

# Department of the Army

## *Summary of Selection Process*

---

### **Introduction**

The Secretary of Defense stated that, while BRAC 2005 must pursue the reduction of excess capacity, it “can make an even more profound contribution to transforming the Department by rationalizing our infrastructure with defense strategy. BRAC 2005 should be the means by which we reconfigure our current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes *both* warfighting capability and efficiency.”

The Secretary of the Army’s memorandum entitled “Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure” stated that the Army’s full participation in BRAC 2005 would enable the Service to realign its infrastructure in a way that maximizes both efficiency and warfighting capability. The Secretary of the Army further emphasized the importance of adhering to BRAC law. He indicated that the Army would treat all of its installations fairly in the process and stressed that no binding decisions would be made prior to the Secretary of Defense’s submission of final recommendations to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Multiple levels of the Department of the Army participated in the BRAC 2005 process. The Executive Office, Headquarters (EOH), the Army’s most senior deliberative group, is made up of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Under Secretary of the Army, and the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army. The EOH issued planning guidance, reviewed analytical assessments, and approved candidate recommendations for submission to the Secretary of Defense.

The Army’s BRAC Senior Review Group (SRG), co-chaired by the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army and Under Secretary of the Army, included both uniformed and civilian members of the Army’s senior leadership, and served as a deliberative and coordinating body for the EOH. The BRAC SRG evaluated potential Army recommendations for EOH consideration, supervised the efforts of the Army Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) representatives, and provided overall planning guidance and direction to the Department’s BRAC analytical group, The Army Basing Study (TABS) Group.

The TABS Group, directed by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Infrastructure Analysis, executed the Army analyses and coordinated the Army’s BRAC 2005 effort. The group’s mission was to conduct a comprehensive assessment of Army installations in compliance with established BRAC law and criteria; to evaluate alternatives; and to develop, document, and publish candidate recommendations for submission to OSD. The TABS Group ensured that the

Army's approach was consistent with the DoD force structure plan, the DoD installation inventory, BRAC selection criteria, and the requirements of Public Law 101-510, as amended.

## **Strategy**

The Army is transforming from a force designed for deterring a well-defined and understood adversary to a post-Cold War era expeditionary force designed for continuous operations over a broad spectrum of threats ranging from traditional to potentially catastrophic. Instead of focusing on a single, well-defined threat or region, the Army is developing a range of complementary and interdependent capabilities that can dominate a range of adversaries and situations. Transformation enables the Army to utilize advantages and mitigate vulnerabilities to sustain its strategic position in the world.

The Army's Modular Force Initiative is reshaping the fighting force—transforming into modular brigade units to become a larger, more powerful, more flexible deployable force. The Army is relocating the fighting force—rebased its overseas units in the continental United States. It is rebalancing the fighting force—transforming the Reserve and Active force mix. The Army is creating a more Joint force—actively participating in Department of Defense efforts for greater joint operations and increased focus on homeland defense missions. The Army is becoming a far better force—a campaign quality, Joint and Expeditionary Army with the capabilities to provide relevant and ready combat power to the Combatant Commanders from a portfolio of installations that trains, sustains, enhances the readiness and well-being of the Joint Team, and provides a platform for rapid deployment.

The Secretary of the Army's strategy for BRAC 2005 is to utilize BRAC to establish a streamlined portfolio of installations with optimized military value and a significantly reduced cost of ownership that:

- Facilitates transformation, Joint operations, and Joint business functions;
- Accommodates rebasing of overseas units within the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS); and
- Divests of an accumulation of installations that are no longer relevant and are less effective in supporting the Joint and Expeditionary Army.

BRAC 2005 is a critical component of Army transformation. The BRAC process enables the Army to reshape the infrastructure supporting the current and future forces, making them even more relevant and combat ready for the Combatant Commander. Through participation in BRAC 2005, the Army realigns its infrastructure to optimize its warfighting capability and efficiency.

## **Selection Process**

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended (part A of Title XXIX, Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) sets the legal baseline for BRAC, although several

significant changes were made for BRAC 2005. The guidelines for the BRAC Selection Criteria were, for the first time, explicitly written into the law. The Army used the BRAC Selection Criteria during its analyses and ensured that military value (Criteria 1-4) was the primary consideration in making its BRAC 2005 recommendations.

To frame its process and begin to develop potential BRAC actions, the Army employed the selection criteria, along with the Force Structure Plan and Installation Inventory submitted to Congress. The law specifies that all BRAC recommendations must be based on the criteria, plan, and inventory; thus, these three requirements formed the analytical foundation for the BRAC 2005 analysis.

The military value (MV) criteria provided the Army a comprehensive, proven technique to compare and select installations to accomplish Army transformation. With BRAC, the Army Modular Force Initiative, return of forces from overseas, and transformation of the Reserve Components will occur within the timeframe necessary to satisfy operational needs. The military value criteria specifically directed attention to staging areas in support of homeland defense, maintenance of a diversity of climate and terrain in support of training, and surge capacity.

The Army began its BRAC 2005 selection process by determining its installation study list, which included and considered all installations on its property list, except those excluded by BRAC law. Using these guidelines, the Army developed a study list of 97 installations (including 10 leased sites).

Full transformation of the Army necessitated transformation of Reserve Component (RC) facilities, as well. There are more than 4,000 Army Reserve and Guard facilities. Due to the sheer number of facilities and the difficulty of comparing RC capabilities to Active Component (AC) capabilities, the Army invited the Adjutants General from each state and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command commanders to conduct analyses of RC facilities against military value criteria and Reserve operational requirements. The military value criteria were used to identify existing or new installations in the same demographic area that provide enhanced homeland defense, training, and mobilization capabilities. The Army sought to create multi-component facilities (Guard and Reserve) and multi-service, Joint facilities to further enhance mission accomplishment.

The Army collected and maintained data from the study-list installations, which became key inputs in selection process analyses. The BRAC process required that all information used to develop and make recommendations be certified as accurate and complete to the best of the certifier's knowledge and belief. In this data collection effort, the TABS Group received continuous support from installation administrators, Major Command trusted agents, and Installation Management Agency trusted agents.

While data collection provided the Army with an inventory of assets at its installations, capacity analysis determined the excesses and shortages that existed within this inventory. Using the Force Structure Plan, the Army assessed the requirements and determined excesses and shortages across various metrics. In addition, by studying surge, the Army assessed possible future requirements and determined how its capacity inventory accommodated uncertainty.

The Army then determined the military value of each installation, the primary consideration for BRAC 2005 recommendations. The Army assessed installations using a common set of 40 attributes that were linked to the military value criteria. The Army defined military value through attributes designed to capture current and future capability and not simply current use. This capabilities-based approach permitted the Army to assess relative installation capabilities to contribute to Army mission accomplishment now and in the future. The military value of each installation is the summed collective scores across weighted attributes, and the Army ranked its installations from 1 to 97.

These intermediate results were the starting point for scenario development. The Army developed strategy-based scenarios that sought to facilitate transformation, rebasing of overseas units, Joint operations, and Joint business functions. Potential stationing actions sought to move units and activities from installations with lower MV to installations with higher MV to take advantage of excess capacity and divest of less-relevant or less-effective installations. Once a scenario had been developed, the Army considered the remaining four selection criteria to determine their impacts on the scenario. For criteria 5-8, the Army evaluated scenarios by using the DoD-sanctioned models that, respectively, calculated cost and savings information, assessed economic impact, evaluated the ability of a local community to support Army requirements, and provided environmental analysis.

The Army developed and analyzed numerous scenarios and selected candidate recommendations for submission to the Infrastructure Executive Council. From this list the Secretary of Defense determined the final Army BRAC 2005 recommendations for submission to the Secretary of Defense.

## **Conclusion**

The Army's BRAC 2005 strategy and process supported the development of recommendations that enhance military value, advance the Modular Force Initiative, accommodate the rebasing of overseas units, reduce cost of ownership, contribute to Joint operations and Joint business function opportunities, and enable the transformation of the Reserve Components and the rebalancing of Active and Reserve forces. These recommendations maintain necessary surge capabilities, enhance homeland defense missions, and continue the transformation to a more relevant and ready Joint and Expeditionary Army.

The recommendations approved by the Secretary of Defense follow:

## ***Recommendations and Justifications***

---

### **Fort Wainwright, AK**

**Recommendation:** Realign Fort Wainwright, AK, by relocating the Cold Regions Test Center (CRTC) headquarters from Fort Wainwright, AK, to Fort Greely, AK.

**Justification:** This recommendation relocates CRTC headquarters to Fort Greely to improve efficiency of operations and enhance personnel safety. Sufficient capacity exists at Fort Greely. There would be no impact on Force Structure. This recommendation relocates headquarters closer to the CRTC's test mission execution on the Bolio Lake Range Complex. This complex, although realigned under Fort Wainwright in BRAC 95, is only 10 miles south of Fort Greely but 100 miles from Fort Wainwright's cantonment area. This action would enhance interoperability and reduce costs by permitting personnel to live closer to their primary work site, thus, avoiding a 200 mile round trip between quarters and work sites. Decreases the risks associated with the required year-round travel in extreme weather conditions. Results in more efficient and cost effective monitoring & control of arctic testing of transformational systems. This recommendation did not consider other locations since the CRTC headquarters only manages testing at one site.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$0.05M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a saving of \$0.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$0.05M with a payback expected in 2 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$0.7M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** This recommendation will not result in any job reductions (direct or indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Fairbanks metropolitan area since Fort Wainwright and Fort Greely are in the same metropolitan area. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** The local area infrastructure is sufficient to support this recommendation. A review of community attributes (Child Care, Cost of Living, Education, Employment, Housing, Medical Health, Population Center, Safety, Transportation, and Utilities) revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the local community's infrastructure to support forces, missions, and personnel. Fort Greely is in the same MSA and MHA as Fort Wainwright; therefore, the Army uses the same information for Local Area for both installations. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation does not impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance

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

### **Fort Gillem, GA**

**Recommendation:** Close Fort Gillem, GA. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Rock Island Arsenal, IL. Relocate the 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52<sup>nd</sup> Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Group to Fort Campbell, KY. Relocate the 81<sup>st</sup> RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Fort Benning, GA. Relocate the 3rd US Army Headquarters support office to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Headquarters US Forces Command (FORSCOM) VIP Explosive Ordnance Support to Pope Air Force Base, NC. Close the Army-Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) Atlanta Distribution Center and establish an enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the remainder of the 81st RRC units and the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Forensics Laboratory.

**Justification:** This recommendation closes Fort Gillem, an Army administrative installation and an AAFES distribution center. The recommendation moves the major tenant organizations to Rock Island Arsenal, Redstone Arsenal, Fort Benning, and Fort Campbell. It also moves small components of the Headquarters 3rd US Army and US Army Forces Command to Pope AFB and Shaw AFB. It enhances the Army's military value, is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities to address future unforeseen requirements. This closure allows the Army to employ excess capacities at installations that can accomplish more than administrative missions.

The closure of Fort Gillem also enables the stationing of its tenant units at locations that will increase their ability to associate with like units and promote coordination of efforts. Both the 52nd EOD Group and the 2nd Recruiting Brigade have regional missions in the Southeastern United States. The 52nd EOD Group was co-located with operational forces at Fort Campbell to provide training opportunities. The 2nd Recruiting Brigade is recommended to relocate to Redstone Arsenal because of its central location in the Southeast and its access to a transportation center in Huntsville, AL. The Army is converting the 1st US Army Headquarters into the single Headquarters for oversight of Reserve and National Guard mobilization and demobilization. To support this conversion the Army decided to relocate 1st Army to Rock Island Arsenal, a central location in the United States. The 81st RRC Equipment concentration Site is relocated to Fort Benning where there are improved training opportunities with operational forces.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$56.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a savings of \$85.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$35.3M with a payback expected in 1 year. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$421.5M.

