BRAC 2005 Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC)
Meeting Minutes of February 23, 2005

The Deputy Secretary of Defense chaired this meeting. The list of attendees is attached.

The Deputy Secretary opened the meeting by asking Mr. Wynne, Acting Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L), to begin the discussion. Using the attached slides, Mr. Wynne began the brief.

The IEC discussed four topics during the meeting: candidate recommendations and strategic presence; approach to payback; costs and savings; and the role of the BRAC Red Team. Highlights of the discussion are as follows:

- The process overview chart should be modified to provide more detail to the steps for finalizing recommendations, the commission process, and implementation.
- The strategic presence and candidate recommendation charts represent commonly used Federal regions and provide an overview of candidate recommendations to date; however, the charts may need to be revised to better convey the aggregate effect of BRAC decisions.
- Payback is important but cannot be viewed in isolation. While some individual candidate recommendations do not pay back in the six-year implementation period, when integrated with other related recommendations, the aggregate of the recommendations will pay back within the implementation period. If they do not, the IEC should closely scrutinize them.
- Payback is not the only issue. Transforming infrastructure can most readily be achieved under BRAC, thereby affording the Department an opportunity it does not normally have. Transformation offers non-monetary benefits that cannot be ignored.
- Costs and savings must be understood in the context of all the candidate recommendations and the overall budget. Members voiced that we need to revisit these in context and exercise caution when examining the military construction commitments envisioned. There were also questions on how we should judge the candidate recommendations that have NPV costs.
- The Red Team is limited to evaluating the extent to which the Joint Cross Service Groups and the Military Departments adhered to the BRAC process rules and policy.
- The Red Team should offer candid assessments about the quality of the recommendations but not alter the content of the recommendations.
Due to time constraints, the IEC could not review candidate recommendations and agreed to schedule an additional meeting to conduct the review, otherwise they would be deferred until the next regularly scheduled meeting. The IEC members agreed to identify to the Chair in advance those specific candidate recommendations with which they have an issue and any philosophic issues or principles they would recommend being discussed.

Approved: Michael W. Wyne
Executive Secretary
Infrastructure Executive Council

Attachments:
1. List of Attendees
2. Briefing slides entitled "Base Realignment and Closure 2005, Briefing to the Infrastructure Executive Council" dated February 23, 2005
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Briefing to the
Infrastructure Executive Council

February 23, 2005
Purpose

Process Overview

• Timeline
• Registered Closure Scenarios
• Candidate Recommendations and Strategic Presence

Approach to Payback issues

ISG/IEC Candidate Recommendations Review

• JCSG Candidate Recommendations
  o Industrial (5)
  o Education & Training (7)
  o Headquarters & Support (13)
  o Medical (3)
  o Supply & Storage (3)
  o Technical (3)

• MilDep Candidate Recommendations
  o USA (21)
  o DoN (2)
  o USAF (31)
Process Overview

Joint Cross-Service Groups

Capacity Analysis  Military Value Analysis  Scenario Development

Military Departments

Capacity Analysis  Military Value Analysis  Scenario Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CY 2003</th>
<th>CY 2004</th>
<th>CY 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Draft Selection Criteria
- Final Selection Criteria
- Capacity Responses to JCSGs
- Mil Value Responses to JCSGs
- JCSG Recommendations Due to ISG 20 Dec
- SecDef Recommendations to Commission

- Scenario Development
- MV Briefs to ISG
- BRAC Report
- BRAC Hearings
- JPATs Criteria 6-8 Work
- Mil Value Data Call
- Data Calls
- MilDeps Recommendations Due 20 Jan
- Commissioner Nominations Deadline
- Scenario Deconfliction
- Start Scenario Data Calls
- MilDeps Recommendations Due 20 Jan
- BRAC Hearings
- MV Briefs to ISG
- BRAC Report
## Registered Closure Scenarios

### Annotated to Indicate Withdrawals (as of 22 Feb 05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Army</th>
<th>Dept of the Navy</th>
<th>Air Force</th>
<th>JCSG Potential Closures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ft Hamilton</td>
<td>NS Pascagoula</td>
<td>Cannon AFB</td>
<td>Fort Huachuca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfridge Army Activities</td>
<td>NS Ingleside</td>
<td>Grand Forks AFB</td>
<td>Soldier System Center Natick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo Chem Depot</td>
<td>NS Everett</td>
<td>Scott AFB</td>
<td>National Naval Med Ctr Bethesda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Chem Depot</td>
<td>SUBASE San Diego</td>
<td>Ellsworth AFB</td>
<td>Walter Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla Chem Depot</td>
<td>SUBASE New London</td>
<td>Holloman AFB</td>
<td>NAS Meridian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deseret Chem Depot</td>
<td>NAS Atlanta</td>
<td>Onizuka AFS</td>
<td>NAS Corpus Christi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Shafter</td>
<td>NAS Brunswick</td>
<td>Los Angeles AFB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Monroe</td>
<td>NAS Oceana</td>
<td>Moody AFB</td>
<td>Presido of Monterey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft McPherson</td>
<td>MCRD San Diego</td>
<td>ANG / Reserve Stations (23 sites)</td>
<td>Brooks City Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watervliet Arsenal</td>
<td>MCAS Beaufort</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rome Lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Island Arsenal</td>
<td>NAS JRB Willow Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mesa AFRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Arsenal</td>
<td>CBC Gulfport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Army Depot</td>
<td>NAS Whiting Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Army Depot</td>
<td>MCSA Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana AAP</td>
<td>NSA New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Star AAP</td>
<td>Naval Postgraduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi AAP</td>
<td>NDW DC (Potomac Annex)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas AAP</td>
<td>Navy Supply Corps School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Bank AAP</td>
<td>NAV Shipyd Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle Barracks</td>
<td>NAV Shipyd Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red River Army Depot</td>
<td>NSA Corona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Monmouth</td>
<td>NAS Point Mugu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NG / Reserve Centers (≈ 485 sites)</td>
<td>Arlington Service Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS Newport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCLB Barstow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NWSC Crane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NSA Philadelphia</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSWC Indian Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve Centers (≈ 80 sites)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Yellow represents JCSG/MilDep cooperative effort.
2. Italics represent options, only one of which would be recommended.
3. Strike through indicates deliberate decision to eliminate scenarios, or render it inactive.
4. Expect a significant number of realignments in addition to these closures.
5. ✔ indicates candidate recommendation submitted.
Candidate Recommendations & Strategic Presence
Approach to Payback Issues

- SecDef’s BRAC Priorities

  - Maximize Joint Utilization
    - Reduce overhead
    - Improve efficiency
    - Facilitate joint training and operations

  - Further Transformation
    - Rationalize our infrastructure to force structure
    - Adjust footprint to maximize warfighter capability and efficiency

  - Convert Waste to Warfighting
    - Eliminate excess capacity which diverts DoD resources

Supporting New Capabilities May Increase Costs
Approach to Payback Issues

IEC Review of Candidate Recommendations (CRs)

• Step 1: *Individual* candidate recommendations presented for *tentative* IEC approval.

• Step 2: ISG and MilDeps consolidate and reconcile all those tentatively approved.
  - While some individual candidate recommendations may not ever payback; once consolidated with others, the payback may improve significantly.

• Step 3: Comprehensive package of candidate recommendations presented to IEC for final approval.
  - Presentation will highlight any recommendations with an NPV cost for discussion of non-monetary benefits.

Tentatively approved CRs go to the Red Team
Approach to Payback Issues

- Big Picture Summaries
  - This and future presentations of candidate recommendations include summary slides that reflect cumulative costs and savings and personnel reductions for:
    - Each JCSG
    - Each Military Department
    - All DoD
## Candidate Recommendations – Cost and Savings

*(As of 18 Feb 05)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One-Time (Costs)</th>
<th>Net Implementation Savings/(Costs)</th>
<th>Annual Recurring Savings/(Costs)</th>
<th>NPV Savings/(Costs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Army</strong>*</td>
<td>(7,789.5)</td>
<td>(7,242.7)</td>
<td>156.4</td>
<td>(5,498.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navy</strong></td>
<td>(1,009.1)</td>
<td>400.3</td>
<td>426.4</td>
<td>4,353.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Force</strong></td>
<td>(1,321.5)</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>445.7</td>
<td>4,137.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JCSGs</strong></td>
<td>(3,860.2)</td>
<td>1,235.1</td>
<td>1,500.7</td>
<td>15,129.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E&amp;T</strong></td>
<td>(85.1)</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>423.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H&amp;SA</strong></td>
<td>(2,362.8)</td>
<td>203.4</td>
<td>676.2</td>
<td>6,495.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial</strong></td>
<td>(548.8)</td>
<td>666.4</td>
<td>435.1</td>
<td>4,683.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intelligence</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical</strong></td>
<td>(368.1)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>1,219.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S&amp;S</strong></td>
<td>(229.9)</td>
<td>276.2</td>
<td>154.2</td>
<td>1,682.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical</strong></td>
<td>(265.6)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>626.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>(13,980.3)</td>
<td>(5,591.2)</td>
<td>2,529.2</td>
<td>18,122.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Army figures do not include $300M in one-time costs, $4.4B in net savings during the implementation period, $1.2B in annual recurring savings after the implementation period, and $15.6B in Net Present Value savings which will result from the overseas initiative that is not subject to the BRAC Commission.
# Candidate Recommendations

Projected Briefings to ISG  (as of 22 Feb 05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>7 Jan</th>
<th>14 Jan</th>
<th>21 Jan</th>
<th>28 Jan</th>
<th>4 Feb</th>
<th>11 Feb</th>
<th>18 Feb</th>
<th>25 Feb</th>
<th>4 Mar</th>
<th>11 Mar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;T</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15/0/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>4/0/3</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;SA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15/0/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>4/1/0</td>
<td>4/0/3</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10/0/0</td>
<td>5/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>4/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8/0/0</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S&amp;S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0/0/1</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>3/0/0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMY</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>95/0/1</td>
<td>32/0/0</td>
<td>21/0/0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoN</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38/0/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15/0/0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

- **Approved** – 305  /  **Disapproved** – 2  /  **Hold** – 11  
- **Pending** - 107

**Note:** MilDeps are for info only to ISG
Joint Cross Service Groups
Candidate Recommendations

Strategy Driven – Data Verified
Industrial Joint Cross Service Group

- Strategy - Joint solutions, regionalization, and follow the fleet.

- Functional Areas
  - Ship Overhaul and Repair
    - Armaments and Munitions
      - 5 presented today
  - Maintenance
## Summary of COBRA Results

### Industrial JCSG ($M)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One-Time (Costs)</th>
<th>Net Implementation Savings/(Costs)</th>
<th>Annual Recurring Savings/(Costs)</th>
<th>NPV Savings/(Costs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(548.8)</td>
<td>666.4</td>
<td>435.1</td>
<td>4,683.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Redacted
Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group

- **Strategy** – Joint centers of excellence, private sector reliance, joint combat and undergraduate flight training, preserve Service acculturation.

