1,067	1,099
		Minor Closure	ILT RAY S. MUSSELMAN MEMORIAL USARC	3	0	3
			BLOOMSBURG USARC	2	0	2
			CHARLES KELLY SUPPORT FACILITY	145	0	145
			CORAOPOLIS USARC	0	0	0
			GERMANTOWN MEMORIAL USARC	5	0	5
			HORSHAM MEMORIAL USARC	7	0	7
			JAMES W. REESE USARC	5	0	5
			LEWISBURG USARC	10	0	10
			LYCOMING MEMORIAL USARC/OMS	7	0	7
			NORTH PENN USARC	0	19	19
			PHILADELPHIA MEMORIAL AFRC	10	0	10
			READING - NMCRC	7	0	7
			SERRENTI USARC / OMS	2	0	2
			USARC WILKES-BARRE (AMSA 32G)	4	0	4
			WILSON-KRAMER USARC / OMS	4	0	4
			Pennsylvania Total	3,298	1,298	4,596
Puerto Rico	1995	Major Closure	ROOSEVELT ROADS - NS	7,891	814	8,705
	2005	Minor Closure	ILT PAUL LAVERGNE USARC	7	0	7

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
Puerto Rico Total				7,898	814	8,712
Rhode Island	1991	Major Closure	DAVISVILLE - NCBC	753	163	916
	1993	Minor Closure	NEWPORT NETC	0	0	0
	2005	Minor Closure	PT LLOYD S. COOPER III USARC	5	0	5
			USARC BRISTOL, RI	5	0	5
			USARC, CPT JONATHAN HARWOOD	3	0	3
			Minor Realignment	NEWPORT NS	0	222
Rhode Island Total				767	385	1,152
South Carolina	1991	Major Closure	MYRTLE BEACH	3,933	0	3,933
	1993	Major Closure	CHARLESTON - NS	0	0	0
			CHARLESTON - NSY	1,373	0	1,373
			CHARLESTON - REDCOM 7	0	0	0
	1995	Minor Closure	CHARLESTON - FISC	0	0	0
	2005	Minor Closure	ROCK HILL MEMORIAL USARC	0	0	0
South Carolina Total				5,306	0	5,306
Tennessee	1993	Major Realignment	MEMPHIS - NAS	1,865	0	1,865
		Minor Closure	MEMPHIS - NRC	0	0	0
	1995	Major Closure	DDMT MEMPHIS	608	34	642
	2005	Minor Closure	CLARKSVILLE USARC	0	0	0
			GUERRY USARC	0	0	0
			USARC CHATTANOOGA	0	0	0
Tennessee Total				2,472	34	2,507

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
Texas	1988	Minor Closure	GALVESTON - NS	9	0	9
	1991	Major Closure	BERGSTROM	333	0	333
			CARSWELL	492	0	492
			CHASE FIELD - NAS	3,388	0	3,388
	1993	Major Closure	DALLAS - NAS	65	0	65
		Minor Closure	ABILENE - NMRC	0	0	0
	1995	Major Closure	REESE	2,987	0	2,987
		Major Realignment	KELLY	1,907	0	1,907
			RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	737	60	797
	2005	Major Closure	BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE	0	0	0
			INGLESIDE NS	155	0	155
			LONE STAR AAP	14,292	1,297	15,589
		Major Realignment	RED RIVER AD	3,189	646	3,835
		Minor Closure	ALICE USARC	4	0	4
			BENAVIDEZ USARC	0	0	0
			GRIMES MEMORIAL USARC	9	0	9
			HANBY-HAYDEN USARC	0	0	0
			HOUSTON USARC #2	6	0	6
			HOUSTON USARC #3	6	0	6
			JULES E. MUCHERT USARC	5	0	5
			LUBBOCK NMCRC	0	0	0
			LUFKIN USARC	0	0	0
			MARSHALL USARC	4	0	4
			MILLER USARC	0	0	0