This recommendation affects: the U.S. Post Office, FEMA, FAA, GSA and the Civil Air Patrol, non-DoD Federal agencies. In the absence of access to credible cost and savings information for these agencies or knowledge regarding whether these agencies will remain on the installation, the Department assumed that the non-DoD Federal agencies will be required to assume new base operating responsibilities on the affected installation. The Department further assumed that because of these new base operating responsibilities, the effect of the recommendation on the non-DoD agencies would be an increase in their costs. As required by Section 2913(d) of the BRAC statute, the Department has taken the effect on the costs of these agencies into account when making this recommendation.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,824 jobs (1,067 direct and 737 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA metropolitan statistical area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructures of the local communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. When moving from Fort Gillem to Rock Island Arsenal, the following local area capability improved: Cost of Living and Population. The following capabilities are less robust: Housing, Education, Employment, and Medical. When moving from Fort Gillem to Fort Campbell, the following local attributes are improved: Cost of Living and Population. The following capabilities are not as robust: Housing, Education, Employment, Medical, Safety and Transportation. When moving from Fort Gillem to Redstone Arsenal, the following local attributes are improved: Cost of Living and Population. The following capabilities are not as robust: Child Care, Housing, Medical, and Transportation. When moving from Fort Gillem to Fort Benning, the following local capability is improved: Population. The following capabilities are not as robust: Housing, Employment, Medical, and Safety. When moving from Fort Gillem to Pope AFB, the following capabilities are improved: Cost of Living and Population. The following capabilities are not as robust: Housing, Employment, Medical, Safety and Transportation. When moving from Fort Gillem to Shaw AFB, the following local capabilities are improved: Cost of Living and Population. The following capabilities are not as robust: Housing, Education, Medical, Transportation and Safety. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

**Environmental Impact:** Closure of Fort Gillem will necessitate consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office to ensure that historic properties are continued to be protected. The closure of ranges at Fort Gillem will require clearance of munitions and remediation of any munition constituents. The remediation costs for these ranges may be significant and the time required for completing remediation is uncertain. Groundwater and surface water resources will require restoration and/or monitoring to prevent further environmental impacts. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases to impaired waterways may be required at Rock Island, Fort Campbell, and Fort Benning to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve USEPA Water Quality Standards. Air Conformity determination and New Source Review and permitting effort

and consultations with tribes regarding cultural resources will be required at Fort Campbell. This recommendation has the potential to impact noise and threatened and endangered species or critical habitat at Fort Campbell. An Air Conformity Analysis will be required at Fort Benning. Construction at Pope AFB may have to occur on acreage already constrained by TES. This recommendation has the potential to impact wetlands at Pope AFB and Shaw AFB. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or waste management. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$1.3M for environmental compliance costs. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Fort Gillem reports \$18M in environmental restoration costs. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an installation is closed, realigned, or remains open, these costs were not included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **Fort McPherson, GA**

**Recommendation:** Close Fort McPherson, GA. Relocate the Headquarters US Army Forces Command (FORSCOM), and the Headquarters US Army Reserve Command (USARC) to Pope Air Force Base, NC. Relocate the Headquarters 3rd US Army to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Installation Management Agency Southeastern Region Headquarters and the US Army Network Enterprise Technology Command (NETCOM) Southeastern Region Headquarters to Fort Eustis, VA. Relocate the Army Contracting Agency Southern Region Headquarters to Fort Sam Houston.

**Justification:** This recommendation closes Fort McPherson, an administrative installation, and moves the tenant headquarters organizations to Fort Sam Houston, Fort Eustis, Pope AFB and Shaw AFB. It enhances the Army's military value, is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities to address future unforeseen requirements. This closure allows the Army to employ excess capacities at installations that can accomplish more than administrative missions. The organization relocations in this recommendation also create multifunctional, multi-component and multi-Service installations that provide a better level of service at a reduced cost.

The recommended relocations also retain or enhance vital linkages between the relocating organizations and other headquarters activities. FORSCOM HQs is relocated to Pope AFB where it will be co-located with a large concentration of operational forces. The USARC HQs has a mission relationship with FORSCOM that is enhanced by leaving the two co-located. 3rd Army is relocated to Shaw AFB where it will be collocated with the Air Force component command of CENTCOM. The IMA and NETCOM HQs are moved to Fort Eustis because of recommendations to consolidate the Northeastern and Southeastern regions of these two commands into one Eastern Region at Fort Eustis. The ACA Southern Region HQs is moved to

Fort Sam Houston where it is recommended to consolidate with the ACA Southern Hemisphere Region HQs, and where it will co-locate with other Army service providing organizations.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$197.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a saving of \$111.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$82.1M with a payback expected in 2 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$895.2M.

This recommendation affects the U.S. Post Office, a non-DoD Federal agency. In the absence of access to credible cost and savings information for that agency or knowledge regarding whether that agency will remain on the installation, the Department assumed that the non-DoD Federal agency will be required to assume new base operating responsibilities on the affected installation. The Department further assumed that because of these new base operating responsibilities, the effect of the recommendation on the non-DoD agency would be an increase in its costs. As required by Section 2913(d) of the BRAC statute, the Department has taken the effect on the costs of this agency into account when making this recommendation.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 7,123 jobs (4,303 direct and 2,820 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA metropolitan statistical area, which is 0.3 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructures of the local communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. When moving from Fort McPherson to Pope AFB, the following local capability is improved: Cost of Living. The following local area capabilities are not as robust: Housing, Employment, Medical and Safety. When moving from Fort McPherson to Fort Eustis, the following local capabilities are improved: Cost of Living and Transportation. The following local area capabilities are not as robust: Housing, Education, and Medical Health. When moving from Fort McPherson to Fort Sam Houston, the following local capability is improved: Cost of Living. The following local area capabilities are not as robust: Employment, Medical and Safety. When moving from Fort McPherson to Shaw AFB, the following local capability is improved: Cost of Living. The following local area capabilities are not as robust: Housing, Education, Medical and Safety. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

**Environmental Impact:** Closure of Fort McPherson will necessitate consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office. Closure of operational ranges will likely necessitate clearance of munitions and remediation of any munition constituents. The remediation costs for these ranges may be significant and the time required for completing remediation is uncertain. Fort McPherson has contaminated water resources that will require restoration and/or monitoring. A new source review will be required at Fort Sam Houston. An Air Conformity

determination and New Source Review and permitting effort will be required at Fort Eustis. A minor air permit revision may be necessary at Pope AFB. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases to impaired waterways may be required at Fort Sam Houston and Fort Eustis to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA water quality standards. Construction at Pope AFB may have to occur on acreage already constrained by TES. This recommendation has the potential to impact wetlands at Pope AFB and Shaw AFB. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; or waste management. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$2.5M for environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Fort McPherson reports \$129.7M in environmental restoration costs. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an installation is closed, realigned, or remains open, these costs were not included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **Fort Bragg, NC**

**Recommendation:** Realign Fort Bragg, NC, by relocating the 7th Special Forces Group (SFG) to Eglin AFB, FL, and by activating the 4th Brigade Combat Team (BCT), 82d Airborne Division and relocating European-based forces to Fort Bragg, NC.

**Justification:** This recommendation co-locates Army Special Operation Forces with Air Force Special Operations Forces at Eglin AFB, activates the 4th BCT of the 82nd Airborne Division and relocates Combat Service Support units to Fort Bragg from Europe to support the Army modular force transformation. This realignment and activation of forces enhances military value and training capabilities by locating Special Operations Forces (SOF) in locations that best support Joint specialized training needs, and by creating needed space for the additional brigade at Fort Bragg. This recommendation is consistent with and supports the Army's Force Structure Plan submitted with the FY 06 budget, and provides the necessary capacity and capability, including surge, to support the units affected by this action.

This recommendation never pays back. However, the benefits of enhancing Joint training opportunities coupled with the positive impact of freeing up needed training space and reducing cost of the new BCT by approximately \$54-\$148M (with family housing) at Fort Bragg for the Army's Modular Force transformation, justify the additional costs to the Department.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$334.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$446.1M. Annual recurring costs to the Department after implementation is \$23.8M, with no payback expected. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$639.2M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** This recommendation will not result in any job reductions (direct or indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Fayetteville, NC and Fort Walton Beach-Crestview-Destin, FL, metropolitan statistical areas. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the local community's infrastructure to support missions, forces, and personnel. Of the ten attributes evaluated (Child Care, Cost of Living, Education, Employment, Housing, Medical Health, Population Center, Safety, Transportation, and Utilities) two levels of support declined (Cost of Living, Education) when moving activities from Fort Bragg to Eglin AFB. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation may result in operational restrictions to protect cultural or archeological resources at Eglin AFB and Fort Bragg. Tribal consultations may also be required at both locations. Operations are currently restricted by electromagnetic radiation and/or emissions and additional operations/training may result in operational restrictions at Eglin AFB. Further analysis may be necessary to determine the extent of new noise impacts at Eglin and Bragg. Additional waste production at Eglin may necessitate modifications of hazardous waste program. Increased water demand at Fort Bragg may lead to further controls and restrictions and water infrastructure may need upgrades due to incoming population. Additional operations at Eglin may impact wetlands, resulting in operational restrictions. An evaluation of operational restrictions for jurisdictional wetlands will likely have to be conducted at Fort Bragg. Added operations may impact threatened and endangered species at Fort Bragg and result in further operational and training restrictions. This recommendation has no impact on air quality; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; or marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$1.0M for environmental compliance costs. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **Fort Monmouth, NJ**

**Recommendation:** Close Fort Monmouth, NJ. Relocate the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY. Relocate the Joint Network Management System Program Office to Fort Meade, MD. Relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot

Level Repairables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as Inventory Control Point functions, detachment of Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate Information Systems, Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research and Development & Acquisition (RDA) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate the elements of the Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems and consolidate into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA.

Realign Fort Belvoir, VA by relocating and consolidating Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare Research, Development and Acquisition activities to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Research and Development and Acquisition (except for the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Army Research Institute, Fort Knox, KY, by relocating Human Systems Research to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL, by relocating and consolidating Information Systems Development and Acquisition to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Realign the PM Acquisition, Logistics and Technology Enterprise Systems and Services (ALTESS) facility at 2511 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA, a leased installation, by relocating and consolidating into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA.

**Justification:** The closure of Fort Monmouth allows the Army to pursue several transformational and BRAC objectives. These include: Consolidating training to enhance coordination, doctrine development, training effectiveness and improve operational and functional efficiencies, and consolidating RDA and T&E functions on fewer installations. Retain DoD installations with the most flexible capability to accept new missions. Consolidate or co-locate common business functions with other agencies to provide better level of services at a reduced cost.

The recommendation relocates the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY and increases training to enhance coordination, doctrine development, training effectiveness and improve operational and functional efficiencies.

The recommendation establishes a Land C4ISR Lifecycle Management Command (LCMC) to focus technical activity and accelerate transition. This recommendation addresses the transformational objective of Network Centric Warfare. The solution of the significant challenges of realizing the potential of Network Centric Warfare for land combat forces requires integrated research in C4ISR technologies (engineered networks of sensors, communications, information processing), and individual and networked human behavior. The recommendation increases efficiency through consolidation. Research, Development and Acquisition (RDA), Test and Evaluation (T&E) of Army Land C4ISR technologies and systems is currently split

among three major sites – Fort Monmouth, NJ, Fort Dix, NJ, Adelphi, MD and Fort Belvoir, VA and several smaller sites, including Redstone Arsenal and Fort Knox. Consolidation of RDA at fewer sites achieves efficiency and synergy at a lower cost than would be required for multiple sites. This action preserves the Army's "commodity" business model by near collocation of Research, Development, Acquisition, and Logistics functions. Further, combining RDA and T&E requires test ranges – which cannot be created at Fort Monmouth.

The closure of Fort Monmouth and relocation of functions which enhance the Army's military value, is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities. Fort Monmouth is an acquisition and research installation with little capacity to be utilized for other purposes. Military value is enhanced by relocating the research functions to under-utilized and better equipped facilities; by relocating the administrative functions to multi-purpose installations with higher military and administrative value; and by co-locating education activities with the schools they support. Utilizing existing space and facilities at the gaining installations, maintains both support to the Army Force Structure Plan, and capabilities for meeting surge requirements.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$822.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$395.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$143.7M with a payback expected in 6 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$1,025.8M.

This recommendation affects non-DoD Federal agencies. These include, the U.S. Post Office, the Department of Justice and the General Services Administration. In the absence of access to credible cost and savings information for those agencies or knowledge regarding whether those agencies will remain on the installation, the Department assumed that the non-DoD Federal Agencies will be required to assume new base operating responsibilities on the affected installation. The Department further assumed that because of these new base operating responsibilities, the affect of the recommendations on the non-DoD agencies would be an increase in cost. As required by Section 2913 (d) of the BRAC statute, the Department has taken the effect on the cost of these agencies into account when making this recommendation.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 9,737 jobs (5,272 direct and 4,465 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 periods in the Edison, NJ Metropolitan Division, which is 0.8 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 20 jobs (11 direct and 9 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 periods in the Elizabethtown, KY Metropolitan Division, which is 0.03 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1,218 jobs (694 direct and 524 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 periods in the Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD-WV Metropolitan Division, which is 0.04 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 63 jobs (37 direct and 26 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 periods in the Huntsville, AL Metropolitan Division, which is 0.03 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential increase of 9,834 jobs (5,042 direct and 4,792 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 periods in the Baltimore-Towson, MD Metropolitan Division, which is 0.6 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential increase of 422 jobs (264 direct and 158 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 periods in the Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown, NY Metropolitan Division, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential increase of 89 jobs (49 direct and 40 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 periods in the Columbus, OH Metropolitan Division, which is 0.01 percent of economic area employment.