- **Functional Areas**
  - Flight Training
  - Professional Development Education
    - 2 presented today
  - Specialized Skill Training
    - 5 presented today
  - Ranges
Summary of COBRA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education and Training JCSG ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Time (Costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Privatize Graduate Education Function

HOLD

Wright-Patterson AFB

Naval Postgraduate School
**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT) at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, by disestablishing graduate level education. Realign the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) at Monterey, California, by disestablishing graduate level education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ eliminates need for education programs at NPS and AFIT.</td>
<td>✓ NPS: 73.7 (1st of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Realize savings through privatizing education function to civilian colleges &amp; universities.</td>
<td>✓ AFIT: 53.4 (2nd of 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $47.2M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Savings: $121.6M</td>
<td>✓ Salinas CA: -5,412 (2,793 Direct; 2,619 Indirect); 2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Savings: $30.8M</td>
<td>✓ Dayton OH: -2235 (1,248 Direct; 987 Indirect); 0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period: 1 year</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: Assigns members to universities across the US - Less benefits of installations and medical care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (savings): $353.3M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: No Impediments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy  ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification  ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended  ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA    ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification  ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis  ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDep

**HOLD**
Combine Functions for OFTE —
Defense Resource Management Institute
**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) at Monterey, CA, by relocating the Defense Resource Management Institute (DRMI) to Ft. Belvoir, VA, and consolidating its functions under the Defense Acquisition University (DAU) at Fort Belvoir, VA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Justification</strong></th>
<th><strong>Military Value</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Aligns similar education activities</td>
<td>✓ MVA Scores: NPS (73.7), DAU (49.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Merges common support functions</td>
<td>✓ Functional closure of NPS function under E&amp;T-0003; Military Judgment as basis for the movement of a subordinate unit to a similar organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Payback</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impacts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $2.8M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: 584 jobs (305 direct/279 indirect) - 0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Savings: $3.7M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: No Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Savings: $0.7M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: No Impediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period: 3 years</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (savings): $7.2M</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps
Establish a Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Education & Training
**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama; Naval Air Station Meridian, Mississippi; and Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island, by relocating religious training and education to Fort Jackson, South Carolina, establishing a Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates redundancy for similar programs.</td>
<td>✓ Ft Jackson 44.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Merges common support function.</td>
<td>✓ Maxwell AFB 41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Train as we fight “jointly”</td>
<td>✓ NTTC Meridian 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Proximity to operational forces of all services</td>
<td>✓ NAVSTA Newport 34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Availability of field training facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One-time cost: $1.2M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net implementation savings: $6.5M</td>
<td>✓ Newport -89 jobs (40 direct/49 indirect); &lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual recurring savings: $1.2M</td>
<td>✓ Meridian -32 jobs (17 direct/15 indirect); &lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback time: 1 year</td>
<td>✓ Montgomery -37 jobs (15 direct/22 indirect); &lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (savings): $15.3M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: No issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: No impediments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps
Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training.
**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Lackland AFB, TX, by relocating Culinary Training to Fort Lee, VA, establishing it as a Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Justification</strong></th>
<th><strong>Military Value</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Uses Interservice Training Review organization as the baseline</td>
<td>✓ Lackland AFB has a higher quantitative military value score than Fort Lee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates redundancy and cost</td>
<td>✓ Military judgment favors Fort Lee because consolidating at the location with the largest amount of the culinary training mission provides the highest overall Military Value to the Department through increased training efficiency at a lower cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Train as we fight “jointly”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Payback</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impacts</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $4.878M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: -452 jobs (272 direct; 170 indirect); &lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Cost: $0.765M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: No issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Savings $0.711M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: No impediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period 5 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (savings) $5.687M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDep
Realign Prime Power Training

Fort Leonard Wood

Fort Belvoir
**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Fort Belvoir, VA, by relocating Army Prime Power School training to Fort Leonard Wood, MO.

### Justification
- The U.S. Army Prime Power courses are Engineer Branch Courses
- The “common core” phase of the NCOES courses are at Fort Leonard Wood, MO

### Military Value
- **Belvoir:**
  - Initial Skills 31.20
  - Skills Progression 37.46
  - Functional 38.58
- **Leonard Wood:**
  - Initial Skills 52.87
  - Skills Progression 46.86
  - Functional 43.91

### Payback
- One Time Cost: $10.23M
- Net Implementation Costs: $7.653M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $3.609M
- Payback Period: 3 Years
- NPV (savings): $40.084M

### Impacts
- Criterion 6: -159 jobs (96 direct/63 indirect); < 0.1%
- Criterion 7: No issues
- Criterion 8: No impediments

### Strategy
- JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs

### COBRA
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/MilDeps

---

**Belvoir:**
- Initial Skills 31.20
- Skills Progression 37.46
- Functional 38.58

**Leonard Wood:**
- Initial Skills 52.87
- Skills Progression 46.86
- Functional 43.91
Establish Joint Center of Excellence for Diver Training

NAVSUPPAC
Panama City

Truman Annex, Key West
Candidate Recommendation: Realign Truman Annex, Key West, FL, by relocating Army Diver training to Panama City, FL, establishing a Joint Center of Excellence for Diver Training.

### Justification
- Train as we fight: “jointly”
- ITRO as the baseline
- Consolidates Diver Training at the installation with the largest Service requirement
- Eliminates redundancy and costs
- Less new infrastructure required

### Military Value
- Panama City, FL:
  - Initial Skills 33.76
  - Skills Progression 33.55
  - Functional 31.90
- Truman Annex evaluated as part of Ft. Bragg
- Military Judgment favored Panama City

### Payback
- One-time cost: $17.776M
- Net implementation cost: $14.237M
- Annual recurring savings: $1.312M
- Payback time: 18 years
- NPV (savings): $0.773M

### Impacts
- Criteria 6: -232 jobs (135 direct/97 indirect); 0.42%
- Criteria 7: No issues
- Criteria 8: No impediments
Realign Transportation Management Training

Lackland AFB

Fort Lee
## Candidate Recommendation:
Realign Lackland AFB, TX, by relocating the Transportation Management training to Ft. Lee, VA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates redundancy</td>
<td>✓ Lackland has higher quantitative military value score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Train as we fight “jointly”</td>
<td>✓ Military Judgment: Locating training at location with largest transportation training mission (Army, Fort Lee) provides highest overall MV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Support Army scenario #USA-0051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Uses Interservice training Review Organization as the baseline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Payback

| ✓ One Time Cost: | $875K |
| ✓ Net Implementation Costs: | $279K |
| ✓ Annual Recurring Savings: | $239K |
| ✓ Payback Period: | 4 years |
| ✓ NPV (savings): | $2.446M |

### Impacts

| ✓ Criterion 6: | -236 jobs (144 direct/92 indirect); <0.1% |
| ✓ Criterion 7: | No issues |
| ✓ Criterion 8: | No impediments |

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps
Strategy - Joint solutions, regionalization, and consolidation of NCR, pay, major HQs, prisons, and leased space.

Functional Areas

- Financial Management
- Military Personnel Centers
  - 1 presented today
- Installation Management
  - 1 presented today
- Major Admin & HQ
  - 5 presented today
- Correctional Facilities
  - 5 presented today
- Civilian Personnel Offices
  - 1 presented today
- Defense Agencies
- Mobilization
- Combatant Commands
- Reserve & Recruiting Commands
## Summary of COBRA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headquarters and Support Activities JCSG ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Time (Costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,362.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Military Personnel Centers

CONCEPT

JOINT OR SERVICE UNIQUE

MEGA San Antonio (includes MC)
HSA-0002
GC-MPC-0001

MEGA Ft Leavenworth (includes MC)
HSA-0005
GC-MPC-0010

ARMY

ARMY HRC @ Knox (includes Recruiting)
HSA-0006
GC-MPC-0011

ARMY HRC @ Ft Sam Houston (includes Recruiting)
HSA-0074
GC-MPC-0014

ARMY & AF @ Randolph
HSA-0004
GC-MPC-0009

*Partially-Joint Concept

ORME

ARMY

NAVY

MEGA Ft Leavenworth (includes MC)
HSA-0005
GC-MPC-0010

NAVY @ Millington (includes Recruiting)
HSA-0007
GC-MPC-0012

Consolidate AF Personnel Functions (Mil & Civ) @ Randolph
HSA-0011
GC-MPC-0015

OR

E

Randolph AFB - AF, Navy, MC
Ft. Sam Houston - Army

OR

E

ARMY

AIR FORCE

AF @ Randolph (includes Recruiting)
HSA-0008
GC-MPC-0013

OR

E

E
### Candidate Recommendation:
Realign Buckley Annex, Denver, CO by relocating the Air Reserve Personnel Center processing functions to Randolph Air Force Base, TX and consolidating them with the Air Force Personnel Center at Randolph Air Force Base, TX and relocating the IMA operational management functions to Robins Air Force Base, GA and consolidating them with the Air Force Reserve Command at Robins Air Force Base, GA. Realign Robins Air Force Base, GA by relocating Air Force Reserve Recruiting Service to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.

### Justification
- Same transformational strategy for Personnel & Recruiting as applied to the Army & Navy.
- Enables mission consolidation of Active & Reserve personnel center processing functions and elimination of excess capacity.
- Enables consolidation of IMA operational functions.
- Co-location of Recruiting functions improves personnel life-cycle management.

### Military Value
- **Personnel:** Buckley Annex, 0.476; Randolph AFB, 0.723.
- **Recruiting:** Military judgment dominated over quantitative scores.
  - Co-location of Personnel Centers, Recruiting Commands, and Education & Training Command at a single location provides the greatest overall value for the Department.

### Payback
- **One Time Cost:** $30.3 M
- **Net Implementation Cost:** $30.5 M
- **Annual Recurring Savings:** $1.3 M
- **NPV (cost):** $15.1 M
- **Payback Period:** 50 Years

### Impacts
- **Criterion 6:**
  - Denver ROI: -828 jobs; less than 0.1%
  - Warner Robins ROI: -43 jobs; less than 0.1%
- **Criterion 7:** Crime Rate at Randolph higher than the national average. No other issues.
- **Criterion 8:** Environmental impediments may exist: historic properties, land use constraints, and T/E species.

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✓ JCSG Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps
Joint Bases (JB)

- JB @ Dix/McGuire/Lakehurst
  HSA-0011
  GC-IM-0003

- JB @ Andrews/Washington
  HSA-0012
  GC-IM-0004

- JB @ Pearl Harbor/Hickam
  HSA-0016
  GC-IM-0008

- JB @ Lewis/McChord
  Lewis “executive agent”
  HSA-0010
  GC-IM-0002

Consolidations

- Consolidate Charleston AFB
  & NWS Charleston
  HSA-0032
  GC-IM-0009

- Consolidate South Hampton Roads Installations
  HSA-0034
  GC-IM-0012

- Consolidate Lackland AFB,
  Ft. Sam Houston, & Randolph AFB
  HSA-0017
  GC-IM-0014

- Consolidate North Hampton Roads Installations
  HSA-0033
  GC-IM-0013

- Consolidate Anderson AFB
  and COMNAVAMERICANAS Guam
  HSA-0127
  GC-IM-00XX

HSA-0127: Consolidate Andersen AFB and COMNAVMARIANAS

**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Andersen AFB by relocating the installation management functions/responsibilities to COMNAVMARIANAS Guam. The U.S. Navy will assume responsibility for the execution of all Base Operating Support (BOS) (with the exceptions of Health and Military Personnel Services) and the O&M portion of Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization (SRM).