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
			NRC Orange	14	0	14
			RATHJEN USARC	0	0	0
			Round Rock USARC	0	0	0
			SAN MARCOS USARC	0	0	0
			SEGURA USARC	0	0	0
			THARP MEM USARC	4	0	4
			USARC PASADENA TEXAS	0	0	0
			USARC SAN ANTONIO (BOSWELL)	9	0	9
			USARC SAN ANTONIO (CALLAGHAN)	5	0	5
			USARC TYLER	0	0	0
			USARC, WILLIAM HERZOG MEMORIAL	6	0	6
			WATTS-GUILLOT USARC	7	0	7
			WICHITA FALLS USARC	3	0	3
Texas Total				27,634	2,002	29,636
Utah	1988	Minor Closure	FORT DOUGLAS	51	0	51
	1993	Major Realignment	TOOELE ARMY DEPOT	1,662	0	1,662
		Minor Closure	OGDEN UT NAVRESCEN	0	0	0
	1995	Major Closure	USARC OGDEN DEPOT	1,086	0	1,086
	2005	Major Closure	DESERET CD	0	0	0
Utah Total				2,799	0	2,799
Vermont	2005	Minor Closure	AMSA 160 RUTLAND	0	0	0
			Berlin USARC	0	0	0
			CHESTER USARC	3	0	3

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
			COURCELLE BROTHERS USARC	5	0	5
Vermont Total				8	0	8
Virginia	1988	Minor Closure	Cameron Station	163	0	163
			DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY - HERNDON	12	0	12
	1991	Minor Closure	ARL-WOODBRIDGE	579	0	579
	1993	Major Closure	VINT HILL FARMS STATION	696	0	696
		Minor Closure	DRIVER - NRTF	600	0	600
			STAUNTON - NRC	1	0	1
	1995	Major Closure	FORT PICKETT	2,873	0	2,873
	2005	Major Closure	FORT MONROE	74	183	257
		Minor Realignment	ALEXANDRIA NRC	0	0	0
Virginia Total				4,998	183	5,181
Washington	1991	Major Closure	PUGET SOUND NS	156	0	156
	1995	Minor Closure	CAMP BONNEVILLE	3,013	0	3,013
	2005	Minor Closure	ILT RICHARD H. WALKER USARC	10	0	10
			FOUR LAKES CS	63	0	63
			FT LAWTON USAR COMPLEX	8	34	42
			OSWALD USARC	3	0	3
			PFC DANIEL L. WAGENAAR USARC	7	0	7
			PFC JOE E. MANN USARC.AMSA 80	7	0	7
			TACOMA - NMCRC	9	0	9

State	BRAC Year	Closure or Realignment	Installation Name	Acres Disposed	Acres Remaining to be Disposed	Sum of Excessed
			VANCOUVER BARRACKS AFRC/AMSA 82	0	0	0
Washington				3,276	34	3,310
West Virginia	2005	Minor Closure	ILT HARRY B. COLBORN USARC	4	0	4
			MOUNDSVILLE - NMCRC	0	0	0
			USARC ELKINS	4	0	4
			USARC RIPLEY	5	0	5
			USARC, MAJ LESLIE BIAS	5	0	5
West Virginia Total				18	0	18
Wisconsin	1995	Minor Closure	SHEBOYGAN - NRC	1	0	1
	2005	Minor Closure	GENERAL MITCHELL AIR FORCE BASE	102	0	102
			LA CROSSE - NRC	0	0	0
			MADISON - NMCRC	0	0	0
			O'CONNELL USARC	0	0	0
			OLSON USARC	4	0	4
Wisconsin Total				107	0	107
Wyoming	2005	Minor Closure	AVIATION SPT FAC, CHEYENNE	0	0	0
Wyoming Total				0	0	0
Grand Total				315,025	72,683	387,708

Source: FY2017 data provided to CRS by the DOD Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), May 2017.

Author Information

Christopher T. Mann
Analyst in Defense Policy and Trade

Acknowledgments

This report would not have been possible without the generous contributions and continuing support of Dan Else, who retired from CRS in 2018.

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.