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

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of communities to support forces, missions, and personnel. When moving from Fort Monmouth to Aberdeen, MD, the following local area capabilities improve: Cost of Living and Medical Health. The following attributes decline: Safety and Transportation. When moving from Fort Monmouth to West Point, the following local area capabilities improve: Education and Employment. The following attribute declines: Housing. When moving from Fort Monmouth to Fort Belvoir, the following local area capabilities improve: Employment and Medical Health. The following attributes decline: Education and Safety. When moving from Fort Monmouth to Fort Meade, the following local area capabilities improve: Cost of Living and Medical Health. The following attributes decline: Education and Safety. When moving from Fort Monmouth to Columbus, OH, the following local area capabilities improved: Cost of living, Employment, and Medical Health. The following attribute declines: Safety. When moving from Fort Belvoir to Aberdeen, MD, the following local area capabilities improve: Cost of living and Education. The following attributes decline: Employment, Safety and Transportation. When moving from Fort Knox to Aberdeen, MD, the following local area capabilities improve: Housing, Employment, and Medical Health. The following attributes decline: Cost of Living, Safety, and Transportation. When moving from Redstone Arsenal to Aberdeen, MD, the following local area capabilities improve: Child Care, Housing, and Medical Health. The following attributes decline: Employment, Safety, Population Center, and Transportation. When moving from Arlington, VA, to Aberdeen, MD, the following attributes decline: Population Center, and Transportation.

**Environmental Impact:** Closure of Fort Monmouth will necessitate consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office to ensure that sites are continued to be protected. Fort Monmouth's

previous mission-related activities will result in land use constraints/sensitive resource area impacts. An Air Conformity Analysis and a New Source Review and permitting effort is required at Aberdeen, West Point, and Fort Belvoir. The extent of the cultural resources on Aberdeen, West Point, and Fort Belvoir are uncertain. Potential impacts may occur as result of increased times delays and negotiated restrictions. Additional operations at Aberdeen, West Point, and Fort Belvoir may further impact threatened/endangered species leading to additional restrictions on training or operations. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA water quality standards. Due to the increase in personnel there would be a minimal impact on waste production and water consumption at Defense Supply Center Columbus (DSCC), OH. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$2.95M for environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Fort Monmouth reports \$2.9M in environmental restoration costs. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an installation is closed, realigned, or remains open, these costs were not included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **Fort Hood, TX**

**Recommendation:** Realign Fort Hood, TX, by relocating a Brigade Combat Team (BCT) and Unit of Employment (UEX) Headquarters to Fort Carson, CO.

**Justification:** This recommendation ensures Army BCTs and support units are located at installations capable of training modular formations, both mounted and dismounted, at home station with sufficient land and facilities to test, simulate, or fire all organic weapon systems. This recommendation enhances the military value of the installations and the home station training and readiness of the units at the installations by relocating units to installations that can best support the training and maneuver requirements associated with the Army's transformation.

This recommendation relocates to Fort Carson, CO, a Heavy BCT that will be temporarily stationed at Fort Hood in FY06, and a Unit of Employment Headquarters. The Army is temporarily stationing this BCT to Fort Hood in FY06 due to operational necessity and to support current operational deployments in support of the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). However, based on the BRAC analysis, Fort Hood does not have sufficient facilities and available maneuver training acreage and ranges to support six permanent heavy BCTs and numerous other operational units stationed there. Fort Carson has sufficient capacity to support these units. The Army previously obtained approval from the Secretary of Defense to temporarily station a third BCT at Fort Carson in FY05. Due to Fort Carson's capacity, the BRAC analysis indicates that the Army should permanently station this third BCT at Fort Carson.

This relocation never pays back because it involves the relocation of a newly activated unit. No permanent facilities exist to support the unit.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$435.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$579.5M. Annual recurring costs to the Department after implementation are \$45.3M. This recommendation never pays back. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$980.4M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential increase of 8,167 jobs (4,945 direct and 3,222 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood, TX metropolitan area, which is 4.4 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of community infrastructure attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the community to support forces, missions, and personnel. When moving activities from Fort Hood to Fort Carson, one attribute improved (Population Center) and one (Education) was not as robust. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

**Environmental Impact:** A New Source Review and permitting effort will be required. at Fort Carson. To preserve archeological/cultural resources at Fort Carson, training restrictions may be imposed and increased operational delays and costs are possible. Tribal consultations may be required. Further analysis will be required to determine the extent of new noise impacts at Fort Carson. Added operations may impact threatened and endangered species at Fort Carson and result in further training restrictions. Distribution of potable water is severely restricted at Fort Carson. Increased missions at the installation may result in additional restrictions or mitigation requirements. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA water quality standards. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$1.1M for environmental compliance costs. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **Red River Army Depot, TX**

**Recommendation:** Close Red River Army Depot, TX. Relocate the storage and demilitarization functions of the Munitions Center to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK. Relocate the munitions maintenance functions of the Munitions Center to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK, and Blue Grass Army Depot, KY. Relocate the depot maintenance of Armament and

Structural Components, Combat Vehicles, Depot Fleet/Field Support, Engines and Transmissions, Fabrication and Manufacturing, Fire Control Systems and Components, and Other to Anniston Army Depot, AL. Relocate the depot maintenance of Powertrain Components, and Starters/Generators to Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Relocate the depot maintenance of Construction Equipment to Anniston Army Depot, AL, and Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Vehicles to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA and Letterkenny Depot, PA. Relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA. Disestablish the supply, storage, and distribution functions for tires, packaged Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants, and compressed gases. Relocate the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot to the Defense Distribution Depot, Oklahoma City, OK.

**Justification:** This recommendation supports the strategy of minimizing the number of industrial base sites performing depot maintenance for ground and missile systems. The receiving depots have greater maintenance capability, higher facility utilization and greater opportunities for inter-service workloading. This recommendation reinforces Anniston's and Letterkenny's roles as Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence for Combat Vehicles (Anniston) and Missile Systems (Letterkenny).

This recommendation decreases the cost of depot maintenance operations by consolidation and elimination of 30 percent of duplicate overhead structures required to operate multiple depot maintenance activities. This recommendation also increases opportunities for inter-service workloading by transferring maintenance workload to the Marine Corps.

This recommendation relocates storage, demilitarization, and munitions maintenance functions to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, and thereby reduces redundancy and removes excess from Red River Munitions Center.

This recommendation allows DoD to create centers of excellence, generate efficiencies, and create deployment networks servicing all Services.

This recommendation relocates the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories to the Defense Distribution Depot Oklahoma City at Tinker Air Force Base. It also contributes to the elimination of unnecessary redundancies and duplication, and streamlines supply and storage processes.

The disestablishment of the wholesale supply, storage, and distribution functions for all packaged POL, tires, and compressed gas products supports transformation by privatizing these functions. Privatization of packaged POL, tires, and compressed gas products will eliminate inventories, infrastructure and personnel associated with these functions and products.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$456.2M. The net present value of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$216.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$76.5M with a payback expected in 4 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$539.0M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 4,176 jobs (2,500 direct and 1,676 indirect) over the 2006 -2011 period in the Texarkana, TX - Texarkana, AR Metropolitan Statistical area, which is 6.2 percent of the economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of community attributes indicates no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces and personnel. When moving from Red River Army Depot to Tobyhanna, 5 attributes improve (child care, medical health, safety, population center, and transportation) and 1 declines (employment). When moving from Red River to Letterkenny Army Depot, 2 attributes decline (child care and housing) and one improves (safety). When moving from Red River to Anniston Army Depot, 3 attributes improve (child care, cost of living and population center) and 1 declines (housing). When moving from Red River to Tinker, seven attributes improve (population, child care, education, employment, housing, medical and transportation) and one attribute declines (crime). There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

**Environmental Impact:** Closure of Red River Army Depot may require consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office to ensure that cultural sites are continued to be protected. Closure of operational ranges at Red River will necessitate clearance of munitions and remediation of any munitions constituents. The remediation costs for these ranges may be significant and the time required for completing remediation is uncertain. Contaminated areas at Red River will require restoration and/or monitoring. An Air Conformity Analysis is required at Anniston, Tobyhanna, and Letterkenny. Anniston is located over a sole-source aquifer, which may require additional mitigation measures/pollution prevention to protect the aquifer from increased depot maintenance activities. The industrial wastewater treatment plant at Anniston may require upgrades. Additional operations at Tinker may impact wetlands, which may lead to operational restrictions. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; or threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$4.8M for environmental compliance costs. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Red River reports \$49.1M in environmental restoration costs. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an installation is closed, realigned, or remains open, these costs were not included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## Fort Monroe, VA

**Recommendation:** Close Fort Monroe, VA. Relocate the US Army Training & Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Headquarters, the Installation Management Agency (IMA) Northeast Region Headquarters, the US Army Network Enterprise Technology Command (NETCOM) Northeast Region Headquarters and the Army Contracting Agency Northern Region Office to Fort Eustis, VA. Relocate the US Army Accessions Command and US Army Cadet Command to Fort Knox, KY.

**Justification:** This recommendation closes Fort Monroe, an administrative installation, and moves the tenant Headquarters organizations to Fort Eustis and Fort Knox. It enhances the Army's military value, is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities to address future unforeseen requirements. The closure allows the Army to move administrative headquarters to multi-purpose installations that provide the Army more flexibility to accept new missions. Both Fort Eustis and Fort Knox have operational and training capabilities that Fort Monroe lacks and both have excess capacity that can be used to accept the organizations relocating from Fort Monroe.

The recommended relocations also retain or enhance vital linkages between them relocating organizations and other headquarters activities. TRADOC HQs is moved to Fort Eustis in order to remain within commuting distance of the Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) HQs in Norfolk, VA. JFCOM oversees all joint training across the military. IMA and NETCOM HQs are moved to Fort Eustis because of recommendations to consolidate the Northeastern and Southeastern regions of these two commands into one Eastern Region at Fort Eustis. The ACA Northern Region is relocated to Fort Eustis because its two largest customers are TRADOC and IMA. The Accessions and Cadet Commands are relocated to Fort Knox because of recommendations to locate the Army's Human Resources Command at Fort Knox. The HRC recommendation includes the collocation of the Accessions and Cadet Commands with the Recruiting Command, already at Fort Knox and creates a Center of Excellence for military personnel and recruiting functions by improving personnel life-cycle management.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$72.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a saving of \$146.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$56.9M with a payback expected in 1 year. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$686.6M.

This recommendation affects the U.S. Post Office, a non-DoD Federal agency. In the absence of access to credible cost and savings information for that agency or knowledge regarding whether that agency will remain on the installation, the Department assumed that the non-DoD Federal agency will be required to assume new base operating responsibilities on the affected installation. The Department further assumed that because of these new base operating responsibilities, the effect of the recommendation on the non-DoD agency would be an increase in its costs. As required by Section 2913(d) of the BRAC statute, the Department has taken the effect on the costs of this agency into account when making this recommendation.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 2,275 jobs (1,013 direct and 1,262 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Virginia Beach-Norfolk-Newport News, VA-NC metropolitan statistical area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. When moving from Fort Monroe to Fort Eustis, the following local area capabilities improved: Child Care, Population and Transportation. When moving from Fort Monroe to Fort Knox, the following local area capabilities improved: Child Care, Cost of Living, Education and Safety. The following capabilities are not as robust: Employment and Medical. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

**Environmental Impact:** Closure of Fort Monroe will necessitate consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office to ensure that historic properties are continued to be protected. Increased operational delays and costs are likely at Fort Knox in order to preserve cultural resources and tribal consultations may be necessary. An Air Conformity determination and New Source Review and permitting effort will be required at Fort Eustis. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required at Fort Eustis to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA water quality standards. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$2.0M for environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Although no restoration costs were reported, Fort Monroe has a probable Military Munitions Response Program site that may require some combination of UXO sweeps, clearance, munition constituent cleanup, remediation, and land use controls. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an installation is closed, realigned, or remains open no cost for environmental remediate was included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **Maneuver Training**

**Recommendation:** Realign Fort Knox, KY, by relocating the Armor Center and School to Fort Benning, GA, to accommodate the activation of an Infantry Brigade Combat Team (BCT) at Fort Knox, KY, and the relocation of engineer, military police, and combat service support units from Europe and Korea. Realign Fort McCoy, WI, by relocating the 84th Army Reserve Regional Training Center to Fort Knox, KY.

**Justification:** This recommendation enhances military value, improves training and deployment capabilities, better utilizes training resources, and creates significant efficiencies and cost savings

while maintaining sufficient surge capability to address future unforeseen requirements. It properly locates Operational Army units in support of the Army's force structure plans and modular force transformation.

This recommendation supports the consolidation of the Armor and Infantry Centers and Schools at Fort Benning and creates a Maneuver Center of Excellence for ground forces training and doctrine development. It consolidates both Infantry and Armor One Station Unit Training (OSUT), which allows the Army to reduce the total number of Basic Combat Training locations from five to four.

This recommendation also relocates the 84th ARRTC to Fort Knox and supports another recommendation which relocates Army Reserve Command and Control units to Fort McCoy. These relocations enhance command and control within the Army Reserve, and promote interaction between the Active and Reserve Components.