### Justification
- Installation management mission consolidation eliminates redundancy and creates economies of scale
- Good potential for personnel and footprint reductions (minimum of 95 positions and associated footprint)
- Fuses synergy-type efficiencies to maximize potential for cost reductions and improved services

### Payback
- One time costs: $2.0M
- Net Implementation savings: $43.3M
- Annual Recurring savings: $9.8M
- Payback period: Immediate
- NPV (savings): $131.4M

### Military Value
- Comparison of BASOPS missions using Military Value model:
  - Andersen AFB - .162
  - COMNAVMARIANNAS – .181
- Enhances jointness

### Impacts
- Criterion 6: -174 jobs (-95 direct/-79 indirect) 0.32%
- Criterion 7: No issues
- Criterion 8: No impediments

**Strategy**  ✔️  **Capacity Analysis / Data Verification**  ✔️  **JCSG/MilDep Recommended**  ✔️  **De-conflicted w/JCSGs**

**COBRA**  ✔️  **Military Value Analysis / Data Verification**  ✔️  **Criteria 6-8 Analysis**  ✔️  **De-conflicted w/MilDep**
DISA

(Defense Information Systems Agency)

Inside DC Area

Outside DC Area

Consolidate DISA Components within DC Area @ Meade
HSA-0045
MAH-MAH-0001

Consolidate DISA Components within DC Area @ Belvoir
HSA-0009 [DECON]
MAH-MAH-0030

Consolidate DISA Components outside DC Area @ Offutt AFB
HSA-0046
MAH-MAH-0034

Consolidate DISA Components outside DC Area @ Peterson AFB
HSA-0000 [DECON]
MAH-MAH-0037

Consolidate DISA Components outside DC Area @ Schriever AFB
HSA-0112 [DECON]
MAH-MAH-0037
Candidate Recommendation (summary): Relocate and consolidate DISA HQs from 6 leased locations in DC area and one in Louisiana to Offutt AFB. Retain a Pentagon Liaison office in Arlington. Relocate the Joint Task Force-Global Network Operation from 2 leased locations in the DC area to Offutt AFB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Consolidates DISA HQ in one location; eliminates redundancy and enhances efficiency.</td>
<td>✓ DISA HQ: 287th of 314</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: NCR: -6,868 jobs (4,019 direct, 2,849 indirect), 0.25%. New Orleans: -296 jobs (151 direct, 145 indirect), less than 0.1%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates ~715,000 USF of leased space.</td>
<td>✓ Offutt AFB: 4th of 314</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: Housing availability and UCR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Synergy with STRATCOM.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: Air quality, possible constraints on buildable acreage. No impediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Potential to close Arlington Service Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Other risks: Business interruption; workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Moves DISA to AT/FP compliant space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $292.7M</td>
<td>✓ DISA HQ: 287th of 314</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: NCR: -6,868 jobs (4,019 direct, 2,849 indirect), 0.25%. New Orleans: -296 jobs (151 direct, 145 indirect), less than 0.1%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Cost: $145.3M</td>
<td>✓ Offutt AFB: 4th of 314</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: Housing availability and UCR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Savings: $49.6M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: Air quality, possible constraints on buildable acreage. No impediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period: 4 Years</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ Other risks: Business interruption; workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (savings): $341.6M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps
Media and Publications

Create New Agency for Media & Publications @ Meade
HSA-0071
MAH-MAH-0012

OR

Create New Agency for Media & Publications @ Lackland AFB
HSA-0104 [DECON]
MAH-MAH-0045

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates 84,000 USF of leased space.</td>
<td>✓ Army Broadcasting Service and Soldiers Radio &amp; TV: 242nd of 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Promotes “jointness” and creates opportunities for savings and synergy.</td>
<td>✓ Soldiers Magazine: 200th of 324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Co-location of new Media Activity with AFIS and Defense Information School facilitates possible consolidation of common support functions.</td>
<td>✓ AF News Agency-Army/AF Hometown News: 303rd of 324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Moves Activities to an AT/FP compliant location.</td>
<td>✓ Naval Media Center: 175th of 324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ AFIS: 248th of 324.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Ft. Meade: 88th of 324.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $42.93M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Cost: $4.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Savings: $9.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period: 4 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (savings): $81.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: -740 jobs in NCR (439 direct, 301 indirect); &lt; 0.1%. -488 jobs in San Antonio (59 direct, 301 indirect); &lt;0.1%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: No Impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: No Impediments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Candidates (summary):**

- Strategy
- COBRA
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/MilDeps
Consolidate NAVAIR Leased Locations @ NAS Patuxent River
HSA-0078
MAH-MAH-0028

OR

Consolidate NAVAIR @ Leased Space
HSA-0103 [DECON]
MAH-MAH-0044
#HSA-0078: Consolidate NAVAIR

**Candidate Recommendation:** Close 214191 Great Mills Road and 21535 Pacific Drive, leased installations in Lexington Park, Maryland. Relocate Naval Air Systems Command to Naval Air Station Patuxent River, Maryland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates approximately 25,000 USF of leased space within the DC Area.</td>
<td>✓ NAVAIR: 241st of 314.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Consolidation of HQs from multiple to single locations eliminates redundancy.</td>
<td>✓ NAS Patuxent River: 143rd of 314.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Moves NAVAIR Components to an AT/FP compliant location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $16.4M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: No job losses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Cost: $15.0M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Savings: $0.5M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: No impediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period: 100+ Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (cost): $9.8M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps
MILDEP Investigation Agencies

Co-locate MILDEP Investigation Agencies
@ Ft. Meade
HSA-0076
MAH-MAH-0007

OR

Co-locate MILDEP Investigation Agencies
@ Quantico
HSA-0108 [DECON]
MAH-MAH-0043
#HSA-0108: Co-locate MILDEP Investigation Agencies

**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Washington Navy Yard, District of Columbia, by relocating the Naval Criminal Investigation Service (NCIS) to MCB Quantico, Virginia. Realign Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland by relocating the AF Office of Special Investigation (AFOSI) to MCB Quantico, Virginia. Realign Ft. Belvoir, Virginia, by relocating the Army Criminal Investigation Command (CID) to MCB Quantico, Virginia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Relocates several large activities away from the National Capital Region.</td>
<td>✓ NCIS: 157th of 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Frees up 524,000 GSF close to Pentagon for other uses.</td>
<td>✓ AFOSI: 154th of 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Provides Navy NCIS with upgraded HQ facility.</td>
<td>✓ USA CID: 199th of 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Co-location of activities with like missions promotes “jointness” and creates opportunities for synergy.</td>
<td>✓ MCB Quantico: 61st of 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Potential synergy with FBI activities at Quantico.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $85.1M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: -45 jobs (27 direct, 18 indirect); &lt; .1%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Cost: $75.5M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: Distance to airport issue. No impediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Savings: $4.1M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: No impediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period: 36 Years</td>
<td>✓ Other risks: Business disruption; benefits of “jointness” and co-location may not materialize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (cost): $32.1M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDep
AF Real Property Agency

Relocate AF Real Property Agency
@ Brooks City-Base, TX
HSA-0122
MAH-MAH-0053
#HSA-0122: Relocate Air Force Real Property Agency

**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Rosslyn Center and the Nash Street Building, leased installations in Arlington, Virginia, by relocating the Air Force Real Property Agency to Brooks City-Base, San Antonio, Texas.

**Justification**
- Eliminates 16,437 USF NCR leased space
- Co-location creates synergy for installation planning and environmental response.
- Moves USAF leased space to an AT/FP compliant location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $3.3M</td>
<td>✓ AFRPA(AF/IE): 290th of 324</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: NCR: -123 jobs (58 direct; 65 indirect); &lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Savings: $ .9M</td>
<td>✓ Brooks City-Base: 82nd of 324</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: No issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Savings: $ .9M</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: historic properties and wetlands impacts. No impediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period: 4 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (savings): $9.3M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategy** ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
**COBRA** ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps
Corrections Facilities Today

- NSB Bangor I
- Fort Lewis II
- Camp Pendleton II
- Edwards AFB I
- MCAS Miramar II* (Female Level III facility)
- Kirtland AFB I
- Ft Leavenworth III
  - Male only facility
- Ft Knox II
- Ft Sill II
- NWS Charleston II
- MCB Quantico I
- NS Norfolk I
- Camp Lejeune II
- NWS Charleston II
- Nas Jacksonville I
- Hawaii: Pearl Harbor I
- Nas Pensacola I

Level I < 1 year
Level II > 1 year < 5 years
Level III > 5 years

➢ 4 facilities constructed in 1950's
Proposed Joint Regional Correctional Facilities

- Average Age of Closed Facilities—26 years
- Working FBOP Reallocation of 500 inmates
- FBOP Transfers fully adjudicated/discharged from military service.
# HSA-0021 – Southwestern Joint Regional Correctional Facility

**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Edwards Air Force Base, California, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, and Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton, California, by relocating the correctional function to Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, California, and consolidating it with the correctional function already at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California, into a single Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

### Justification

- Improves jointness, catalyst to creating a Joint DoD correctional system.
- Buildable acres available @ MCAS Miramar.
- Consolidates DoD correctional facilities

### Military Value

- Edwards 12th of 17
- Kirtland 14th of 17
- Pendleton 15th of 17
- Miramar 2nd of 17

### Payback

- One Time Cost: $34.8M
- Net Implementation Cost: $28.4M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $5.3M
- Payback Period: 8 Years
- NPV (savings): $24.6M

### Impacts

- Economic: 22 to 288 job losses; <0.1%
- Community: No Issues
- Environmental: No impediments.
- Other Risks: Prisoner transportation costs higher at Miramar than Edwards and Kirtland.

### Strategy

- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis

### COBRA

- De-conflicted w/MilDep
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
Candidate Recommendation: Realignment of Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia, Marine Corps Base Quantico, Virginia, and Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, by relocating and consolidating the correctional function into a single Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facility at Naval Support Activity Norfolk, Northwest Annex, Chesapeake, Virginia.

Justification
- Improves jointness, catalyst to creating a Joint DoD correctional system.
- Buildable acres available @ NSA Norfolk, Northwest Annex.
- Consolidates DoD correctional facilities

Military Value
- Norfolk 8th of 17
- Lejeune 9th of 17
- Quantico 13th of 17

Payback
- One Time Cost: $60.3M
- Net Implementation Cost: $54.1M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $6.6M
- Payback Period: 12 Years
- NPV (savings): $13.2M

Impacts
- Economic: 2 to 199 job losses; (0.1% to 0.22%)
- Community: No Issues
- Environmental: No impediments.
- Other Risks: Prisoner transportation costs higher at Lejeune and Quantico.
# HSA-0024 – Southeastern Joint Regional Correctional Facility

Candidate Recommendation: Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida, and Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida, by relocating the correctional function to Naval Weapons Station Charleston, South Carolina, and consolidating it with the correctional function already at Naval Weapons Station Charleston, South Carolina, into a single Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Improves jointness, catalyst to creating a Joint DoD correctional system.</td>
<td>✓ Jacksonville 17\textsuperscript{th} of 17</td>
<td>✓ Economic: 32 to 74 job losses; &lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Buildable acres available @ NWS Charleston.</td>
<td>✓ Pensacola 7\textsuperscript{th} of 17</td>
<td>✓ Community: No Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Consolidates DoD correctional facilities.</td>
<td>✓ Charleston 3\textsuperscript{rd} of 17</td>
<td>✓ Environmental: No impediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Other Risks: Prisoner transportation costs higher at Charleston than Jacksonville and Pensacola.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Payback**

- One Time Cost: $5.6M
- Net Implementation Cost: $6.0M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $108K
- Payback Period: 100+Years
- NPV (costs): $4.4M

**Military Value**

- JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs

- COBRA
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification

- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/MilDep

HOLD
### # HSA-0020 – Northwestern Joint Regional Correctional Facility

**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Subase Bangor, Washington, by relocating the correctional function to Fort Lewis, Washington, and consolidating it with the correctional function already at Fort Lewis, Washington, into a single Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Improve jointness, catalyst to creating a Joint DoD correctional system.</td>
<td>✓ Bangor 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; of 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Insufficient buildable acres at Subase Bangor.</td>
<td>✓ Fort Lewis 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; of 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Consolidates DoD correctional facilities.</td>
<td>✓ Military judgment: Fort Lewis adequate buildable acres. Subase Bangor and Fort Lewis only DOD correctional facilities in the geographical region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $66.3M</td>
<td>✓ Economic: -30 jobs (16 direct; 14 indirect); &lt; 0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Cost: $69.6M</td>
<td>✓ Community: No issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Costs: $1.06M</td>
<td>✓ Environmental: No impediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period: Never</td>
<td>✓ Other Risks: Prisoner transportation costs higher at Fort Lewis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (cost): $ 72.5 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✓ Strategy
- ✓ COBRA
- ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDep

**HOLD**
# HSA-0022 – Midwestern Joint Regional Correctional Facility

**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, Fort Knox, Kentucky, and Fort Sill, Oklahoma, by relocating and consolidating the correctional function into a new single Level II Joint Regional Correctional Facility at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Improves jointness, catalyst to creating a Joint DoD correctional system.</td>
<td>✓ Leavenworth 1(^{st}) of 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Buildable acres available @ Fort Leavenworth.</td>
<td>✓ Knox 4(^{th}) of 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Consolidates DoD correctional facilities</td>
<td>✓ Sill 11(^{th}) of 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $67.9M</td>
<td>✓ Lackland 6(^{th}) of 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Cost: $72.7M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Costs: $1.4M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period: Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (costs): $78.4M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impacts**

- ✓ Economic: 17 to 198 job losses; <0.1% to 0.31%
- ✓ Community: No Issues
- ✓ Environmental: No impediments.
- ✓ Other Risks: Prisoner transportation costs higher at Lackland, Knox, and Sill.

