

## **Fort Devens, Massachusetts**

**Category: Command and Control**  
**Mission: 10th Special Forces Group**  
**Cost to Close: \$160.2 million**  
**Savings: 1992-97: \$30.8 million;**  
**Annual: \$55.2 million**  
**Payback: 0 years**

### **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION**

Close Fort Devens, retaining only those facilities to support Reserve Component training. Create a small Reserve enclave on Fort Devens's main post and retain approximately 3,000 acres for use as a regional training center. Retain the Headquarters, Information Systems Command (ISC) and supporting elements at Fort Huachuca, Arizona, and Fort Monmouth, New Jersey; and relocate selected ISC elements from Fort Belvoir, Virginia, to Fort Ritchie, Maryland, or another location in the National Capital Region (a change to the 1988 Base Realignment and Closure Commission recommendations). Relocate the 10th Special Forces Group (SFG) from Fort Devens to Fort Carson, Colorado.

The Army will soon need fewer command-and-control installations. Fort Devens ranked ninth out of eleven installations in its category and is not critical to either the midterm management of the Army's build down or the long-term strategic requirements of the Army's command-and-control installation structure.

### **COMMUNITY CONCERNS**

The community argued that the DoD recommendation violates the law because it changes the 1988 Base Realignment and Closure Commission's recommendation, which never was enacted. It also claimed that the Army would be better served by having the Headquarters, ISC, located nearer to a "center of high technology." The community argued that closing Fort Devens will remove the active

Army presence in New England. The community also claimed that the training ranges were adequate to support the 10th SFG. Finally, the community argued that the proposed closure will have a significant impact on the local economy and that the Army overstated the expected land value of the properties to be sold.

### **COMMISSION FINDINGS**

The Commission found that all installations in this category were treated fairly. It also found that the change to the 1988 Base Realignment and Closure Commission's recommendation to leave the ISC at Fort Huachuca, Fort Monmouth, and the National Capital Region does not violate the law. Additionally, a 1989 GAO report revised the 1988 Commission's findings regarding recurring savings from \$21 million to \$8.1 million and the payback periods from 0 years to a range of 43 to 200 years. The Commission also found that because the Headquarters, ISC, had not left Fort Huachuca, the mission may best be continued there, avoiding construction costs of approximately \$74 million at Fort Devens.

The Commission found that the training area at Fort Devens could not adequately support the 10th SFG training. It has insufficient maneuver space, a small drop zone, limits on demolition training, and limits on weapon firing. The proximity to a civilian airport also affects high-altitude, low-opening operations. Army presence will remain in New England for Reserve Component support, recruiting, and other activities.

The Commission also found that the Army will retain 4,600, not 3,000 acres for Reserve Component training. This has been confirmed with the Department of the Army. The Commission found that Fort Devens has newly constructed facilities and that DoD should make maximum use of these facilities in future stationing decisions. The Commission estimates civilian unemployment would increase by two percentage points. The Commission did not include any proposed land

sale in its calculations and found that this did not change the Army's decision.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Commission finds that DoD's recommendation did not deviate substantially from the force-structure plan and the final selection criteria. The Commission, therefore, recommends the closure of Fort Devens and the retention of **4,600** acres and those facilities essential to support Reserve Component Training requirements; and realignment of the **10th** SFG to Fort Carson. Instead of moving Headquarters, ISC, and supporting elements to Fort Devens from Forts Huachuca, Monmouth, and Belvoir and leased space in the National Capital Region as recommended by the **1988** Base Realignment and Closure Commission, retain Headquarters, ISC, at Fort Huachuca and support elements at Fort Monmouth, and relocate selected ISC elements from Fort Belvoir to Fort Ritchie or another location in the National Capital Region.

### **Fort Dix, New Jersey**

*Category: Fighting (Major Training Areas)*

*Mission: Reserve Component Training*

*Cost to Close: \$30.2 million*

*Savings: 1992-97: \$60.5 million;*

*Annual: \$25.3 million*

*Payback: 0 years*

### **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION**

Close Fort Dix, relocating active organizations that do not directly support the Reserve Component (except those that cannot be relocated elsewhere). Retain **only** those facilities and training areas necessary to support Reserve Component training. This proposal changes the **1988** Base Realignment and Closure Commission's recommendation to maintain Fort Dix in a semiactive status. It is driven by a desire to reduce base operations and real-property-maintenance costs by eliminating excess facilities and relocating

tenants that do not support the Reserve Component.

### **COMMUNITY CONCERNS**

The community argued that the land value included in **DoD's** recommendation (**\$82.6** million) was overstated. The community also argued that Fort Dix could be used for many alternative purposes, including the **U.S.** Army Reserve Command headquarters, a Reserve Center of Excellence for training, or the site of other DoD activities that are now in leased space in the Washington, D.C., area.

The community asserted that the unemployment impact would be large and that the word "close" in DoD's recommendation was not clear. The community was concerned that the word "closure" would preclude Fort Dix from being available as a potential receiver of other Reserve Component training missions or as a potential receiver of other DoD activities. The community further argued that Fort Dix, while ranking second in its category based on military-value calculations, was selected for closure because of potential savings.

The community asserted that Fort Dix was not given full credit for its quality-of-life attributes, such as family housing.

### **COMMISSION FINDINGS**

The Commission found that DoD did not treat all installations in this category equally. Four other lower-ranked bases were deferred from further consideration because of uncertainty in the Reserve Component force structure and because the results of a study addressing the Reserve Component training strategies and management of major training areas were not **known**.

The Commission found that, while the land value may have been overstated, it had **no** impact on the final decision.