This recommendation directly supports the Army's operational unit stationing and training requirements by using available facilities, ranges, training land at Fort Knox, KY (vacated by the Armor Center and School) to effectively and efficiently relocate various Combat Support and Combat Service Support units returning from overseas, and as the installation platform for the activation of a new Infantry BCT. These units are a combination of the relocation of Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS) – related units returning from overseas and the activation of units as part of the Army's modular force transformation.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$773.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$244.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$123.3M with a payback expected in 5 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$948.1M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** This recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 8,521 jobs (6,100 direct and 2,421 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Elizabethtown, KY Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 12.9 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 834 jobs (497 direct and 337 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Monroe County, WI area, which is 3.5 percent of economic area employment.

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

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of community infrastructure attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. When moving activities from Fort McCoy to Fort Knox, five improved (Child Care, Cost of Living, Education, Population Center and Transportation) and one (Employment) was not as robust. When moving from Fort Knox to Fort Benning, the

following local area capabilities improved: Employment, Population Center, and Transportation; and the following local area capabilities are not as robust: Cost of Living, Education, and Safety. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

**Environmental Impact:** Tribal consultations may be necessary at Fort Knox and Fort Benning. An Air Conformity Analysis and New Source Review will be required at Fort Benning. Noise analysis and monitoring is required at Fort Knox and Fort Benning to determine the extent of new noise impacts.. Additional operations may impact TES at Fort Benning, leading to additional restrictions on operations. Fort Knox range is located over the recharge zone of a sole-source aquifer, which may result in future regulatory limitations on training activities. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA water quality standards at Fort Benning. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; waste management; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$1.3M for environmental compliance costs. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **Operational Army (IGPBS)**

**Recommendation:** Realign Fort Bliss, TX by relocating air defense artillery units to Fort Sill and relocating 1st Armored Division and various echelon above division units from Germany and Korea to Fort Bliss, TX. Realign Fort Sill by relocating an artillery (Fires) brigade to Fort Bliss. Realign Fort Hood, TX by relocating maneuver battalions, a support battalion, and aviation units to Fort Bliss, TX. Realign Fort Riley, KS by inactivating various units, activating a Brigade Combat Team (BCT) and relocating 1st Infantry Division units and various echelons above division units from Germany and Korea to Fort Riley, KS. Realign Fort Campbell, KY, by relocating an attack aviation battalion to Fort Riley, KS.

**Justification:** This proposal ensures the Army has sufficient infrastructure, training land and ranges to meet the requirements to transform the Operational Army as identified in the Twenty Year Force Structure Plan. It also ensures the Army maintains adequate surge capacity. As part of the modular force transformation, the Army is activating 10 new combat arms brigades for a total of 43 active component brigade combat teams (BCTs). Including the results of the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS), the number of BCTs stationed in the United States will rise from twenty-six to forty. Relocating the units listed in this recommendation to Fort Bliss, Fort Riley, and Fort Sill takes advantage of available infrastructure and training land. Fort Bliss and Fort Riley are installations capable of training modular formations, both mounted and dismounted, at home station with sufficient land and facilities to test, simulate, or fire all organic weapon systems. This recommendation enhances home station training and readiness of the units at all installations.

Relocating 1st Armored Division units and echelons above division (EAD) units to Fort Bliss will transform it from an institutional training installation into a major mounted maneuver training installation. This avoids overcrowding and overuse at other installations by stationing them at one of the installations with the greatest capacity. It also creates a potential opportunity for enhanced Operational Testing due to the close proximity of Fort Bliss to White Sands Missile Range.

Relocating an Air Defense Artillery (ADA) unit to Fort Sill supports the establishment of the Net Fires Center, combining the Artillery and ADA schools at Fort Sill and provides a force stabilization opportunity for soldiers in this unit. Relocating the Artillery (Fires) Brigade to Fort Bliss collocates the artillery with the maneuver units at Fort Bliss and vacates space at Fort Sill for the ADA unit.

Realigning Fort Riley by inactivating an Engineer Brigade Headquarters, two other engineer units, two maneuver battalions and other smaller units beginning in FY 06 directly supports the Army's modular force transformation. It also facilitates activating a BCT in FY 06, and relocating 1st Infantry Division Headquarters, the Division Support Command Headquarters, Aviation Brigade units and other units returning from overseas to Fort Riley. The relocation of an attack aviation battalion from Fort Campbell to Fort Riley supports the formation of a multi-functional aviation brigade at Fort Riley.

The Army obtained approval to temporarily station a BCT at Fort Hood in 2005 and another BCT at Fort Bliss in 2006. This recommendation validates the stationing of that BCT at Fort Bliss and relocates two maneuver battalions, an armored reconnaissance squadron and a support battalion from Fort Hood to support the activation at Fort Bliss. Relocating these battalions will provide the assets necessary to accomplish the activation. Relocating aviation units from Fort Hood supports the activation of a multi-functional aviation brigade.

While this recommendation does not in BRAC terms save money, the costs are mitigated by the non-BRAC savings that will accrue to the Department from the closure or realignment of the overseas locations from which these units come. Those non-BRAC savings amount to \$4,400M during the 6 year period, and approximately \$20,000M of 20 year net present value savings.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$3,946M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$5,229M. Annual recurring costs to the Department after implementation are \$294.7M, with no payback expected. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$7,826.7M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 748 jobs (434 direct and 314 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Clarksville, TN-KY Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.6 percent of economic region of influence employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 8,522 jobs (5,136 direct and 3,386 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Killeen-Temple-Fort Hood Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 4.5 percent of economic region of influence employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of community infrastructure attributes revealed some issues regarding the ability of the communities to support forces, missions, and personnel. The City of El Paso, TX (Fort Bliss) and the City of Manhattan, KS (Fort Riley) must cooperate fully and quickly to assess requirements and implement them, especially in the areas of housing and schools. When moving activities from Fort Hood to Fort Bliss, four attributes improved (Housing, Medical Health, Safety, and Population Center) and one (Employment) is not as robust. When moving activities from Fort Campbell to Fort Riley, three attributes improved (Housing, Employment, and Safety) and two (Child Care and Population Center) are not as robust. When moving activities from Fort Bliss to Fort Sill, two attributes improved (Cost of Living, and Employment) and six (Housing, Education, Medical Health, Safety Population Center and Utilities) are not as robust. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

**Environmental Impact:** An Air Conformity determination and New Source Review and permitting effort will be required at Fort Bliss. To preserve cultural and archeological resources, training restrictions may be imposed and increased operational delays and costs are possible at Fort Bliss and tribal consultations may be required. Tribal negotiations may be required at Fort Riley to expand use near listed areas. Added operations at Riley and Sill may impact threatened and endangered species and result in further restrictions. Development of a Programmatic Agreement, tribal consultations, and evaluations to determine significance of cultural and historical resources will be required at Fort Sill. Further analysis will be required to determine the extent of new noise impacts at Bliss, Riley, and Sill. This recommendation results in significant additional water demands for the Fort Bliss region and therefore the installation will likely have to purchase or develop new potable water sources if groundwater sources are not sufficient. Further analysis will be required to assess long-term regional water impacts. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required at Fort Sill to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve USEPA Water Quality Standards. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; waste management; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$2.6M for environmental compliance costs. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## RC Transformation in Alabama

**Recommendation:** Realign Birmingham Armed Forces Reserve Center, Birmingham, Alabama, by relocating Detachment 1, 450th Military Police Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on or near Birmingham Air National Guard Base, Birmingham, Alabama, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Alabama National Guard units from the following Alabama ARNG Readiness Centers: Fort Graham, Fort Hanna and Fort Terhune, Birmingham, Alabama, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Wright United States Army Reserve Center, Mobile, Alabama and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Mobile, Alabama, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Alabama National Guard units from the following Alabama ARNG Readiness Centers: Fort Ganey, and Fort Hardeman, Mobile, Alabama, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Faith Wing United States Army Reserve Center on Fort McClellan, Alabama and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Pelham Range in Anniston, Alabama.

Close the Finnell United States Army Reserve Center and the Area Maintenance Support Activity, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, and the Vicksburg United States Army Reserve Center, Vicksburg, Mississippi, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Area Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA) in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and AMSA shall have the capability to accommodate the 31st Chemical Brigade from the Northport Alabama Army National Guard Readiness Center, and units from the Fort Powell-Shamblin Alabama Army National Guard Readiness Center, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Screws Army Reserve Center in Montgomery, Alabama; close the Cleveland Abbot Army Reserve Center, Tuskegee, Alabama; close the Harry Gary, Jr. Army Reserve Center, in Enterprise, Alabama; close the Quarles-Flowers Army Reserve Center in Decatur, Alabama; close the Grady Anderson Army Reserve Center, Troy, Alabama; and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) at the Alabama Army National Guard Joint Forces Headquarters Complex in Montgomery, AL, if the Army is able to acquire suitable property for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate ARNG units currently located on the Alabama Army National Guard Joint Forces Headquarters Complex in Montgomery, Alabama, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Alabama. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes nine Army Reserve Centers and one Area Maintenance Support Activity throughout the state of Alabama and constructs five multi component/service, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers, and one Area Maintenance Support Facility capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing fifteen geographically separated facilities into five modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. The Department understands that the State of Alabama will close ALARNG Readiness Centers: Fort Graham, Fort Hanna, Fort Terhune, Fort Ganey, Fort Hardeman and Fort Powell-Shamblin and realign the Northport Alabama Army National Guard Readiness Center by relocating the 31<sup>st</sup> Chemical Brigade to the new AFRC. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$72.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$109.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$31.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$17.8M with a payback expected in 6 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$140.3M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 40 jobs (28 direct and 12 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Birmingham-Hoover Alabama metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 44 jobs (28 direct and 16 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Vicksburg, MS Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 32 jobs (22 direct and 10 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Mobile, Alabama Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 171 jobs (103 direct and 68 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Montgomery, Alabama Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 19 jobs (10 direct and 9 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Enterprise-Ozark, Alabama Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 23 jobs (15 direct and 8 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Troy, Alabama Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.2 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 5 jobs (3 direct and 2 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Tuskegee, Alabama Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** Wetlands Survey may need to be conducted at Birmingham IAP to determine impact. This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals,

resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.4M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Arizona**

**Recommendation:** Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Allen Hall near Tucson Arizona and the Area Maintenance Support Activity 18 on Fort Huachuca, Arizona by relocating all units from the closed facilities to an Armed Forces Reserve Center and maintenance facility on the Arizona Army National Guard Silverbell Army Heliport/Pinal Air Park in Marana, Arizona, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Arizona National Guard 860th MP Company and the 98th Troop Command from Papago Park Readiness Center, if the State of Arizona decides to relocate those units.

Close the Deer Valley United States Army Reserve Center (#2) in Phoenix and re-locate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the Arizona Army National Guard Buckeye Training Site. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Army National Guard Phoenix Readiness Center, if the State of Arizona decides to relocate those units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Arizona. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two Army Reserve centers, closes an Army Maintenance Support Activity and constructs two multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), in the State of Arizona, capable of accommodating National Guard and Army Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing units from six geographically separated facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. Relocating units to Buckeye will allow them to utilize a large local training area while maintaining a reasonably close commuting distance from Phoenix. The Department understands that the State of Arizona will close the

Army National Guard Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop Phoenix, Arizona, and realign the Papago Park Army National Guard Readiness Center by relocating the 860<sup>th</sup> Military Police Company and the 98<sup>th</sup> Troop Command. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs. This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$1.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$31.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$5.3M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$5.9M with a payback expected in 5 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$51.7M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 113 jobs (60 direct and 53 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Tucson, AZ Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands.

This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.06M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## RC Transformation in Arkansas

**Recommendation:** Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Arkadelphia, Arkansas and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Arkadelphia, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Arkadelphia if the State of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Camden, Arkansas and relocate units into an Armed Forces Reserve Center by converting the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Camden if the state decides to alter their facility.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, El Dorado, Arkansas and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in El Dorado, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, El Dorado if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Realign the Army Reserve Center, Darby, Arkansas, by relocating the 341st Engineer Company and elements of the 75th Division (Exercise) from buildings #2552-2560, 2516, and 2519, Fort Chaffee, AR into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center, on Fort Chaffee, AR. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the following Arkansas National Guard Readiness Centers: the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Charleston, AR, the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Van Buren, AR, and the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Fort Smith, AR, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site (ECS), Barling, Arkansas and relocate units to a new Joint Maintenance Facility on Fort Chaffee, Arkansas. The new Joint Maintenance Facility shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Combined Support Maintenance Shop (CSMS) on Fort Chaffee if the State of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Hot Springs, Arkansas and the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Activity (OMS), 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. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas Army National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center in Hot Springs, AR if the State of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Jonesboro, Arkansas and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Field Maintenance Site in Jonesboro, AR if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Jonesboro, AR, the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center,

Paragould, AR and the Field Maintenance Site (FMS), Jonesboro, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units. Close the Pond United States Army Reserve Center, Fayetteville, Arkansas and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Northwest Arkansas, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Centers in Fayetteville, Springdale, Rogers and Bentonville, Arkansas if the State of Arkansas decides to relocate those units.