**HOLD**
Regional CPOs Transactional Services

From 25 CPOs locations to 10

Eliminated CPOs
DoD CPOs
# HSA-0029 – Consolidate CPOs Transactional Services

**Candidate Recommendation (summary):** Realign the CPOs of DLA, New Cumberland; DISA, Arlington; DLA, Columbus; DoDEA, Arlington; WHS, Arlington; DeCA, Arlington; Rock Island Arsenal; Fort Richardson; Wright-Patterson AFB; Robins AFB; Hill AFB; Tinker AFB; Bolling AFB; Pacific-Honolulu; Stennis; leased-facilities/installations by consolidating from 25 CPOs into 10 DoD regional civilian personnel offices at: DFAS, Indianapolis; Redstone Arsenal; Aberdeen Proving Ground; Ft. Riley; Ft. Huachuca; Randolph AFB; Silverdale; Portsmouth; Naval Station, San Diego; and Naval Support Activity, Mechanicsburg – Philadelphia.

## Justification
- Creates single DoD entity for managing CPO transactional operations
- Improves jointness by eliminating 15 CPOs and creating 10 joint DoD CPOs.
- Eliminates excess capacity and leased space.
- Enabling potential to close Rock Island Arsenal.

## Payback
- One Time Cost: $102.4M
- Net Implementation Cost: $58.9M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $32.3M
- Payback Period: 3 years
- NPV (savings): $250.0M

## Military Value
- Increases average military value for civilian personnel centers from .520 to .567.

## Impacts
- Economic: -30 to -426 jobs; less than 0.1% to 0.2%.
- Community: No significant issues.
- Environmental: No impediments.

### Strategy
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- COBRA

### Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- De-conflicted w/MilDeps

### JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis

### De-conflicted w/JCSGs
Medical Joint Cross Service Group

- **Strategy** - Proficient and jointly trained medical forces ready to deploy. Size treatment facilities to beneficiary population demand. Consolidate, co-locate, and partner with civilian/VA.

- **Functional Areas**
  - Inpatient
  - Enlisted Medical Training
    - 1 presented today
  - Officer Medical Training
  - Primary Care
    - 1 presented today
  - Specialty Care
    - 1 presented today
  - Aerospace Operational Med
  - Combat Casualty Care
  - Hyperbaric and Diving Medicine
  - IM/IT Acquisition
  - Medical Biological Defense
  - Medical Chemical Defense
Summary of COBRA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical JCSG ($M)</th>
<th>One-Time (Costs)</th>
<th>Net Implementation Savings/(Costs)</th>
<th>Annual Recurring Savings/(Costs)</th>
<th>NPV Savings/(Costs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(368.1)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>1,219.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MED-0005 Medical Basic and Specialty Enlisted Training

- NMC San Diego Naval School of Health Science – San Diego
- NAVSTA Great Lakes Hospital Corps "A" School
- Sheppard AFB 382nd Medical Training Wing
- NMC Portsmouth Naval School of Health Science – Portsmouth
- Fort Sam Houston
### MED-0005: Medical Basic and Specialty Enlisted Training

**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Naval Air Station Great Lakes, IL, by relocating medical enlisted basic training to Fort Sam Houston, TX. Realign Sheppard Air Force Base, TX by relocating medical enlisted basic training and medical enlisted specialty training to Fort Sam Houston, TX. Realign Naval Medical Center Portsmouth, VA by relocating medical enlisted specialty training to Fort Sam Houston, TX. Realign Naval Medical Center San Diego, CA, by relocating medical enlisted specialty training to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

#### Justification
- Reduces excess capacity
- Consolidates medical training
- Field Medical Training Site Available

#### Military Value
- Sheppard AFB: 67.47
- NAS Great Lakes: 63.49
- Fort Sam Houston: 62.95
- NMC Portsmouth: 61.62
- NMC San Diego: 60.35

#### Payback
- One Time Cost: $236M
- Net Implementation cost: $221M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $14M
- Payback Period: 26 years
- 20 Yr. NPV (cost): $69M

#### Impacts
- Criteria 6: from -1198 to -4248 jobs (0.12 to 3.12%)
- Criteria 7: No issues
- Criteria 8: No impediments

- Strategy
- COBRA
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/MilDeps
Inpatient Healthcare Services

- Transformational Option
  - Multi-Service Market Optimization

**Pending**
- San Antonio
- Lackland AFB
- Ft Sam Houston
- NCR
  - Andrews AFB
  - Fort Belvoir
  - Walter Reed AMC
  - Bethesda NMC

**Rejected**
- Ft Jackson/Shaw AFB
- Hawaii
- Fairbanks

**Accepted**
- USAFA
- Fort Eustis
- McChord AFB
- Pope AFB
#MED-0017 Pope AFB

**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Pope Air Force Base, NC, by relocating all medical functions to Fort Bragg, NC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅ Reduces excess capacity</td>
<td>✅ Healthcare Services Function:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Redistributes military providers to areas with more eligible population</td>
<td>✅ Pope AFB: 43.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Reduces inefficient operations</td>
<td>✅ Fort Bragg: 87.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅ One Time Cost: $5.7M</td>
<td>✅ Criteria 6: −415 jobs (239 direct, 176 indirect); 0.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Net Implementation Savings: $48.3M</td>
<td>✅ Criteria 7: No issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Annual Recurring Savings: $11.8M</td>
<td>✅ Criteria 8: No impediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ Payback Period: Immediate</td>
<td>✅ NPV (savings): $154M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅ NPV (savings):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✅ Strategy ✅ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✅ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✅ De-conflicted w/JCSGs

✅ COBRA ✅ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✅ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✅ De-conflicted w/MilDep
#MED-0022 McChord AFB

## Candidate Recommendation:
Realign McChord Air Force Base, WA, by relocating all medical functions to Fort Lewis, WA.

### Justification
- ✔ Reduces excess capacity
- ✔ Redistributes military providers to areas with more eligible population
- ✔ Reduces inefficient operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ One Time Cost: $1.98M</td>
<td>✔ Healthcare Services Function:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Net Implementation Savings: $48.7M</td>
<td>✔ McChord AFB: 51.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Annual Recurring Savings: $10.5M</td>
<td>✔ Fort Lewis: 76.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Payback Period: Immediate</td>
<td>✔ Criteria 6: –355 jobs (192 direct, 163 indirect); &lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ NPV (savings): $142.2M</td>
<td>✔ Criteria 7: No issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Criteria 8: No impediments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impacts
- ✔ Criteria 6: –355 jobs (192 direct, 163 indirect); <0.1%
- ✔ Criteria 7: No issues
- ✔ Criteria 8: No impediments

### Strategy
- ✔ Strategy
- ✔ COBRA
- ✔ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- ✔ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- ✔ JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- ✔ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ✔ De-conflicted w/MilDep
Supply & Storage Joint Cross Service Group

- **Strategy -** Transition from linear to networked processes. Force-focused with regionalized distribution.

- **Functional Areas**
  - Supply
  - Storage
  - Distribution

- All 3 candidate recommendations presented privatize supply, storage, and distribution of tire, packaged POL and compressed gas.
## Summary of COBRA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply &amp; Storage JCSG ($M)</th>
<th>One-Time (Costs)</th>
<th>Net Implementation Savings/(Costs)</th>
<th>Annual Recurring Savings/(Costs)</th>
<th>NPV Savings/(Costs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(229.9)</td>
<td>276.2</td>
<td>154.2</td>
<td>1,682.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#S&S-0043

Inventory Control Points

Defense Distribution Depots

Legend

- Inventory Control Points
- Defense Distribution Depots
Candidate Recommendation (Summary): Privatize wholesale supply, storage and distribution for all tires used by DoD. Disestablish tire supply functions performed by TACOM at Detroit Arsenal and by Ogden Air Logistics Center at Hill AFB. Disestablish tire storage and distribution functions performed at the following DDs: Columbus, Tobyhanna, Susquehanna, Richmond, Norfolk, Cherry Point, Albany, Warner Robins, Anniston, Jacksonville, Red River, Oklahoma City, Corpus Christi, Puget Sound, Hill, San Diego, Barstow, San Joaquin, and Pearl Harbor.

Justification
- Supports transformation by privatizing wholesale storage and distribution processes
- Allows use of latest technologies, expertise and business practices to improve support to customers
- Frees-up 1.6M sq ft of storage capacity

Military Value
- Relative Quantitative Military Value: Not relevant because all functions for tires are privatized. All activities performing supply, storage and distribution for tires are being privatized.

Payback
- One-Time Cost: $3.6M
- Net Implementation Savings: $35.9M
- Annual Savings: $8.3M
- Payback Period: Immediate
- NPV (Savings): $110.9M

Impacts
- Criterion 6: From -2 to -75 jobs; <0.1% to 0.11%
- Criterion 7: No impediments
- Criterion 8: No impediments
Candidate Recommendation (Summary): Privatize wholesale supply, storage and distribution for all packaged POL used by DoD. Disestablish packaged POL supply functions performed by the ICP at Defense Supply Center Richmond and by NAVICP-Mechanicsburg. Disestablish packaged POL storage and distribution functions performed at the following DDs: Columbus, Tobyhanna, Susquehanna, Richmond, Norfolk, Cherry Point, Albany, Warner Robins, Anniston, Jacksonville, Red River, Oklahoma City, Corpus Christi, Puget Sound, Hill, San Diego, Barstow, San Joaquin, and Pearl Harbor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supports transformation by privatizing wholesale storage and distribution processes</td>
<td>✓ Relative Quantitative Military Value: Not relevant because all functions for packaged POL are privatized. All activities performing supply, storage and distribution for packaged POL are being privatized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Allows use of latest technologies, expertise and business practices to improve support to customers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Frees-up .9M sq ft of storage capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One-Time Cost: $2.9M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: From -2 to -46 jobs; &lt;0.1% all areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Savings: $29.1M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: No impediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Savings: $6.4M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: No impediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback Period: Immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV (Savings): $86.8M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps
#S&S-0045

Inventory Control Points

Defense Distribution Depots

Legend

Inventory Control Points

Defense Distribution Depots
**Candidate Recommendation (Summary):** Privatize wholesale supply, storage and distribution for all compressed gases used by DoD. Disestablish compressed gas supply functions performed by the ICP at Defense Supply Center Richmond. Disestablish compressed gas storage and distribution functions performed at the following DDs: Columbus, Tobyhanna, Susquehanna, Richmond, Norfolk, Cherry Point, Albany, Warner Robins, Anniston, Jacksonville, Red River, Oklahoma City, Corpus Christi, Puget Sound, Hill, San Diego, Barstow, San Joaquin, and Pearl Harbor.

### Justification

- Supports transformation by privatizing wholesale storage and distribution processes
- Allows use of latest technologies, expertise and business practices to improve support to customers
- Frees-up 325K sq ft of storage capacity

### Military Value

- **Relative Quantitative Military Value:** Not relevant because all functions for compressed gases are privatized. All activities performing supply, storage and distribution for compressed gases are being privatized.