Close the Stone United States Army Reserve Center, Pine Bluff, Arkansas and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Arkansas National Guard units from the Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Center, Pine Bluff if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Arkansas. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes seven Army Reserve centers, one Equipment Concentration Site and one Organizational Maintenance Site and constructs eight multi-component, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs) and one multi-component, maintenance facility throughout the State of Arkansas, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing twenty-six geographically separated facilities into nine modern, multi-component facilities. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Arkansas will close fifteen Arkansas Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Charleston, Van Buren, Fort Smith, Jonesboro, Paragould, El Dorado, Pine Bluff, Arkadelphia, Fayetteville, Springdale, Rogers, Bentonville, and Hot Springs, the Fort Chaffee Combined Support Maintenance Shop and the Jonesboro Field Maintenance Shop. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs. This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$63.3M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$118.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$97.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$5.8M with a payback expected in 31 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$38.2M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 48 jobs (34 direct and 14 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Pine Bluff Arkansas metropolitan statistical area, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 37 jobs (24 direct and 13 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the El Dorado/Union County micropolitan statistical area, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

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

## RC Transformation in California

**Recommendation:** Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Moffett Field, California, the George Richey United States Army Reserve Center, San Jose, California, and the Jones Hall United States Army Reserve Center, Mountain View, California and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Shop on existing Army Reserve property on Moffett Field, California. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate California National Guard Units from the following California ARNG Readiness Centers: Sunnyvale, California, San Lorenzo, California, Redwood City, California, and the Organizational Maintenance Shop, San Jose, California, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Desiderio United States Army Reserve Center, Pasadena, California, the Schroeder Hall United States Army Reserve Center, Long Beach, California, the Hazard Park United States Army Reserve Center, Los Angeles, California, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on property being transferred to the Army Reserve from the General Services Administration at Bell, California. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate California National Guard Units from the following California ARNG Readiness Centers: Bell, California, and Montebello, California, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of California. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes six Army Reserve centers, two Naval Reserve Centers, and one Marine Corps Reserve Center, throughout the State of California, and constructs two multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing fifteen geographically separated facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of California will close five California Army Guard Armories: Sunnyvale, San Lorenzo, Redwood City, Bell, and Montebello, California, and the Organizational Maintenance Shop, San Jose, California. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new AFRCs will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$6.3M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$78.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$41.3M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$8.9M with a payback expected in 10 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$46.0M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 4 jobs (3 direct and 1 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 106 jobs (72 direct and 34 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.3M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. Installation has no jurisdictional wetlands. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Connecticut**

**Recommendation:** Close Turner US Army Reserve Center, Fairfield, CT, close Sutcovey US Army Reserve Center, Waterbury, CT; close Danbury US Army Reserve Center Danbury, CT, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Maintenance Facility in Newtown, CT, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities adjacent to the existing CT Army National Guard Armory in Newtown, CT. The new AFRC and OMS shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Connecticut Army National Guard Armories in Naugatuck, Norwalk and New Haven, CT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the US Army Reserve Center, Middletown, CT, the Organizational Maintenance Shop, Middletown, CT; the SGT Libby US Army Reserve Center, New Haven, CT; the Organizational Maintenance Shop, New Haven, CT; the Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity #69, Milford, CT and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center, Organizational Maintenance Shop and Army Maintenance Support Activity in Middletown, Connecticut, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC, OMS and AMSA shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Connecticut Army National Guard Armories in Putnam, Manchester, New Britain and the CTARNG facility in Newington, CT if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Connecticut. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes five US Army Reserve Centers, one Army Maintenance Support Activity and two Organizational Maintenance Shops throughout the state of Connecticut and constructs two Armed Forces Reserve Centers and collocated Organizational Maintenance Shops and one Army Maintenance Support Activity capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. The Department understands that the State of Connecticut will close seven Connecticut Army National Guard Centers: Naugatuck, Norwalk, New Haven, Putnam, Manchester, New Berlin and Newington, Connecticut. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$52.1M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$128.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$107.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$5.8M with a payback expected in 36 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$47.5M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 26 jobs (18 direct and 8 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 33 jobs (21 direct and 12 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the New Haven-Milford, CT metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.2M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Delaware**

**Recommendation:** Close the Major Robert Kirkwood United States Army Reserve Center and its organizational maintenance shop in Newark, DE and re-locate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and organizational maintenance support facility in Newark, DE, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Delaware Army National Guard units from the William Nelson Armory in Middletown, DE, if the state decided to relocate those units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Delaware. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes an Army Reserve Center in Newark, DE and relocates units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and organizational maintenance support facility capable of accommodating Delaware Army National Guard units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing two facilities into one. The Department understands that the State of Delaware will close the William Nelson

Armory in Middletown, DE. The Armed Forces Reserve Center will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from the closed facilities into the new AFRC.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimized the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers, and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$10.9M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$13.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$9.8M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$0.9M with a payback expected in 19 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$0.9M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 13 jobs (9 direct and 4 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Wilmington, DE-MD-NJ metropolitan division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require

spending approximately \$0.03M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## **RC Transformation in Georgia**

**Recommendation:** Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Columbus, GA and relocate and consolidate those units together with Army Reserve Units currently on Fort Benning into a new United States Army Reserve Center on Fort Benning, GA.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Georgia. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one United States Army Reserve Center in Columbus, GA and relocates units together with United States Army Reserve units currently on Fort Benning into a new United States Army Reserve Center on Fort Benning, GA. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by reducing the number of separate DoD installations and by relocating a U.S. Army Reserve Center to an existing base. This recommendation supports the recommendation to close Fort Gillem by providing a relocation site for the vehicles and equipment stored at the Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site (ECS).

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers, and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$52.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and

communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$21.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$3.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$5.0M with a payback expected in 5 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$44.8M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 103 jobs (65 direct and 38 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Columbus, GA-AL metropolitan statistical area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation may impact air quality and water quality at Fort Benning. Due to the increase in personnel and new construction, an Air Conformity Analysis will be required. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA water quality standards. This recommendation has no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.008M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. Installation has no jurisdictional wetlands. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## **RC Transformation in Hawaii**

**Recommendation:** Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Hilo (SFC Minoru Kunieda), HI and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Keaukaha Military Reservation if the Army can acquire suitable land for the construction of the new facilities. The New AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Hawaii National Guard units from the following Hawaii ARNG Armories: Keauu and Honokaa if the state decides to relocate those units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Hawaii. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Army Reserve Center in Hilo, HI and constructs a multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on Keaukaha Military Reservation, Hawaii. The Department understands that the State of Hawaii will close two Hawaii Army National Guard Armories: Keaau and Honokaa, HI. The Armed Forces Reserve Center will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from the closed facilities into the new AFRC.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$17.4M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$56.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$26.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department to the Department after implementation are \$9.1M with a payback expected in 7 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$62.4M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 181 jobs (118 direct and 63 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Hilo County metropolitan area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** Keuakaha Military Reservation has potential contamination from underground storage tanks, and hazardous waste and pesticide storage areas. The installation reported potential for lead-based paint contaminated soil. There is the potential for encountering storm water permitting issues. These conditions may impose restrictions or delays that impact proposed construction. This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.1M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Illinois**

**Recommendation:** Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Marion, IL, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Carbondale, IL, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Illinois National Guard Units from the following Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Cairo, IL and Carbondale, IL, if the State of Illinois decides to relocate those units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Centralia, IL and the United States Army Reserve Center in Fairfield, IL, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Mt. Vernon, IL. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Illinois National Guard Units from the following Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Mt. Vernon (17B75), IL, Mt. Vernon (17B73), IL, and Salem (17C65), IL, if the State of Illinois decides to relocate those units.

Close the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Waukegan, IL and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Lake County, IL, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Illinois National Guard Units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center in Waukegan, IL, if the State of Illinois decides to relocate those units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Illinois. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create

significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four United States Army Reserve Centers and constructs three multi-component, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of Illinois, capable of accommodating National Guard, Army Reserve, Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing ten geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Illinois will close six Illinois Army Guard Armories: Cairo, IL, Carbondale, IL, Mount Vernon, IL, Mount Vernon, IL, Salem, IL, and Waukegan, IL. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs. The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new AFRCs will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$29.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$42.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$28.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$3.5M with a payback expected in 14 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$6.5M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 49 jobs (32 direct and 17 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Carbondale, IL micropolitan area, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.05M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## **RC Transformation in Indiana**

**Recommendation:** Close Lafayette United States Army Reserve Center in Lafayette, IN and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on the site of the existing Indiana Army Guard Armory (18B75) Lafayette, IN, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Indiana National Guard units from the following Indiana ARNG Readiness Centers: Boswell, IN, Attica, IN, Delphi, IN, Remington, IN, Monticello, IN, and Darlington, IN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Realign Charles H. Seston United States Army Reserve Center by relocating the 402<sup>nd</sup> Engineer Company and Detachment 1 of the 417th Petroleum Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Greenwood and Franklin, IN, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the Indiana National Guard units from the Camp Atterbury Army National Guard Readiness Center (building #500), and the 219<sup>th</sup> Area Support Group Readiness Center (Building #4), Camp Atterbury, IN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Indiana. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Army Reserve Center in the state of Indiana and constructs two multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. The Department understands that the State of Indiana will close the following INARNG Readiness Centers: Boswell, IN, Attica, IN, Delphi, IN, Remington, IN, Monticello, IN, Darlington, IN, and Camp Atterbury, IN. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$34.7M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$47.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$33.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$2.7M with a payback expected in 22 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$6.1M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 32 jobs (21 direct and 11 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Lafayette, IN Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 16 jobs (12 direct and 4 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Indianapolis, IN Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.02M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Iowa**

**Recommendation:** Close the Recruiting Battalion Headquarters and Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) leased facilities in Des Moines and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and MEPS at Camp Dodge, IA. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center located at Camp Dodge, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center and the Area Maintenance Support Activity in Middletown, IA and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) with an Organizational Maintenance and Vehicle Storage Facility on Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, IA. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Burlington Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Burlington, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Muscatine, IA and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) in Muscatine, IA, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Muscatine Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Muscatine, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Cedar Rapids, IA and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) with an Organizational Maintenance Facility (OMF) in Cedar Rapids, IA, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Cedar Rapids Army

National Guard Readiness Center and its Organizational Maintenance Facility located in Cedar Rapids, IA, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Iowa. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes three Army Reserve Centers, one Area Maintenance Support Activity, one Recruiting Battalion, and one Military Entrance Processing Station, throughout the State of Iowa and constructs three multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers, two Organizational Maintenance Facilities, and one MEPS, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing eight geographically separated facilities into four modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. The Department understands that the State of Iowa will close IAARNG Readiness Centers: Camp Dodge, IA, Burlington, IA, Muscatine, IA, and Cedar Rapids, IA. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$20.5M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$68.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a saving of \$16.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$19.4M with a payback expected in 3 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$201.7M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 303 jobs (218 direct and 85 indirect jobs) over

the 2006 – 2011 period in the Des Moines Iowa Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.06M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Kentucky**

**Recommendation:** Close the Richmond US Army Reserve Center, Maysville US Army Reserve Center and relocate and consolidate those units with Army Reserve units currently on Bluegrass Army Depot into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Field Maintenance Facility (FMS) on Blue Grass Army Depot, KY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Kentucky National Guard units located on Bluegrass Army Depot, KY, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Paducah Memorial United States Army Reserve Center and the Paducah #2 United States Army Reserve Center and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Field Maintenance Shop (FMS) adjacent to the Paducah Airport, Paducah, KY, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and FMS shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Paducah Army National Guard Readiness Center and the Kentucky Army National Guard Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS) #2, Paducah, KY, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Kentucky. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the

Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four Army Reserve Centers throughout the state of Kentucky and constructs two multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers, and two Field Maintenance Shops capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing seven geographically separated facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. The Department understands that the State of Kentucky will close the Blue Grass Station and the Paducah Army National Guard Readiness Centers and the Kentucky Army National Guard Organizational Maintenance Shop, Paducah, KY. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$5.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$25.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$6.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$4.2M with a payback expected in 6 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$34.1M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 284 jobs (18 direct and 106 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Maysville, KY Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 48 jobs (31 direct and 17 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Paducah, KY-IL metropolitan statistical area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** Due to presence of cultural resources and a very limited portion of the installation having been surveyed, surveys may have to occur at Blue Grass. Blue Grass Army Depot has a limited ability to accept new missions due to threatened and endangered species. This recommendation has no impact on air quality, dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.04M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. Installation has no jurisdictional wetlands. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Louisiana**

**Recommendation:** Close the Roberts United States Army Reserve Center Baton Rouge, LA and the Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Baton Rouge, LA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Field Maintenance Shop on suitable state property adjacent to the Baton Rouge Airport (State Property). The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Louisiana National Guard Units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Baton Rouge, LA and the Army National Guard Organizational Maintenance Shop #8 located in Baton Rouge, LA if the State of Louisiana decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close United States Army Reserve Center, Shreveport, LA, and the United States Army Reserve Center, Bossier City, LA and relocate all Reserve Component units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center that will be constructed on or adjacent to the Naval-Marine Corps Reserve Center, Shreveport in Bossier City, LA if the Army is able to acquire suitable property for construction of the facilities.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Louisiana. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes three Army Reserve centers, one Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center and constructs two multi component or joint, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of Louisiana, capable of accommodating National Guard, Army Reserve, Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve units.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing six separate facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Louisiana will close the Louisiana Army National Guard Readiness Center in Baton Rouge and Organizational Maintenance Shop # 8 in Baton Rouge. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new AFRCs will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$20.0M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$30.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a saving of \$17.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$13.6M with a payback expected in 2 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$147.6M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 235 jobs (158 direct and 77 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Baton Rouge, LA Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.05M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Maryland (AFRC Frederick, MD)**