### Payback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Cost:</td>
<td>$1.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Implementation Savings:</td>
<td>$8.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Savings:</td>
<td>$2.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback Period:</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV (Savings):</td>
<td>$26.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impacts

- **Criterion 6:** From -2 to -10 jobs; <0.1% all areas
- **Criterion 7:** No impediments
- **Criterion 8:** No impediments

### Strategy

- JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs

### COBRA

- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- De-conflicted w/MilDep
Technical Joint Cross Service Group

- **Strategy** - Align and consolidate Research, Development, Acquisition, Test, & Evaluation Centers for functional and technical efficiency and synergy

- **Functional Areas**
  - Research
  - Development & Acquisition
  - Test & Evaluation

- 3 presented today involve all functions
Summary of COBRA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical JCSG ($M)</th>
<th>One-Time (Costs)</th>
<th>Net Implementation Savings/(Costs)</th>
<th>Annual Recurring Savings/(Costs)</th>
<th>NPV Savings/(Costs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(265.6)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>626.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TECH-0020 Joint Meteorology & Oceanography Center

Consolidates all DoD Weather Modellers with operational command; enables Navy leaving Monterey

- Losing activities are:
  - Naval Postgraduate School (Monterey)
  - White Sands Missile Range
Tech-0020 Joint Meteorology & Oceanography Center

**Candidate Recommendation:** Close the Naval Research Laboratory, Monterey Detachment Division, Monterey, CA. Relocate all functions to the Stennis Space Center, MS, and consolidate them with Naval Research Laboratory Detachment at Stennis Space Center, MS. Realign Army Research Laboratory, White Sands Missile Range, NM, by relocating the Battlespace Environments research, development and acquisition functions to Stennis Space Center, MS, and consolidate them with Naval Research Laboratory Detachment, Stennis Space Center, MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhances technical synergy in Meteorology &amp; Oceanography RD&amp;A</td>
<td>Research: Stennis 2\textsuperscript{nd} of 5; Monterey 3\textsuperscript{rd} of 5; White Sands 5\textsuperscript{th} of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports the Battlespace Environments Joint Functional Concepts (CJCSI 3170)</td>
<td>Development &amp; Acquisition: Stennis 3\textsuperscript{rd} of 3, Monterey 1\textsuperscript{st} of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military judgment supported Stennis, not Monterey, because quantitative military value does not account for presence of Stennis NOAA National Ocean Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-time cost: $12.7M</td>
<td>Criterion 6:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net implementation cost: $10K</td>
<td>•Las Cruces -114 jobs (56 direct, 58 indirect); 0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual recurring savings: $2.3M</td>
<td>•Salinas -155 (76 direct, 79 indirect); &lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback time: 6 years</td>
<td>Criterion 7: No issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPV (savings): $20.7M</td>
<td>Criterion 8: No impediments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tech-0032 Chemical-Biological RD&A

Consolidates DoD CB RDA to two locations: Aberdeen Proving Grounds and Ft Dietrick

- Losing activities are:
  - Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren
  - Naval Support Activity Crane
  - Brooks City Base
  - NMRC Silver Springs Walt Reed Army Medical Center
  - Walt Reed Army Institute of Research
  - DTRA (Belvoir)
  - Tyndall AFB
  - JPEO CB (Falls Church VA)
### Candidate Recommendation (summary):
Realigns Walter Reed Medical Center, DC, Naval Medical Research Center, Silver Spring, MD, Fort Belvoir, VA, Tyndall AFB, FL, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division, VA, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division, IN, Brooks City-Base, TX, and Skyline 2 and 6, Falls Church, VA. Locates Medical Biological Defense Research at Fort Detrick, MD and Chemical Biological Defense Research and Development and Acquisition to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

### Justification
- Enhances technical synergy in proving defense against chem-bio agents
- Supports PL 103-160 mandating a single CB defense program
- Supports DoD Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support

### Military Value
- Ft Detrick, Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG) and NSWC Dahlgren had the highest MV scores.
- Military judgment applied when reviewing those scores drove the decision to consolidate both R and D&A functions for CBD to APG and the medical biological defense research to Ft. Detrick.

### Payback
- One-time cost: $75.7M
- Net implementation costs: $53.5M
- Annual recurring savings: $6.3M
- Payback time: 15 years
- NPV (savings): $8.3M

### Impacts
- Criterion 6: From -22 to -598 jobs; <0.1% to 2.3% across 5 economic areas
- Criterion 7: No issues
- Criterion 8: No impediments
Tech-0054 Navy C4ISR RDAT&E Consolidation

- Gain (1)
- Lose (1)

Losing activity is: Pt. Mugu

Cleans up Pt Mugu—Allows Navy to Close (with Tech 42)
### Candidate Recommendation:
Close Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, Pt. Mugu, CA. Relocate the Sensors, Electronic Warfare (EW), and Electronics Research, Development, Acquisition, Test & Evaluation (RDAT&E) functions to Naval Air Warfare Center, Weapons Division, China Lake, CA.

### Justification
- Eliminate redundant infrastructure
- More efficient use of retained assets

### Military Value
- China Lake has higher quantitative MV in D&A and T&E.
- Point Mugu has slightly higher quantitative MV in Research, although approximately the same
- Military judgment said consolidation at China Lake provides highest overall Military Value

### Payback
- One-time cost: $72.8M
- Net implementation cost: $51.0M
- Annual recurring savings: $6.7M
- Payback time: 13 years
- NPV (savings): $13.8M

### Impacts
- Criteria 6: -1075 jobs (479 direct, 596 indirect); <0.3%
- Criteria 7: No issues
- Criteria 8: No impediments

---

- ✓ Strategy
- ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- ✓ COBRA
- ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps
Army Candidate Recommendations
Agenda

• Review Candidate Recommendations
  ▪ 11 Joint basing or co-location
  ▪ 8 Army only and multi-component
  ▪ 2 active duty closures
  ▪ 1 update: IGPBS

• Review Cost Summary
Army Guard and Reserve Property

140 Candidate Recommendations close 484 of 4020 Existing Facilities (12%)
Close Ft McPherson & Ft Gillem
Candidate Recommendation: Close Ft. McPherson. Relocate the Headquarters US Army Forces Command (FORSCOM), and the Headquarters US Army Reserve Command to Pope AFB. Relocate the Headquarters 3rd US Army to Shaw AFB. Relocate the Installation Management Agency’s Southeastern Region HQs and the NETCOM Southeastern Region HQs to Ft. Lee. Relocate the Army Contracting Agency Southern Region HQs to Ft. Sam Houston.

### Justification
- Relocation proposals vacate 56% of total Ft. McPherson square footage
- No proposals to utilize created excess makes Ft. McPherson too expensive to maintain
- Enabling proposals: HSA-0124, HSA-0128, HSA-0009, HSA-0077 & USAF-0096

### Military Value
- Increases military value by moving from a lower ranked installation to higher ranked installations
- Ft. McPherson (51), Ft. Lee (34), Ft. Sam Houston (43)

### Payback
- One-Time Cost: $225.2M
- Net Implementation Savings: $109.1M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $89.2M
- Payback Period: 2 Years
- NPV (Savings): $921.5M

### Impact
- Criterion 6 – Max potential reduction of 7,123 jobs (4,303 direct & 2,820 indirect) or -0.26% of the total ROI employment
- Criterion 7 – Of the 10 attributes evaluated only one decreases significantly (Medical when moving to Pope AFB)
- Criterion 8 – Moderate Impact - potential Cult/Arch resource issues (Lee); close & remediate 4 operational ranges & groundwater contamination (McPherson)

### Strategy
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- COBRA
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)

### De-conflicted
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services
# Candidate # USA-0121

**Candidate Recommendation:** Close Ft. Gillem, GA. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Ft. Dix, NJ. Relocate the 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52nd EOD Group to Ft. Campbell, KY. Establish an enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the 81st RRC units and the CID Forensics Laboratory.

## Justification
- Operational capabilities enhanced by moving 1<sup>st</sup> Army
- Closure of AAFES vacates most of Ft. Gillem
- No proposals to utilize created excess in warehouse and admin space make Ft. Gillem too expensive to maintain

## Payback
- One-Time Cost: $87.2M
- Net Implementation Savings: $51.1M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $34.2M
- Payback Period: 2 Years
- NPV (Savings): $362.6M

## Military Value
- Increases Military Value by moving from a low ranking installation to higher ranking installations
- Ft. Gillem (52), Ft. Dix (23), Ft. Campbell (14), Redstone Arsenal (29)

## Impacts
- Criterion 6 - Max potential reduction of 1,652 jobs (994 Direct & 658 Indirect) or -0.06% of the total ROI employment
- Criterion 7 – Of the 10 attributes evaluated only one decreases significantly (Medical when moving to Redstone Arsenal or Pope AFB)
- Criterion 8 – Moderate Impact - air analysis req’d (Dix, Campbell); potential Cult/Arch resource issues (Dix, Redstone); close & remediate 11 operational ranges & groundwater contamination (Gillem)

## Strategy
- MILDEP Recommended
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs

## Other
- De-conflicted w/Services

---

**Candidate # USA-0121**

**Candidate Recommendation:** Close Ft. Gillem, GA. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Ft. Dix, NJ. Relocate the 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52nd EOD Group to Ft. Campbell, KY. Establish an enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the 81st RRC units and the CID Forensics Laboratory.

## Justification
- Operational capabilities enhanced by moving 1<sup>st</sup> Army
- Closure of AAFES vacates most of Ft. Gillem
- No proposals to utilize created excess in warehouse and admin space make Ft. Gillem too expensive to maintain

## Payback
- One-Time Cost: $87.2M
- Net Implementation Savings: $51.1M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $34.2M
- Payback Period: 2 Years
- NPV (Savings): $362.6M

## Military Value
- Increases Military Value by moving from a low ranking installation to higher ranking installations
- Ft. Gillem (52), Ft. Dix (23), Ft. Campbell (14), Redstone Arsenal (29)

## Impacts
- Criterion 6 - Max potential reduction of 1,652 jobs (994 Direct & 658 Indirect) or -0.06% of the total ROI employment
- Criterion 7 – Of the 10 attributes evaluated only one decreases significantly (Medical when moving to Redstone Arsenal or Pope AFB)
- Criterion 8 – Moderate Impact - air analysis req’d (Dix, Campbell); potential Cult/Arch resource issues (Dix, Redstone); close & remediate 11 operational ranges & groundwater contamination (Gillem)

## Strategy
- MILDEP Recommended
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs

## Other
- De-conflicted w/Services
Candidate Recommendation: Realign Fort Riley, KS by relocating combat arms brigade elements to Fort Bliss, TX, and relocating 1st Infantry Division units and various echelons above division units to Fort Riley, KS. Realign Fort Bliss, TX by relocating the Air Defense Artillery School to Fort Sill (#USA-0004 Net Fires) and relocating 1st Armored Division and 2d Infantry Division units and various echelon above division units to Fort Bliss, TX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Single-Service collocation of Brigade Combat Teams at Fort Bliss and takes advantage of one of the largest heavy maneuver areas</td>
<td>✓ MVI: Fort Bliss (1), Fort Riley (14)</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6 – Max potential increase of 39,933 jobs in the El Paso, TX metropolitan area which is 12.15% of ROI.</td>
<td>✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Single-Service collocation of Brigade Combat Teams at Fort Riley to support the Army’s transformation to a modular force</td>
<td>✓ Improves Military Value (by moving activities to a higher military value installation), and takes advantage of excess capacity at Fort Bliss and Fort Riley.</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7 – Low risk. Of the ten attributes evaluated two declined (Cost of living and Employment)</td>
<td>✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Lowest One-Time Cost among alternatives</td>
<td>✓ Essential to support the Twenty Year Force Structure Plan</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8 – Significant Impact – large population increase; air analysis required, &amp; potential restrictions due to archeological resource issues &amp; water availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. One-time Cost: $4188.1M
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $855.5M
3. Annual Recurring Savings: $919.7M
4. Payback Period: 3 years
5. NPV Savings: $7607.2M
**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign Fort Riley, KS by relocating combat arms brigade elements to Fort Bliss, TX, and relocating 1st Infantry Division units and various echelons above division units to Fort Riley, KS. Realign Fort Bliss, TX by relocating the Air Defense Artillery School to Fort Sill (#USA-0004 Net Fires) and relocating 1st Armored Division and 2d Infantry Division units and various echelon above division units to Fort Bliss, TX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Single-Service collocation of Brigade Combat Teams at Fort Bliss and takes advantage of one of the largest heavy maneuver areas</td>
<td>✓ MVI: Fort Bliss (1), Fort Riley (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Single-Service collocation of Brigade Combat Teams at Fort Riley to support the Army’s transformation to a modular force</td>
<td>✓ Improves Military Value (by moving activities to a higher military value installation), and takes advantage of excess capacity at Fort Bliss and Fort Riley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Non-BRAC savings of $4.4B during the 6 year period available for BRAC and other priorities (Non-BRAC NPV savings are $15.6B)</td>
<td>✓ Essential to support the Twenty Year Force Structure Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One-time Cost:</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6 – Max potential increase of 39,933 jobs in the El Paso, TX metropolitan area which is 12.15% of ROI. Max potential increase of 15,991 jobs in the Manhattan, KS metropolitan area which is 22.08% of ROI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Net of Implementation Costs:</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7 – Low risk. Of the ten attributes evaluated two declined (Cost of living and Employment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Annual Recurring Costs:</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8 – Significant Impact – large population increase; air analysis required, &amp; potential restrictions due to archeological resource issues &amp; water availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Payback Period:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NPV Costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3839.5M</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5215.7M</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$328.7M</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8003.2M</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
✓ JCSG Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/Services
## Candidate Recommendation Financials