**Recommendation:** Close the Flair Memorial Armed Forces Reserve Center and its organizational maintenance shop in Frederick, MD and re-locate US Army Reserve and US Marine Corps Reserve units to new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center and organizational maintenance support facility on Fort Detrick, MD.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Maryland. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Army Reserve Center and one Organizational Maintenance Shop in Frederick, MD and constructs a multi service, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop on Fort Detrick, MD. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by reducing the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$10.0M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$6.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a savings of \$1.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$1.7M with a payback expected in 3 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$17.8M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 38 jobs (22 direct and 16 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Bethesda-Frederick-Gaithersburg, MD metropolitan division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** An Air Conformity determination and a New Source Review and permitting effort will be required at Fort Detrick. This recommendation has no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.2M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. Installation has no jurisdictional wetlands. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has

been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Massachusetts**

**Recommendation:** Close the Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site 65 Annex, Ayer, MA and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Ayer, MA; realign the Devens Reserve Forces Training Area, MA, by relocating the 323d Maintenance Facility, and the Regional Training Site Maintenance to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex in Ayer, MA; realign Ayer Area 3713 by relocating storage functions to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex in Ayer, MA. Realign the Marine Corps Reserve Center Ayer, MA, by relocating the 1/25th Marines Maintenance Facility, Marine Corps Reserve Electronic Maintenance Section, and Maintenance Company/4th Marine Battalion to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex in Ayer, MA. The new Armed Forces Reserve Center complex shall have the capability to accommodate all Reserve units affected by this recommendation including Army National Guard units from the Ayer Armory and Consolidated Support Maintenance Shop, Ayer, MA, if the state decides to relocate the National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Massachusetts. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Equipment Concentration Site Annex, realigns a Reserve Forces Training Area and a US Marine Corps Reserve Center, and constructs a multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Center in Ayer, Massachusetts. The Department understands that the State of Massachusetts will close: one Massachusetts Army National Guard Armory and one Consolidated Support Maintenance Site, Ayer, Massachusetts. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from the closed facilities to the new AFRC complex.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$28.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$85.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$ 79.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$1.7M with a payback expected in 100+ years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$60.4M.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.005M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Michigan**

**Recommendation:** Close the US Army Reserve Center Stanford C. Parisian in Lansing, MI, close the Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity #135 in Battle Creek, MI, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Custer Reserve Training Center, MI.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Michigan. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create

significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Army Reserve Center in Lansing, MI and one Area Maintenance Support Activity in Battle Creek, MI and constructs a multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) capable of accommodating Reserve units. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to a new AFRC.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$9.0M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$7.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a savings of \$1.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$2.1M with a payback expected in 3 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department after implementation are a savings of \$21.6M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 37 jobs (25 direct and 12 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Lansing – East Lansing MI metropolitan statistical area, which is 0.01 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.03M for waste management and/or environmental compliance

activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Minnesota**

**Recommendation:** Close US Army Reserve Center Faribault, MN and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center at Faribault Industrial Park if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Faribault Minnesota Army National Guard Armory, if the state decides to relocate those units.

Close US Army Reserve Center Cambridge, MN and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Cambridge, MN if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Minnesota ARNG units from the Cambridge Minnesota Army National Guard Armory, if the state decides to relocate those units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Minnesota. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two US Army Reserve Centers throughout the State of Minnesota and constructs two Armed Forces Reserve Centers capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. The Department understands that the State of Minnesota will close two Minnesota Army National Guard Armories: Faribault and Cambridge, MN. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing four geographically separated facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business practices.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$3.0M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$17.3M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$17.8M. Annual recurring costs to the Department after implementation are \$0.006M. This recommendation never pays back. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$17.1M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** This recommendation will not result in any job reductions (direct or indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Faribault County, MN or Minneapolis-St Paul-Bloomington, MN-WI area. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.04M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Missouri**

**Recommendation:** Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Greentop, MO, and relocate units to a new United States Army Reserve Center in Kirksville, MO, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

Close the Jefferson Barracks United States Army Reserve Center, and re-locate units into a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center on Jefferson Barracks, MO, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Missouri Army National Guard Units from the Readiness Center in Jefferson Barracks if the State of Missouri decides to relocate those units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Missouri. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two Army Reserve centers and constructs one Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and one United States Army Reserve Center, in the State of Missouri, capable of accommodating National Guard and Army Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing four separate facilities into two modern Reserve Centers. These facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Missouri will close one Missouri Army Guard Readiness Centers on Jefferson Barracks. The Armed Forces Reserve Center will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRC.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$5.5M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$28.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$0.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department

after implementation are \$6.4M with a payback expected in 3 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$61.0M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 121 jobs (67 direct and 54 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the St. Louis, MO-IL Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** Minor revisions to the air permit may be needed at Lambert IAP AGS (Jefferson Barracks). It may be necessary to build on constrained acreage at Lambert. A wetlands survey may need to be conducted at Lambert. This recommendation has no impact cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.5M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## **RC Transformation in Montana**

**Recommendation:** Close Galt Hall Army Reserve Center in Great Falls, MT and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, MT.

Close Army Reserve Center Veuve Hall (building #26) and Area Maintenance Support Activity #75 on Fort Missoula, MT, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Missoula, MT if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Montana National Guard units from the Montana Army National Guard Armory in Missoula, MT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Montana. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two US Army Reserve Centers and one Army Maintenance Support Activity throughout the State of Montana and constructs two Armed Forces Reserve Centers capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. The Department understands that the State of Montana will close one Montana Army National Guard Armory in Missoula, MT. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$19.5M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$26.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$19.8M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$1.5M with a payback expected in 23 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$4.3M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 27 jobs (17 direct and 10 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Great Falls, MT Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** Additional operations may impact T&E species and/or critical habitats and wetlands at Malstrom. This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; waste management; or water resources. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.09M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Nebraska**

**Recommendation:** Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Wymore, NE, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in the vicinity of Beatrice, NE, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard Units from the following Nebraska ARNG Readiness Centers: Fairbury, NE, Falls City, NE and Troop C, 1-167th Cavalry in Beatrice, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Columbus, NE, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Columbus, NE, The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard Units from the Nebraska ARNG Readiness Center, Columbus, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Hastings, NE, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Greenlief Training Site in Nebraska. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard Units from the following Nebraska ARNG Readiness Centers: Grand Island, NE, Crete, NE, and Hastings, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Kearney, NE, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Kearney, NE if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard Units from the Nebraska ARNG Readiness Center, Kearney, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in McCook, NE, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in McCook, NE, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Nebraska National Guard Units from the Nebraska ARNG Readiness Center, McCook, NE, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Nebraska. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes five Army Reserve centers, and constructs five multicomponent, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of Nebraska, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing thirteen geographically separated facilities into five modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Nebraska will close eight Nebraska Army Guard Armories: Grand Island, Crete, Hastings, Fairbury, Falls City, Columbus, Kearney, and McCook, NE. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new AFRCs will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives. This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$31.4M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and

communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$33.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$6.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$6.2M with a payback expected in 5 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$53.7M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 48 jobs (31 direct and 17 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Columbus, NE Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 48 jobs (31 direct and 17 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Grand Island NE Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 12 jobs (8 direct and 4 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Kearney, NE Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.07M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## RC Transformation in New Hampshire

**Recommendation:** Close Paul Doble Army Reserve Center in Portsmouth, NH; and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and associated training and maintenance facilities adjacent to Pease Air National Guard Base, NH, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and complex will have the capability to accommodate New Hampshire National Guard units from the following New Hampshire ARNG Armories: Rochester, Portsmouth, Somersworth and Dover, NH, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of New Hampshire. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one Armed Forces Reserve Center in Portsmouth, NH and constructs a multi-component, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Center on land adjacent to Pease Air National Guard Base. The Department understands that the State of New Hampshire will close four New Hampshire Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Rochester, Portsmouth, Somersworth and Dover. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from the closed facilities into the new AFRC.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$14.6M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$54.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$44.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$3.1M with a payback expected in 26 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$12.9M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 73 jobs (44 direct and 29 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Rockingham County-Strafford County, NH metropolitan division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** Additional operations at Pease-Newington Air Reserve Base may impact sensitive resource areas and constrain operations. A wetlands survey may need to be conducted to determine impact to wetlands at Pease-Newington. This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.2M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in New Jersey**

**Recommendation:** Close the Nelson Brittin Army Reserve Center in Camden, NJ and relocate units to a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center in Camden, NJ, if the Army can acquire suitable land for the construction of the new facilities. The New AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the New Jersey ARNG Armory, Burlington, if the state decides to relocate those units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of New Jersey. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes Brittin Army Reserve Center in Camden, NJ and constructs a multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) in Camden, NJ. This recommendation reduces costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing two separate facilities into one modern AFRC. The Department understands that the State of New Jersey will close one National Guard Armory in Burlington, NJ. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate units to the new multi functional AFRC in Camden, NJ.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation. This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$14.5M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$15.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$2.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$3.0M with a payback expected in 5 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$26.6M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 64 jobs (35 direct and 29 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Camden, NJ Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.01M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in New Mexico**

**Recommendation:** Close the Jenkins Armed Forces Reserve Center located in Albuquerque, New Mexico and re-locate the units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Kirtland Air Force Base.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of New Mexico. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes an Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) located in Albuquerque, New Mexico and relocates units to a new multi functional AFRC on Kirtland Air Force Base, NM. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating a geographically separate facility onto an existing base. Reducing the number of DoD installations also reduces the manpower costs required to sustain multiple facilities.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$0.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$17.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$4.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$3.0M with a payback expected in 6 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$24.6M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction 65 jobs (36 direct and 29 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Albuquerque, NM metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** A minor revision to the existing air permits may be necessary at Kirtland AFB. Kirtland may have to modify their hazardous waste program due to incoming mission. Additional operations at Kirtland may impact wetlands. This recommendation has no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.5M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in New York**

**Recommendation:** Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Stewart-Newburg, NY and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Stewart Army Sub Post adjacent to Stewart Air National Guard Base, NY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate New York National Guard units from the Readiness Center at Newburg, NY, if the State of New York decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center and Army Maintenance Support Activity, Niagara Falls, NY and construct a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the existing site in Niagara Falls, NY. The New AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate the NY National Guard units from the Niagara Falls Readiness Center, if the state of New York decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the BG Theodore Roosevelt United States Army Reserve Center, Uniondale, NY, the Amityville Armed Forces Reserve Center (Army Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve), Amityville, NY, and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Shop on federal property licensed to the New York Army National Guard in Farmingdale, NY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate New York National Guard units from the following New York Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Bayshore, Freeport, Huntington Station, Patchogue and Riverhead, and Organizational Maintenance Shop 21, Bayshore, NY, if the State of New York decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of New York. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four Army Reserve centers and constructs three multi-component, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of New York, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing three geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of New York will close six New York Army Guard Armories: Niagara Falls, Bayshore, Freeport, Huntington Station, Patchogue and Riverhead, and Organizational Maintenance Shop 21 Bayshore, NY. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new AFRCs will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$81.6M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$103.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$88.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$4.0M with a payback expected in 47 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$46.5M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 37 jobs (28 direct and 9 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Nassau-Suffolk County, NY metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1 job (1 direct and 0 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

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

## RC Transformation in North Carolina

**Recommendation:** Close the Army Reserve Adrian B. Rhodes Armed Forces Reserve Center in Wilmington, NC, close the Rock Hill Armed Forces Reserve Center in Rock Hill, South Carolina, close the Niven Armed Forces Reserve Center in Albermarle, NC and relocate all Army and Navy units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS) in Wilmington, NC, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of North Carolina. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two Army Reserve Centers in the state of North Carolina and one Army Reserve Center in the state of South Carolina and constructs a multi component, multi functional, Armed Forces Reserve Center capable of accommodating Navy and Army Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing three geographically separated facilities into a modern Armed Forces Reserve Center.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$10.2M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and

increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$9.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a savings of \$5.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$2.6M with a payback expected in 2 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a saving of \$30.2M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 43 jobs (29 direct and 14 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Albemarle, NC Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.03M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in North Dakota**

**Recommendation:** Close 96th RRC David Johnson USARC in Fargo, ND and relocate into a new Reserve Center on Hector Field Air National Guard Base.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of North Dakota. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the

Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes a United States Army Reserve Center (USARC) located in Fargo, ND and relocates units to a new USARC on Hector Field Air National Guard Base, ND. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facility and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$4.0M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$7.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$8.1M. Annual recurring costs to the Department after implementation are \$0.02M. This recommendation never pays back. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$8.0M.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** Wetlands Survey may need to be conducted at Hector Field Air National Guard Base to determine impact. This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.01M for waste management and/or environmental compliance

activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Ohio**

**Recommendation:** Close the Scouten Army Reserve Center, Mansfield, OH and the Parrott Army Reserve Center, Kenton, OH, and relocate all units to a new AFRC at Mansfield Air National Guard Base located at Mansfield-Lahm Airport. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Ohio ARNG Armories in Mansfield and Ashland, OH, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close US Army Reserve Center, Springfield OH, and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the Springfield Air National Guard Base, Springfield, OH. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facility: Ohio ARNG Readiness Center, Springfield, OH; if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close Fort Hayes US Army Reserve Center, Columbus, OH and Whitehall US Army Reserve Center, Whitehall, OH and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following facilities: Ohio ARNG Armories Howey (Columbus), Sullivant (Columbus), Newark, Westerville and Oxford, OH, Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base, Building #943 if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Ohio. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes five US Army Reserve Centers throughout the state of Ohio and constructs three Armed Forces Reserve Centers capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing thirteen geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers.