Submitted as of 4 Feb 05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Time Cost ($B)</th>
<th>Net Costs ($B)</th>
<th>Recurring Costs ($B)</th>
<th>NPV ($B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>USA</strong></td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>($0.5)</td>
<td>($2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total IGPBS</strong></td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>($0.9)</td>
<td>($7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAC</strong></td>
<td>$3.8</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-BRAC</strong></td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>($4.4)</td>
<td>($1.2)</td>
<td>($15.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Closures: AC 21
RC 484
Total Realignments: AC 44
RC 138
Backup: Army Candidate Recommendation Quad Charts
Candidate Recommendation: Close the United States Army Reserve Center (USARC) located in Camden and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center at the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Camden, AR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Multi-Component Reserve collocation</td>
<td>✓ Improves operational efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization</td>
<td>✓ Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Closes substandard / undersized facilities</td>
<td>✓ Enhances administrative and training capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates leased property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection / recruiting / retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One-Time Cost: $4,995K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal economic impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Net of Implementation Costs: $5,339K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal community impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recurring Costs: $77K</td>
<td>✓ Low environmental impact / no significant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Payback Period: Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NPV Costs: $5,868K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
✓ JCSG Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/Services
Candidate # USA-0019

**Candidate Recommendation:** Close the United State Army Reserve Center located in El Dorado; close the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center located in El Dorado and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in El Dorado, Arkansas, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

**Justification**
- Multi Component Reserve collocation
- Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization
- Closes substandard / undersized facilities
- Eliminates leased property
- Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention

**Military Value**
- Improves operational efficiencies
- Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense
- Enhances administrative and training capability

**Payback**
1. One-Time Cost: $9,050K
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $9,549K
3. Recurring Costs: $73K
4. Payback Period: Never
5. NPV Costs: $9,802K

**Impacts**
- Minimal economic impact
- Minimal community impact
- Environmental impact / no significant issues

**Strategy**
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis

**COBRA**
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services
# Candidate # USA-0070

**Candidate Recommendation:** Close the Pond United States Army Reserve Center located in Fayetteville; close Army National Guard Readiness Centers in Fayetteville, Springdale, Rogers and Bentonville, Arkansas and relocate the units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Northwest, Arkansas.

## Justification

- Multi Compo Reserve collocation
- Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization
- Closes substandard / undersized facilities
- Eliminates leased property
- Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection / recruiting / retention

## Military Value

- Improves operational efficiencies
- Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense
- Enhances administrative and training capability

## Payback

1. One-Time Cost: $17,786K
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $17,881K
3. Recurring Savings: $72K
4. Payback Period: 100 +Year
5. NPV Costs: $16,429K

## Impacts

- Minimal economic impact
- Minimal community impact
- Low environmental impact / no significant issues

## Strategy

- JCSG Recommended
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs

## COBRA

- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/Services
**Candidate Recommendation:** Close the US Army Reserve Center in Kearney, Nebraska; and establish an Armed Forces Reserve Center by re-locating the unit to the Army National Guard Armory in Kearney, Nebraska.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Multi component Reserve collocation</td>
<td>✓ High Military Value – Enhanced operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization</td>
<td>✓ Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates lease / closes substandard / undersized facilities</td>
<td>✓ Combines combat support units in one location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One-Time Cost: $1,078K</td>
<td>✓ Max potential reduction of 15 jobs (8 direct &amp; 7 indirect) or less than 0.1 % of the total ROI employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Net of Implementation Savings: $2,242K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal community impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recurring Savings: $748K</td>
<td>✓ Low environmental risk / no significant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Payback Period: 1 Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NPV Savings: $8,980K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going) ✓ JCSG Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going) ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/Services
**Candidate Recommendation:** Close the Nebraska Army National Guard Armory in Columbus, Nebraska; close the US Army Reserve Center in Columbus, Nebraska and re-locate units into a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center in Columbus, Nebraska, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Multi Compo Reserve collocation</td>
<td>✓ High Military Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization</td>
<td>✓ Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates lease / closes substandard / undersized facilities</td>
<td>✓ Increases training time and effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention</td>
<td>✓ Improves operational efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Combines support units in one location</td>
<td>✓ Combines support units in one location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One-Time Cost: $7,884K</td>
<td>✓ Maximum potential reduction of 52 jobs (31 direct and 21 indirect) or 0.15 percent of the total ROI employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Net of Implementation Savings: $3,042K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal community impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recurring Savings: $2,455K</td>
<td>✓ Low environmental risk / no significant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Payback Period: 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NPV Savings: $25,345K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- ✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- ✓ JCSG Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/Services
**Candidate Recommendation:** Close Army Reserve facility McCook, Nebraska; close the Nebraska Army Guard Armory McCook, Nebraska; and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center at McCook, Nebraska, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Multi service Reserve collocation</td>
<td>✓ Improves operational effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization</td>
<td>✓ Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates lease /closes substandard / undersized facilities</td>
<td>✓ Enhances training associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection / recruiting / retention</td>
<td>✓ Combines combat support units in one location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One-Time Cost: $5,255K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal economic impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Net of Implementation Costs: $4,804K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal community impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recurring Savings: $138K</td>
<td>✓ Low environmental risk / no significant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Payback Period: 100 years</td>
<td>✓ JCSG Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NPV Costs: $3,322K</td>
<td>✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going) ✓ JCSG Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going) ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/Services
**Candidate Recommendation:** Close the Klamath Falls Armory and relocate Reserve Component units into a new Reserve Component Facility on Kingsley Field Air National Guard Base, OR.

### Justification
- Multi Service Reserve collocation
- Supports Readiness Processing and Mobilization
- Closes substandard / undersized facilities
- Enhances Anti-Terror / Force Protection, recruiting /retention

### Military Value
- High Military Value – New joint capability
- Enhances Homeland Defense
- New training capability

### Payback
1. One-Time Cost: $8,445K
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $8,978K
3. Recurring Costs: $83K
4. Payback Period: Never
5. NPV Costs: $9,346K

### Impacts
- Minimal economic impact
- Minimal community impact
- Low environmental risk / no significant issues
- USA proposal on AF (ANG) Installation

- Strategy
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- COBRA
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services
# Candidate Recommendation

Close the Tennessee Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop (FMS) located in Tullahoma; close the Tennessee Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop (FMS) located in Winchester, Tennessee and relocate units into a new Consolidated Maintenance Facility on Arnold AFB Tullahoma, Tennessee.

## Justification

- Multi-Service Reserve consolidation on Air Force property
- Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization
- Increases functional effectiveness
- Closes substandard / undersized facilities
- Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection / recruiting / retention

## Military Value

- High Military Value – maintenance consolidation
- Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense
- Enhances equipment readiness
- Improves operational efficiencies
- Enhances administrative and storage capability

## Payback

1. One-Time Cost: $4,197K
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $4,385K
3. Recurring Costs: $28K
4. Payback Years: Never
5. NPV Costs: $4,449K

## Impacts

- Minimal economic impact
- Minimal community impact
- Low environmental risk / no significant issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>JCSG Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COBRA</th>
<th>Criteria 6-8 Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ✓     | De-conflicted w/JCSGs |
| De-conflicted w/Services |
Candidate Recommendation: Close the Galt Hall Army Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana.

**Justification**
- Multi service Reserve collocation
- Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization
- Eliminates lease / closes substandard / undersized facility
- Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention

**Military Value**
- High Military Value – New Joint Capability
- Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense
- Improves operational efficiencies
- Establishes joint interoperability / enhanced deployment
- Combines support units in one location

**Payback**
1. One-Time Cost: $7,578K
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $7,810K
3. Recurring Costs: $15K
4. Payback Period: Never
5. NPV Costs: $7,604K

**Impacts**
- Minimal economic impact
- Minimal community impact
- Low environmental risk / no significant issues
- USA proposal on AF installation

- Strategy
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- COBRA
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services
**Candidate Recommendation:** Close the Oklahoma Army National Guard hangar and administrative buildings in Norman; realign Oklahoma Air Guard administrative buildings located on Will Rogers Oklahoma Air National Guard Base, Oklahoma and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center, simulator building, aircraft maintenance hangar and shop and Field Maintenance Shop on the Will Rogers Oklahoma Air National Guard Base, Oklahoma, if the State of Oklahoma provides the real property at no cost to the United States.

### Justification
- Multi service Reserve collocation
- Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization
- Closes substandard / undersized facilities
- Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention

### Military Value
- High Military Value – New Joint Capability
- Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense
- Establishes joint interoperability
- Improves operational efficiencies
- Driven by Aviation transformation requirements

### Payback
1. One-Time Cost: $17,991K
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $20,820K
3. Recurring Costs: $625K
4. Payback Period: Never
5. NPV Costs: $25,635K

### Impacts
- Minimal economic impact
- Minimal community impact
- Low environmental impact/no significant issues
- USA proposal on AF installation

### Strategy
- COBRA
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)

### Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis

### De-conflicted w/Services
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
### Candidate Recommendation

Close Wyoming Army National Guard Army Aviation Support Facility (AASF) in Cheyenne, Wyoming and relocate all Army National Guard aviation functions and the 1022nd Medical Company (Air Ambulance) to a new Readiness Center and Multi-Service Aviation Maintenance and Training Site and Readiness Center on F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming.