This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create

improved business practices. The Department understands that the State of Ohio will close eight Ohio Army National Guard Centers: Mansfield, Ashland, Springfield, Howey (Columbus), Sullivant (Columbus), Newark, Westerville, and Oxford, OH and realign Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base Building #943 by relocating the Regional Training Institute to the new AFRC. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$74.4M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$134.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$93.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$9.3M with a payback expected in 18 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$1.3M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 56 jobs (41 direct and 15 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Columbus, OH metropolitan statistical area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 139 jobs (71 direct and 68 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Mansfield, OH metropolitan statistical area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** A minor air permit revision may be needed at Springfield-Beckley AGS and Mansfield ANG Base and new permits may be needed at DSCC OH. The recommendation may require building on constrained acreage at Springfield-Beckley and Mansfield. Additional operations may impact sensitive resource areas at Springfield-Beckley. The hazardous waste program at Springfield-Beckley and Mansfield may need to be modified.

Treatment works at Mansfield may need to be modified. Air emission permits and storm water management permits may be required at DSCC OH. Additional operations at Springfield-Beckley and Mansfield may impact wetlands, which may restrict operations. This recommendation has no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; or threatened and endangered species or critical habitat. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.9M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Oklahoma**

**Recommendation:** Close the Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) Broken Arrow located in Broken Arrow, OK and relocate the Army Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve and Naval Reserve units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and consolidated maintenance facility in Broken Arrow, OK if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Broken Arrow, Eufaula, Okmulgee, Tahlequah, Haskell, Cushing, Wagoner and the Field Maintenance Shop (FMS 14) located in Okmulgee, if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Keathley and Burris United States Army Reserve Centers located in Lawton and Chickasha, OK; close the Wichita Falls United States Army Reserve Center in Wichita Falls, TX; close the 1st, 3rd, 5th, and 6th United States Army Reserve Centers and Equipment Concentration Site (ECS) located on Fort Sill and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Sill, OK and a new United States Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site to be collocated with the Oklahoma Army National Guard Maneuver Area Training Equipment Site on Fort Sill. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Lawton, Frederick, Anadarko, Chickasha, Marlow, Walters, and Healdton; realign B/1-158 Field Artillery (MLRS) from the Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Center located in Duncan if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Floyd Parker United States Army Reserve Center in McAlester, OK and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Consolidated Field Maintenance Shop on the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, McAlester, OK. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: the Field Maintenance Shop in Durant, OK; the Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers in Atoka, Allen, Hartshorne, Madill, McAlester and Tishomingo, OK; the Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Center and Field Maintenance Shop in Edmond, OK if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Ashworth United States Army Reserve Center located in Muskogee, OK and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Muskogee, OK, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Henryetta, Muskogee, Okemah, Pryor, and Stilwell, OK if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Farr United States Army Reserve Center, Antlers, OK, the Roush United States Army Reserve Center, Clinton, OK, the Smalley United States Army Reserve Center, Norman, OK and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Consolidated Maintenance Facility on the Norman Military Complex, Norman, OK. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard facilities: Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers in Tonkawa, OK, Konawa, OK, Wewoka, OK, Oklahoma City (23rd Street), OK, the 23d Street Field Maintenance Shop in Oklahoma City, the Consolidated Maintenance Facility on the Norman Military Complex, Norman, OK and C CO, 700th Support Battalion from the Readiness Center, Edmond, OK if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Manuel Perez and Billy Krowse United States Army Reserve Centers located in Oklahoma City, OK. Relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in West Oklahoma City, OK, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard facilities: Readiness Centers located in Southwest Oklahoma City (44th Street), El Reno, Minco, and Pawnee, the Oklahoma Army National Guard 1345 Transportation Company and the 345th Quartermaster Water Support Battalion from Midwest City if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Robbins United States Army Reserve Center located in Enid, OK and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Consolidated Field Maintenance Shop on Vance Air Force Base, OK. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Oklahoma Army National Guard units from the following Oklahoma Army National Guard facilities: Enid, Alva, Woodward, Blackwell, Cherokee, Watonga, and the National Guard Field Maintenance Shop in Enid, OK if the State of Oklahoma decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Oklahoma. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes eleven Army Reserve centers, realigns five Army Reserve facilities and constructs seven joint or multi-component, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs) throughout the State of Oklahoma, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing units from sixty-four geographically separated facilities into seven modern, multi-component facilities. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Oklahoma will close forty Oklahoma Army National Guard Readiness Centers, close five Maintenance Facilities, realign two Readiness Centers and one Maintenance Facility. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$61.9M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$168.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$98.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$16.5M with a payback expected in 11 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$63.8M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 46 jobs (30 direct and 16 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Johnston County, OK Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.2 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 25 jobs (16 direct and 9 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Muskogee, OK Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 162 jobs (84 direct and 78 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the

Oklahoma City, OK, metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 36 jobs (26 direct and 10 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Tulsa OK Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** Potential cultural resource impacts may occur at McAlester, since resources must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required at McAlester and Fort Sill to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA Water Quality Standards. Modification of hazardous waste program at Vance may be necessary. This recommendation has no impact on air quality, dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.6M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## **RC Transformation in Oregon**

**Recommendation:** Close Sears Hall United States Army Reserve Center in Portland, OR, close Sharff Hall United States Army Reserve Center in Portland, OR, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Camp Withycombe, OR. The new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) shall have the capability to accommodate Oregon National Guard units currently on Camp Withycombe and from the following Oregon ARNG Armories: Lake Oswego Armory, Maison Armory, and Jackson Band Armory, OR, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Oregon. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two Army Reserve Centers in the State of Oregon and constructs a multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Center capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing three geographically separated facilities into a modern Armed Forces Reserve Center. The Department understands that the State of Oregon will close: Lake Oswego Armory in Lake Oswego, OR and realign the Jackson Band Armory, and the Maison Armory. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from the closed and realigning facilities to the new AFRC complex.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$36M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering the existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs, would reduce costs to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$24.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$23.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$0.3M with a payback expected in 100+ years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$19.8M.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.02M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Pennsylvania**

**Recommendation:** Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Lewisburg, PA, the United States Army Reserve Center in Bloomsburg, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Bloomsburg, PA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in the Lewisburg / Bloomsburg, PA area, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate PA National Guard Units from the following Army National Guard Readiness Centers: Lewisburg, PA, Sunbury, PA, and Berwick, PA, if the Commonwealth of PA decides to relocate those units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center in Williamsport, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Williamsport, PA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in Williamsport, PA, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Pennsylvania National Guard Units from the Army National Guard Readiness Center in Williamsport, PA, if the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania decides to relocate those units.

Close the Reese United States Army Reserve Center in Chester, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Chester, PA, the Germantown Veterans Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Philadelphia, PA, the Horsham Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Horsham, PA, the 1LT Ray S. Musselman Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Norristown, PA, and the North Penn memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Norristown, PA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility at Willow Grove Joint Reserve Base, PA. The Army shall establish an enclave at Willow Grove Joint Reserve Base, PA, to retain essential facilities to support activities of the Reserve Components.

Close the Wilson Kramer United States Army Reserve Center in Bethlehem, PA, and the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Bethlehem, PA, and relocate units to a new United States Army Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in the Allentown/ Bethlehem, PA area, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

Close the Philadelphia Memorial United States Armed Forces Reserve Center in Philadelphia, PA, the Philadelphia Memorial United States Armed Forces Reserve Center Organizational Maintenance Shop in Philadelphia, PA, and relocate Army Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in Bristol, PA, on the existing Bristol Veterans Memorial Reserve Center site.

Close the Serrenti Memorial United States Army Reserve Center in Scranton, PA, the Serrenti Memorial United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Scranton, PA, the United States Army Reserve Center in Wilkes-Barre, PA, the United States Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Wilkes-Barre, PA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an organizational maintenance facility in Scranton, PA, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the Commonwealth of PA. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes eleven Army Reserve Centers, one Armed Forces Reserve Center, and seven Organizational Maintenance Shops, throughout the Commonwealth of PA and constructs six multi-component, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers, with six co-located Organizational Maintenance Facilities, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing sixteen geographically separated facilities into six modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. The Department understands that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will close PAARNG Readiness Centers: Lewisburg, PA, Sunbury, PA, Berwick, PA, and Williamsport, PA. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$110.4M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and

increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$142.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$81.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$14.2M with a payback expected in 10 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$58.4M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 18 jobs (11 direct and 7 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Lewisburg, PA Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 66 jobs (44 direct and 22 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Philadelphia, PA Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 77 jobs (55 direct and 22 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Scranton – Wilkes Barre Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 46 jobs (29 direct and 17 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Williamsport, PA metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 34 jobs (22 direct and 12 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Bloomsburg-Berwick, PA Micropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation may impact air quality at NAS Willow-Grove, which is in a region projected/proposed for non-attainment for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and Ozone (8-hour). Due to new construction an Air Conformity Analysis and New Source Review and permitting effort will be required. This recommendation has no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal

resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.4M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Puerto Rico**

**Recommendation:** Close the US Army Reserve Center 1st Lieutenant Paul Lavergne, Bayamon, PR and relocate the 973rd Combat Support (CS) Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on United States Army Reserve property in Ceiba, PR, and relocate all other units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on Fort Buchanan, PR. Realign the US Army Reserve Center Captain E. Rubio Junior, Puerto Nuevo, PR, by relocating the 807th Signal Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Buchanan, PR. The new AFRC on Fort Buchanan, PR shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Puerto Rico Army Guard San Juan Readiness Center, San Juan, PR, if Puerto Rico decides to relocate those National Guard units. The new AFRC facility in Ceiba, PR shall have the capability to accommodate Puerto Rico National Guard units from the following PRARNG Readiness Centers: Humacao, Juncos, and Ceiba, PR, if Puerto Rico decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Realign United States Army Reserve Center Captain E. Rubio Junior, Puerto Nuevo, PR, by relocating the 8th Brigade, 108th DIV (IT) to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Allen, PR.

Realign United States Army Reserve Center Ramey, Aguadilla, PR by relocating the 249th Quartermaster Company into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Mayaguez, PR, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land. The new facility shall have the capability to accommodate Puerto Rico National Guard units from the Puerto Rico Army National Guard Readiness Center Mayaguez, if Puerto Rico decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout Puerto Rico. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes one and realigns four US Army Reserve Centers throughout Puerto Rico and constructs four multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing five geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that Puerto Rico will close PRARNG Readiness Centers: Humacao, Juncos, Ceiba, and Mayaguez, PR. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$36.4M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$87.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$64.0M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$7.3M with a payback expected in 15 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$8.6M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 161 jobs (95 direct and 66 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the San Juan-Caguas-Guaynabo, PR MSA metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 15 jobs (10 direct and 5 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Aguadilla-Isabela-San Sebastian, PR metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of the community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support

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

**Environmental Impact:** Additional operations at Fort Buchanan may impact threatened and endangered leading to additional restrictions on construction, training, or operations. This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.1M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Rhode Island**

**Recommendation:** Close the Bristol Army Reserve Center, Bristol, RI, the Harwood Army Reserve Center, Providence, RI, the Warwick Army Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop, Warwick, RI. Relocate all units to a new Army Reserve Center on Newport Naval Base, RI.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Rhode Island. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes three Army Reserve Centers in Bristol, Harwood and Warwick, RI; and closes one Army Reserve Organizational Maintenance Shop in Warwick, RI and constructs a multi functional Army Reserve Center (AFRC) on Newport Naval Base, RI. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The site selected was determined as the best location because it optimizes the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$20.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$32.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is cost of \$9.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$4.6M with a payback expected in 6 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$35.3M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 108 jobs (48 direct and 60 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** Naval Station Newport is in serious Non Attainment for Ozone (1-hr). Consultation with state historic preservation authorities may be necessary at Newport. This recommendation may impact waste management and water resources at Newport. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$41,000 for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## RC Transformation in Tennessee

**Recommendation:** Close the Guerry United States Army Reserve Center, Chattanooga, TN, and Bonney Oaks United States Army Reserve Center, Chattanooga, TN, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) on Volunteer Army Ammunition Plant, Chattanooga, TN.