### Justification

- Multi service active and reserve collocation
- Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization
- Active and Reserve aviation maintenance consolidation
- Closes substandard / undersized facilities
- Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection / recruiting / retention

### Military Value

- High Military Value – New Joint maintenance capability
- Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense
- Establishes joint interoperability
- Collocates Army reserve aviation units on Air Force installation
- Increases training time and effectiveness

### Payback

1. One-Time Cost: $39,466K
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $33,237K
3. Recurring Savings: $1,434K
4. Payback Period: 62 years
5. NPV Costs: $18,695K

### Impacts

- Max potential reduction of 27 jobs (19 direct & 8 indirect) or less than 0.05 % of the total ROI employment
- Minimal community impact
- Low environmental risk / no significant issues
- USA proposal on AF Installation

### Strategy

- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services

- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)

- COBRA
**Candidate # USA-0194**

**Candidate Recommendation:** Close New York Army National Guard Armory in Niagara Falls and relocate units to the US Army Reserve Center and Army Maintenance Support Activity in Niagara Falls to co-locate with USAR units and establish a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Maintenance Support Activity on existing USAR property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Multi Component Reserve collocation</td>
<td>✓ High Military Value - new Army operational efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization</td>
<td>✓ Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Closes substandard / undersized facilities</td>
<td>✓ Improves functional effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances Anti Terror/Force Protection / recruiting/retention</td>
<td>✓ Increases training time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Collocates combat and support units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Payback**

1. One-Time Cost: $23,604K
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $26,079K
3. Recurring Costs: $476K
4. Payback Period: Never
5. NPV Costs: $29,289K

**Impacts**

✓ Minimal economic impact
✓ Minimal community impact
✓ Low environmental risk / no significant issues
✓ USA proposal adjacent to an AF Installation

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
✓ JCSG Recommended ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis
✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs ✓ De-conflicted w/Services
**Candidate Recommendation:** Close Alabama Army National Guard Armories Fort Graham, Fort Hanna, and Fort Terhune in Birmingham, Alabama. Close NMCRC Bessemer, AL and NRC Tuscaloosa, AL; realign Birmingham Armed Forces Reserve Center, in Birmingham, Alabama by relocating Detachment 1 450th Military Police Company and all units from the closing properties into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on or near Birmingham Air National Guard Base, if the State of Alabama provides the real property at no cost to the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Multi service Reserve co-location</td>
<td>✓ New training capability - Increases training time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization</td>
<td>✓ Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Closes substandard / undersized facilities</td>
<td>✓ Improves functional effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention</td>
<td>✓ Maximizes training associations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One-Time Cost: $23,608K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal economic impact—maximum potential reduction of 40 jobs (28 direct and 12 indirect) or 0.01 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Net of Implementation Costs: $12,860K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal community impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recurring Savings: $2,514K</td>
<td>✓ Low environmental risk / no significant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Payback: 10 years</td>
<td>✓ Joint USA and DON proposal that supports DON-099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NPV Savings: $10,693K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going) ✓ JCSG Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going) ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/Services
Candidate Recommendation: Close Arkansas Army National Guard Armory in Hot Springs, AR and the United States Army Reserve Center located in Hot Springs, AR and the United States Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA) located in Malvern, AR and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on property located in Hot Springs, AR, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Multi Component Reserve collocation</td>
<td>✓ Improves operational efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization</td>
<td>✓ Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Closes substandard / undersized facilities</td>
<td>✓ Enhances administrative and training capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Eliminates leased property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One-Time Cost: $8,911K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal economic impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Net of Implementation Costs: $8,813K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal community impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recurring Savings: $65K</td>
<td>✓ Low environmental impact / no significant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Payback Period: 100+ Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NPV Costs: $7,829K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)</th>
<th>JCSG Recommended</th>
<th>De-conflicted w/JCSGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ COBRA</td>
<td>Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)</td>
<td>✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis</td>
<td>✓ De-conflicted w/Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Candidate Recommendation:
Close California Army Guard Armory in Oxnard, CA. Close Army Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Centers on Port Hueneme, CA. Relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Port Hueneme, Navy Base Ventura County, CA.

### Justification
- Multi service Reserve collocation
- Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization
- Closes substandard / undersized facilities
- Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention

### Military Value
- High Military Value – New Joint Capability
- Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense
- Establishes joint use facility
- Improves operational efficiencies

### Payback
1. One-Time Cost: $8,323K
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $5,643K
3. Recurring Savings: $619K
4. Payback Period: 17 Years
5. NPV Savings: $261K

### Impacts
- Minimal community impact: Maximum potential reduction of 15 jobs (8 direct and 7 indirect) or -0.0 percent
- Low environmental risk / no significant issues
- USA proposal on DON Installation

### Strategy
- JCSG Recommended
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs

### COBRA
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/Services
**Candidate Recommendation:** Close 96th RRC David Johnson USARC in Fargo and move into a new Reserve Center on Hector Field Air National Guard Base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Multi service Reserve collocation</td>
<td>✓ High Military Value – Joint stationing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization</td>
<td>✓ Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Closes substandard / undersized facilities</td>
<td>✓ New joint maintenance capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances Anti Terror/Force Protection / recruiting/retention</td>
<td>✓ Improves functional operations / enhances readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ New training capability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One-Time Cost:</td>
<td>✓ Minimal economic impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Net of Implementation Costs:</td>
<td>✓ Minimal community impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recurring Costs:</td>
<td>✓ Low environmental risk / no significant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Payback Period:</td>
<td>✓ USA proposal on AF Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NPV Costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $7,857K
- $8,109K
- $18K
- Never
- $7,887K
- USA proposal on AF Installation

- Strategy ✓
- COBRA ✓
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going) ✓
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going) ✓
- JCSG Recommended ✓
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs ✓
- De-conflicted w/Services ✓
### Candidate Recommendation:
Close West Virginia Army National Guard Armory in Martinsburg and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Shepherd Air National Guard Base, Martinsburg, West Virginia.

### Justification
- Multi service Reserve Co-location
- Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization
- Closes substandard / undersized facility
- Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention

### Military Value
- High Military Value – new joint capability
- Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense
- Improves operational efficiencies
- Enhances training

### Payback
1. One-Time Cost: $8,871K
2. Net of Implementation Savings: $1,655K
3. Recurring Savings: $2,371K
4. Payback Period: 3 Years
5. NPV Savings: $23,244K

### Impacts
- Minimal economic impact: maximum potential reduction of
- 48 jobs (30 direct and 18 indirect) or -0.04 percent. Minimal community impact
- Low environmental risk / no significant issues
- USA proposal on AF Installation
Candidate # USA-0212

Candidate Recommendation: Close Army Reserve Center Westover (Chicopee), the MacArthur Reserve Center (Springfield), Army Maintenance Support Activity (Windsor Locks) Massachusetts. Close Maloney Army Reserve Center on Devens Reserve Forces Training Area and disestablish the 94th Regional Readiness Command. Close Army Guard Armory Agawam, Massachusetts. Close Westover Armed Forces Reserve Center and relocate US Marine Corps Reserves and Naval Reserve SEABEE to new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. Establish an Army Reserve Sustainment Brigade headquarters in the new facility on Westover Air Reserve Base.

### Justification
- Multi Service Reserve collocation
- Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization
- Closes substandard / undersized facilities
- Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention

### Military Value
- High Military Value – New Joint Capability
- Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense
- Improves operational efficiencies

### Payback
- 1. One-Time Cost: $101,905K
- 2. Net of Implementation Costs: $69,552K
- 3. Recurring Savings: $7,636K
- 4. Payback Period: 17 Years
- 5. NPV Savings: $3,303K

### Impacts
- Minimal economic impact – max potential loss of 243 jobs (155 direct and 88 indirect) or 0.02% of the total ROI employment (Cambridge-Newton-Framingham MA. Metropolitan Division) and max potential increase of 118 jobs (78 direct and 40 indirect) or 0.03% of the total ROI employment (Springfield, MA. MSA)
- Minimal community impact
- Low environmental impact

- Strategy
- COBRA
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services
Candidate Recommendation: Close Paul Doble Army Reserve Center in Portsmouth, NH; close New Hampshire Army Guard Armories in Rochester, Portsmouth, Sommersworth and Dover, NH and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and associated training and maintenance facilities on Pease Air National Guard Base, NH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Multi-Service Reserve collocation</td>
<td>✓ Transformational – improves training effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supports Readiness Processing and Home Station Mobilization</td>
<td>✓ Enhances Homeland Security and Homeland Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Closes substandard / undersized facilities</td>
<td>✓ Establishes joint interoperability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Enhances Anti Terror / Force Protection, recruiting / retention</td>
<td>✓ Improves operational efficiencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. One-Time Cost: $53,482K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal economic impact - Max potential reduction of 0 jobs (0 direct &amp; 0 indirect) or 0.0% of the economic area employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Net Implementation Costs: $50,138K</td>
<td>✓ Minimal community impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recurring Savings: $881K</td>
<td>✓ Low environmental impact / no significant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Payback Period: 100+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NPV Costs: $40,415K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Candidate Recommendation

Close Ft. McPherson. Relocate the Headquarters US Army Forces Command (FORSCOM), and the Headquarters US Army Reserve Command to Pope AFB. Relocate the Headquarters 3rd US Army to Shaw AFB. Relocate the Installation Management Agency’s Southeastern Region HQs and the NETCOM Southeastern Region HQs to Ft. Lee. Relocate the Army Contracting Agency Southern Region HQs to Ft. Sam Houston.

### Justification
- Relocation proposals vacate 56% of total Ft. McPherson square footage
- No proposals to utilize created excess makes Ft. McPherson too expensive to maintain
- Enabling proposals: HSA-0124, HSA-0128, HSA-0009, HSA-0077 & USAF-0096

### Military Value
- Increases military value by moving from a lower ranked installation to higher ranked installations
- Ft. McPherson (51), Ft. Lee (34), Ft. Sam Houston (43)

### Payback
- One-Time Cost: $225.2M
- Net Implementation Savings: $109.1M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $89.2M
- Payback Period: 2 Years
- NPV (Savings): $921.5M

### Impacts
- Criterion 6 – Max potential reduction of 7,123 jobs (4,303 direct & 2,820 indirect) or -0.26% of the total ROI employment
- Criterion 7 – Of the 10 attributes evaluated only one decreases significantly (Medical when moving to Pope AFB)
- Criterion 8 – Moderate Impact - potential Cult/Arch resource issues (Lee); close & remediate 4 operational ranges & groundwater contamination (McPherson)

- Strategy
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- COBRA
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- MILDEP Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services
**Candidate Recommendation:** Close Ft. Gillem, GA. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Ft. Dix, NJ. Relocate the 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52nd EOD Group to Ft. Campbell, KY. Establish an enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the 81st RRC units and the CID Forensics Laboratory.

### Justification
- Operational capabilities enhanced by moving 1st Army
- Closure of AAFES vacates most of Ft. Gillem
- No proposals to utilize created excess in warehouse and admin space make Ft. Gillem too expensive to maintain

### Military Value
- Increases Military Value by moving from a low ranking installation to higher ranking installations
- Ft. Gillem (52), Ft. Dix (23), Ft. Campbell (14), Redstone Arsenal (29)

### Payback
- One-Time Cost: $87.2M
- Net Implementation Savings: $51.1M
- Annual Recurring Savings: $34.2M
- Payback Period: 2 Years
- NPV (Savings): $362.6M

### Impacts
- Criterion 6 - Max potential reduction of 1,652 jobs (994 Direct & 658 Indirect) or -0.06% of the total ROI employment
- Criterion 7 – Of the 10 attributes evaluated only one decreases significantly (Medical when moving to Redstone Arsenal or Pope AFB)
- Criterion 8 – Moderate Impact - air analysis req’d (Dix, Campbell); potential Cult/Arch resource issues (Dix, Redstone); close & remediate 11 operational ranges & groundwater contamination (Gillem)

### Strategy
- MILDEP Recommended
- COBRA
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
# Candidate #USA-0221 (Update)

## Candidate Recommendation:
Realign Fort Riley, KS by relocating combat arms brigade elements to Fort Bliss, TX, and relocating 1st Infantry Division units and various echelons above division units to Fort Riley, KS. Realign Fort Bliss, TX by relocating the Air Defense Artillery School to Fort Sill (#USA-0004 Net Fires) and relocating 1st Armored Division and 2d Infantry Division units and various echelons above division units to Fort Bliss, TX.

## Justification
- Single-Service collocation of Brigade Combat Teams at Fort Bliss and takes advantage of one of the largest heavy maneuver areas
- Single-Service collocation of Brigade Combat Teams at Fort Riley to support the Army’s transformation to a modular force
- Non-BRAC savings of $4.4B during the 6 year period available for BRAC and other priorities (Non-BRAC NPV savings are $15.6B)

## Military Value
- MVI: Fort Bliss (1), Fort Riley (14)
- Improves Military Value (by moving activities to a higher military value installation), and takes advantage of excess capacity at Fort Bliss and Fort Riley.
- Essential to support the Twenty Year Force Structure Plan

## Payback
1. One-time Cost: $3839.5M
2. Net of Implementation Costs: $5215.7M
3. Annual Recurring Costs: $328.7M
4. Payback Period: Never
5. NPV Costs: $8003.2M

## Impacts
- Criterion 6 – Max potential increase of 39,933 jobs in the El Paso, TX metropolitan area which is 12.15% of ROI. Max potential increase of 15,991 jobs in the Manhattan, KS metropolitan area which is 22.08% of ROI.
- Criterion 7 – Low risk. Of the ten attributes evaluated two declined (Cost of living and Employment)
- Criterion 8 – Significant Impact – large population increase; air analysis required, & potential restrictions due to archeological resource issues & water availability

## Strategy
- JCSG Recommended
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs

## Capacity Analysis / Data Verification (On going)
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/Services
Department of the Navy

BRAC 2005

Candidate Recommendations Brief to

Infrastructure Executive Council
Progression of Analysis

DON
469 DON Activities

Surface/Subsurface
Aviation
Ground
Recruit Training
Officer Accessions
DON Unique PME
Reserve Centers
Recruiting Districts/Stations
Regional Support
Other Support

Capacity Analysis
Military Value Analysis
Optimization
Scenario Development
Scenario Assessment

Operational:
- Ground – 1 scenario
- Surface/Subsurface – 11 scenarios (plus 4 variations)
- Aviation – 8 scenarios

DON-specific HSA:
- Reserve Centers – 36 scenarios
- Regional Support Activities – 13 +2 scenarios
- Recruiting Management – 3 scenarios

DON-specific E&T:
- Recruit Training – 1 scenario
- Officer Accessions – 4 scenarios
- DON Unique PME – 0 scenarios

Other Support
- IUSS/METOC/NCTAMS – 0 scenarios

Scenario Analysis
Costs & Saving
Other Considerations
IEG Deliberations
CR Risk Assessment

Additional Analysis:
- Surface/Subsurface
  - Carrier move (2 scenarios)
- Aviation (3 scenarios)
- Reserves (Joint)
- Fenceline Closures

Advanced Analysis:
- Surface/Subsurface
  - 3 Candidate Recommendations (CRs) [4 activities]
- Aviation – 1 CR [1 activity]
- Officer Accessions – 1 CR [1 activity]

DON-specific HSA:
- Reserve Centers – 29 CRs [29 activities]
- Regional Support Activities – 5 CRs [10 activities]
- Recruiting Management – 1 CR [5 activities]
Close NAS Atlanta
Candidate Recommendation: Close NAS Atlanta, GA. Relocate VAW 77 to NAVSTA Norfolk, VA; VR 46 and C-12 aircraft to NAS JRB Ft. Worth, TX; HMLA 773, MALS 42, and MAG 42 to Robins AFB, GA; VMFA 142 to NAF Washington, DC; and RIA 14 to Ft. Gillem, GA. Retain Windy Hill Annex and consolidate Naval Air Reserve with NMCRC at Dobbins ARB, GA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Reduces Excess Capacity</td>
<td>✓ Increases average military value of operational air stations from 56.22 to 56.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Saves $$ by shutting down facilities</td>
<td>✓ Ranked 21 of 23 Active Bases in the Aviation Operations function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Aligns reserve VAW with active forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Maintains Reserve demographics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One Time Cost: $49.4M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: -1,917 jobs; 0.07% job loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation Savings: $218.6M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: No substantial impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Savings: $53.9M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: No substantial impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback: Immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV Savings: $701.4M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis/Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis/Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDep
Consolidate Officer Training at NS Newport
**Candidate Recommendation:** Realign NAS Pensacola, FL by relocating Officer Training Command (OTC) Pensacola, FL to NAVSTA Newport, RI and consolidating with OTC Newport.

### Justification
- Mission consolidation
- Saves $$ by eliminating personnel and reducing operating costs
- Frees up 90 KSF of space at NAS Pensacola for other uses

### Military Value
- Increases average military value from 55.92 to 57.50
- Ranked 4 of 4 Active bases in the Officer Accessions Training Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ One time costs: $3.22M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6: -643 jobs 0.31% job loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Net Implementation savings: $6.29M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 7: No substantial impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Annual Recurring Savings $1.67M</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 8: No substantial impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Payback: 2 years</td>
<td>✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ NPV savings: $21.22M</td>
<td>✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strategy
- Capacity Analysis/Data Verification
- COBRA
- Military Value Analysis/Data Verification
- JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
## DON Candidate Recommendation
### Payback Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR2 Package</th>
<th>Billets Elim</th>
<th>Billets Moved</th>
<th>Time Costs</th>
<th>Steady-State Savings</th>
<th>20 Year NPV</th>
<th>Cost/NPV Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aviation (1) [DON-0068]</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>-53.90</td>
<td>-701.40</td>
<td>1:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTCs (1) [DON-0085]</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>-21.22</td>
<td>1:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>52.62</td>
<td>-55.57</td>
<td>-722.62</td>
<td>1:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Totals (CR1 &amp; CR2)</th>
<th>Billets Elim</th>
<th>Billets Moved</th>
<th>Time Costs</th>
<th>Steady-State Savings</th>
<th>20 Year NPV</th>
<th>Cost/NPV Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface/Subsurface (3)</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>9,807</td>
<td>921.13</td>
<td>-314.04</td>
<td>-2,863.33</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation (1)</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>49.40</td>
<td>-53.90</td>
<td>-701.40</td>
<td>1:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTCs (1)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>-21.22</td>
<td>1:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Centers (29)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>-22.61</td>
<td>-316.17</td>
<td>1:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Support Activities (5)</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>49.32</td>
<td>-23.04</td>
<td>-258.33</td>
<td>1:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting Management (1)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>-14.53</td>
<td>-207.76</td>
<td>1:85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>11,773</td>
<td>1,034.16</td>
<td>-429.79</td>
<td>-4,368.21</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Dollars shown in Millions
Air Force
BRAC Update to IEC

23 Feb 05

Fred Pease
Dep Assistant Sec,
Basing & Infrastructure Analysis
Air Force scenarios incorporated:

Optimal Squadron Sizing

- Adjustments made to provide more efficient operational units (e.g. Fighter increased from 15 to 24 Primary Aircraft Authorization)

Active / ARC Mix

- Balances of the mix were made to support both “Tails” and Manpower requirements through numerous Active / ARC “Associations”

- Crew ratio increase (e.g. F-16 ratio increases from 1.25 to 1.5)

- Combined with static ANG manpower puts increased focus on Active/ARC mix
Air Force scenarios incorporated:

- **Optimal Squadron Sizing**
  - Adjustments made to provide more efficient operational units (e.g. Fighter increased from 15 to 24 Primary Aircraft Authorization)

- **Crew ratio increase** (e.g. F-16 ratio increases from 1.25 to 1.5)
  - Combined with static ANG manpower puts increased focus on Active/ARC mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Current Crew Ratio</th>
<th>Future AD/Blend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 40 and higher</td>
<td>F-16</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Air Force scenarios incorporated:

- **Optimal Squadron Sizing**
  - Adjustments made to provide more efficient operational units (e.g., Fighter increased from 15 to 24 Primary Aircraft Authorization)
- **Crew ratio increase** (e.g., F-16 ratio increases from 1.25 to 1.5)
  - Combined with static ANG manpower puts increased focus on Active/ARC mix
- **Active / ARC Mix**
  - Balances of the mix were made to support both “Tails” and Manpower requirements through numerous Active / ARC “Associations”
Redacted
Redacted
Airspace Considerations
Preliminary BRAC Costs/Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closures</th>
<th>Realignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bradley (G)</td>
<td>1. Andrews (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cannon (A)</td>
<td>2. Beale (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Duluth (G)</td>
<td>3. Birmingham (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ellsworth (A)</td>
<td>4. Capital (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ft. Smith (G)</td>
<td>5. Dover (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Grand Forks (A)</td>
<td>6. Eglin (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Great Falls (G)</td>
<td>7. Eielson (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hulman (G)</td>
<td>8. Ellington (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hector (G)</td>
<td>9. Elmendorf (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kulis (G)</td>
<td>10. Fairchild (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lambert (G)</td>
<td>11. Grissom (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mansfield (G)</td>
<td>12. Hill (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Nashville (G)</td>
<td>13. Hancock Field (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. New Castle (G)</td>
<td>14. Key Field (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Niagara (G, R)</td>
<td>15. Luis-Munoz (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Onizuka (A)</td>
<td>16. Luke (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Otis (G)</td>
<td>17. March (R,G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Pittsburgh (R)</td>
<td>18. Maxwell (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pope (A)</td>
<td>19. McGuire (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Portland (G/R)</td>
<td>20. Mountain Home (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Richmond (G)</td>
<td>21. NAS New Orleans ARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Springfield-Beckley (G)</td>
<td>22. Pittsburgh (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. W.K. Kellogg (G)</td>
<td>23. Reno (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Willow Grove (G/R)</td>
<td>24. Rickenbacker (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Yeager (G)</td>
<td>25. Robins (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Schenectady (G)</td>
<td>26. Selfridge (G, R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Seymour Johnson (A)</td>
<td>27. Selfridge (G, R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Seymour Johnson (A)</td>
<td>28. Selfridge (G, R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSD Track</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total 1T Cost/(Savings)</th>
<th>Steady</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0011</td>
<td>Close Onizuka</td>
<td>$116,636</td>
<td>$15,958 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0018</td>
<td>Close Ellsworth</td>
<td>$348,367</td>
<td>$233,025 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0033</td>
<td>Close Bradley</td>
<td>$5,823</td>
<td>$4,779 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0035</td>
<td>Close Duluth</td>
<td>$4,764</td>
<td>$3,454 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0036</td>
<td>Close Fort Smith</td>
<td>$11,547</td>
<td>$5,266 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0037</td>
<td>Close Great Falls</td>
<td>$24,557</td>
<td>$14,338 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0039</td>
<td>Close Hector</td>
<td>$4,035</td>
<td>$2,434 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0040</td>
<td>Close Hulman</td>
<td>$5,875</td>
<td>$686 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0041</td>
<td>Realign Lambert-St Louis</td>
<td>$25,336</td>
<td>$6,370 Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0044</td>
<td>Realign Otis</td>
<td>$37,314</td>
<td>$9,571 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0049</td>
<td>Close WK Kellogg</td>
<td>$8,883</td>
<td>$313 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0050</td>
<td>Close Ellington</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$0 Immed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0051</td>
<td>Realign Seymour Johnson</td>
<td>$37,772</td>
<td>$26,197 Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0042</td>
<td>Close Willow Grove</td>
<td>$44,085</td>
<td>$17,754 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0053</td>
<td>Realign Luke</td>
<td>$9,983</td>
<td>$0 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0054</td>
<td>Realign Mountain Home</td>
<td>$71,603</td>
<td>$24,045 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0055</td>
<td>Realign NAS New Orleans</td>
<td>$29,538</td>
<td>$13,018 Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0060</td>
<td>Close Nashville</td>
<td>$22,027</td>
<td>$10,084 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0066</td>
<td>Close Mansfield</td>
<td>$28,049</td>
<td>$9,481 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0067</td>
<td>Realign Schenectady</td>
<td>$3,565</td>
<td>$2,068 Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0069</td>
<td>Realign Luis Munoz</td>
<td>$5,009</td>
<td>$3,078 Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0034</td>
<td>Realign Capital</td>
<td>$9,917</td>
<td>$4,109 Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0046</td>
<td>Close Richmond</td>
<td>$18,247</td>
<td>$1,512 Immed ($10,000) ($4,444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0048</td>
<td>Realign Hill</td>
<td>$67,979</td>
<td>$44,245 Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0032</td>
<td>Close Cannon</td>
<td>$79,000</td>
<td>$13,760 Immed ($273,000) ($118,576)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0080</td>
<td>Close Birmingham</td>
<td>$16,535</td>
<td>$7,260 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0077</td>
<td>Close Key Field</td>
<td>$15,289</td>
<td>$5,336 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0047</td>
<td>Realign Springfield-Beckley</td>
<td>$12,177</td>
<td>$751 Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF-0063</td>
<td>Realign Andrews</td>
<td>$31,440</td>
<td>$9,265 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$1,085,246 $486,184 $66,654 ($321,940)
Way Ahead

- Estimate remaining 24 recommendations to be briefed at 7 Mar IEC
- Currently refining costs/savings with other MilDeps and JCSGs
Questions?