Close the Kingsport Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC), the Kingsport Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS), and the Army Maintenance Support Activity (AMSA), Kingsport, TN, and relocate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Field Maintenance Shop on Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Kingsport, TN. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Tennessee National Guard units from the Kingsport Armed Forces Reserve Center, Kingsport, TN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center outside of Fort Campbell (located in Clarksville TN), KY, and relocate units, along with units currently in buildings #6912 and #2907 on Fort Campbell into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) and Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS) on Fort Campbell, KY. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the Clarksville Army National Guard Readiness Center, Clarksville, TN, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Tennessee. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four Army Reserve Centers, one Area Maintenance Support Activity and one Organizational Maintenance Shop throughout the State of Tennessee and constructs three multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers, one Field Maintenance Shop, and one Organizational Maintenance Shop capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing nine geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. This recommendation reduces the number of separate DoD installations by relocating to an existing base.

The Department understands that the State of Tennessee will close the Clarksville Army National Guard Readiness Center, Clarksville, TN. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$23.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$36.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$28.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$2.7M with a payback expected in 18 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$1.1M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 39 jobs (32 direct and 7 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Kingsport-Bristol-Bristol, TN-VA metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** An Air Conformity Analysis and New Source Review is required at Holston and Fort Campbell. Significant mitigation measures and training restrictions to limit releases may be required at Holston and Fort Campbell to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA water quality standard. This recommendation has no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.5M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the

installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Texas**

**Recommendation:** Close the Tharp United States Army Reserve Center, Amarillo, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Amarillo, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Amarillo, Pampa, and Hale Co, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Brownsville, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Brownsville, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Center in Brownsville, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Boswell, TX and the United States Army Reserve Center, Callaghan, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on existing Federal property on Camp Bullis, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Center in Hondo, TX, A Company and Headquarters Company, 1<sup>st</sup> of the 141st Infantry, the Fifth Army ITAAS, the Regional Training Site-Intelligence, and the Texas Army National Guard Area Support Medical Battalion, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Grimes United States Army Reserve Center, Abilene, TX and relocate B Company of the 413th Civil Affairs Battalion and the Area Maintenance Support Activity 11 Sub-Shop to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Field Maintenance Shop on Dyess Air Force Base, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Abilene, Coleman, and Snyder, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop, Abilene, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Seguera, TX, the United States Army Reserve Center, Benavidez, TX, the United States Army Reserve Center, Fort Bliss, TX, the United States Army Reserve Center, McGregor Range, TX and the United States Army Reserve Equipment Concentration Site, McGregor Range, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Consolidated Equipment Concentration Site and Maintenance Facility on Fort Bliss, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Fort Bliss and Hondo Pass, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Herzog United States Army Reserve Center, Dallas, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on the existing Grand Prairie Reserve Complex, Grand Prairie,

TX. Realign the 490th Civil Affairs Battalion from the Grimes United States Army Reserve Center and relocate the unit into the new AFRC. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Arlington, TX, and California Crossing, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Pasadena, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Field Maintenance Shop in (East) Houston, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Baytown, Pasadena, and Ellington Field, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop located on Ellington Field, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close United States Army Reserve Center #2, Perimeter Park, TX and United States Army Reserve Center #3, Houston, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a consolidated Field Maintenance Shop in (Northwest) Houston, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Beaumont, Port Arthur, Port Neches, and Orange, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop located in Port Neches, TX if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Miller United States Army Reserve Center, Huntsville, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Huntsville, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Center in Huntsville, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Muchert United States Army Reserve Center, Dallas, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center Lewisville, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Denton, Irving, and Denison, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Lufkin, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Lufkin, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Lufkin and Nacogdoches, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Alice, TX and the United States Army Reserve Center, NAS Kingsville, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on NAS Kingsville, TX, if the Army determines the property is suitable for construction. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas

ARNG Readiness Centers: Alice and Kingsville, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the Watts-Guillot United States Army Reserve Center, Texarkana, TX and realign the Hooks Army Reserve Center on Red River Army Depot by relocating units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Red River Army Depot, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Atlanta, and Texarkana, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close Round Rock United States Army Reserve Center (leased) and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a consolidated Field Maintenance Shop in Round Rock, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the Texas ARNG Readiness Centers in Austin and Taylor, TX, and the Texas Army National Guard Field Maintenance Shop in Austin, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, San Marcos, TX, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in San Marcos, TX, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: San Marcos, Sequin, and New Braunfels, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units. Close the Hanby-Hayden United States Army Reserve Center, Mesquite, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Shop on United States Army Reserve property in Seagoville, TX. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Dallas #2, Kaufman and Terrell (including the Organizational Maintenance Shop), TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Tyler, TX and the United States Army Reserve Center, Marshall, TX and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with a Field Maintenance Shop in Tyler, TX, if the Army is able to acquire suitable land for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Texas National Guard Units from the following Texas ARNG Readiness Centers: Athens, Tyler, Henderson, Kilgore, Marshall, and Corsicana, TX, and the Field Maintenance Shop in Marshall, TX, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Texas. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

The recommendation closes twenty-four Army Reserve centers and one equipment concentration site, realigns one Army Reserve Center, and constructs seventeen multicomponent, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of Texas, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing seventy-seven geographically separated facilities into seventeen modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of Texas will close forty-three Texas Army Guard Armories: Abilene, Alice, Amarillo, Arlington, Atlanta, Athens, Austin, Baytown, Beaumont, Brownsville, California Crossing, Coleman, Corsicana, Dallas #2, Denison, Denton, Ellington Field, Fort Bliss, Henderson, Hondo, Hondo Pass, Huntsville, Irving, Kaufman, Kilgore, Kingsville, Lufkin, Marshall, Nacogdoches, New Braunfels, Orange, Pampa, Pasadena, Hale Co, Port Arthur, Port Neches, San Marcos, Sequin, Snyder, Taylor, Terrell, Texarkana and Tyler, TX; close six Army National Guard Field Maintenance Facilities in Abilene, Austin, Marshall, Ellington Field, Port Neches and Terrell; and realign Camp Bullis. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$231.3M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$375.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$220.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$36.0M with a payback expected in 12 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$133.2M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in the maximum potential job reductions (direct and indirect) over the 2006-2011 period, as follows:

| <u>Economic Area</u>                                 | <u>Direct Job Reductions</u> | <u>Indirect Job Reductions</u> | <u>Total Job Reductions</u> | <u>% of Economic Area Employment</u> |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Austin-Round Rock, TX, Metropolitan Statistical Area | 106                          | 39                             | 145                         | Less than 0.1                        |

|   |     |    |     |               |
|---|-----|----|-----|---------------|
| Dallas – Plano - Irving, TX, Metropolitan Division          | 137 | 73 | 210 | Less than 0.1 |
| El Paso, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area                   | 106 | 82 | 188 | Less than 0.1 |
| Houston-Baytown-Sugarland, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area | 61  | 43 | 104 | Less than 0.1 |
| Lufkin, TX, Micropolitan Statistical Area                   | 10  | 5  | 15  | Less than 0.1 |
| San Antonio, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area               | 106 | 89 | 195 | Less than 0.1 |
| Tyler, TX Metropolitan Statistical Area                     | 16  | 9  | 25  | Less than 0.1 |

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** An Air Conformity determination and New Source Review and permitting effort will be required at Fort Bliss. To preserve cultural and archeological resources, training restrictions may be imposed and increased operational delays and costs are possible at Fort Bliss and NAS Kingsville. Tribal consultations may be required at Fort Bliss. This recommendation may require minor air permit modifications at Dyess. This recommendation may also impact noise and wetlands at Dyess. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or water resources. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.9M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### RC Transformation in Vermont

**Recommendation:** Close Chester Memorial Army Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop, Chester, VT and Berlin Army Reserve Center, Berlin, VT and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance Facility in the vicinity of White River Junction, VT if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and OMS shall have the capability to

accommodate units from the following facilities: Vermont Army National Guard Armories in Ludlow, North Springfield and Windsor, VT, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close Army Reserve Center, Courcelle Brothers and associated Organizational Maintenance Shop, Rutland, VT; close Army Reserve Army Maintenance Support Activity, Rutland, VT and relocate all units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Facility in the vicinity of Rutland, VT, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC and Maintenance Activity shall have the ability to accommodate units from the following facility: Vermont Army National Guard Armory Rutland, VT; if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Vermont. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

The recommendation closes four US Army Reserve Centers, one Area Maintenance Support Activity and two Organizational Maintenance Shops throughout the State of Vermont and constructs two Armed Forces Reserve Centers and collocated Organizational Maintenance facilities capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing eleven geographically separated facilities into two modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers with maintenance facilities. These new facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business practices. The Department understands that the State of Vermont will close four Vermont Army National Guard Centers: Ludlow, North Springfield, Windsor and Rutland, VT. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$30.1M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$61.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$57.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$1.4M with a payback expected in 100+ years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$41.7M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** This recommendation will not result in any job reductions (direct or indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Ludlow, VT or Rutland County, VT economic areas. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.8M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Washington**

**Recommendation:** Close Mann Hall Army Reserve Center, Area Maintenance Support Shop #80 and Walker Army Reserve Center in Spokane, WA and relocate units to a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop on Fairchild Air Force Base. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following Washington ARNG facilities: Washington ARNG Armory and Organizational Maintenance Shop, Geiger Field, WA, if the state decides to relocate those units.

Close Wagenaar Army Reserve Center Pasco, WA and relocate units to a new consolidated Armed Forces Reserve Center on Yakima Training Center. Realign Pendleton Army Reserve Center on Yakima Training Center by moving all assigned units to the new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Yakima Training Center. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following Washington ARNG facility: Washington ARNG Ellensburg Readiness Center, if the state decides to relocate those units.

Close the Oswald United States Army Reserve Center, Everett, WA, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the Everett, WA area if the Army is able to acquire suitable

land for construction of the new facility. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate units from the following Washington ARNG facilities: Washington ARNG Everett Readiness Center and Snohomish Readiness Center, if the state decides to relocate those units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of Washington. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four US Army Reserve Centers and one Area Maintenance Support Activity, realigns one Army Reserve Center and constructs three multi component, multi functional Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRCs) throughout the State of Washington, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation also reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing nine geographically separated facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These joint use facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business practices. The Department understands that the State of Washington will close four Washington Army National Guard Centers: Geiger Field, Everett, Snohomish and Ellensburg; and one Organizational Maintenance Shop, Geiger Field, WA. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$24.5M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and

increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$61.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$33.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$8.2M with a payback expected in 9 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$46.1M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 70 jobs (38 direct and 32 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Spokane, WA Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 89 jobs (57 direct and 32 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA metropolitan area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** A minor air permit revision may be needed at Fairchild. Additional operations may impact cultural, archeological, or tribal resources at Fairchild. Environmental consultation is required at Fairchild and Wagenaar USARC, due to the presence of species of concern. This recommendation may impact wetlands at Fairchild. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; waste management; or water resources. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.4M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

## **RC Transformation in West Virginia**

**Recommendation:** Close the Elkins US Army Reserve Center and its supporting Maintenance Shop in Beverly, WV and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity

of Elkins, WV, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate West Virginia Army National Guard Units from the Readiness Center in Elkins, WV if the State decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close the 1LT Harry Colburn US Army Reserve Center and its supporting Maintenance Shop in Fairmont, WV and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Fairmont, WV, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate West Virginia National Guard Units from the Readiness Center in Fairmont, WV if the State decides to relocate those National Guard units.

Close SSG Roy Kuhl US Army Reserve Center and Maintenance Facility in Ripley and the MAJ Elbert Bias USAR Center, Huntington, WV and re-locate units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in the vicinity of Ripley, WV, if the Army is able to acquire land suitable for the construction of the facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate West Virginia National Guard Units from the West Virginia Army National Guard Readiness Center in Spencer, West Virginia if the State of West Virginia decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities throughout the State of West Virginia. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes four Army Reserve centers, three supporting Maintenance Shops and constructs three multi-component, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs), throughout the State of West Virginia, capable of accommodating National Guard and Reserve units. This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing ten separate facilities into three modern Armed Forces Reserve Centers. These multi-component facilities will significantly reduce operating costs and create improved business processes. The Department understands that the State of West Virginia will close three West Virginia Army Guard Armories: Spencer, Fairmont, Elkins, WV. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into the new AFRCs.

The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new AFRCs will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$43.6M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$29.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a savings of \$4.2M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$7.6M with a payback expected in 3 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$77.0M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 135 jobs (88 direct and 47 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Fairmont, WV metropolitan statistical area, which is 0.5 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 1 job (1 direct and 0 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.08M for waste management and/or environmental compliance

activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Wisconsin**

**Recommendation:** Close the Truman Olson and G.F. O’Connell US Army Reserve Centers in Madison, WI and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) in Madison, WI, if the Army can acquire suitable land for the construction of the new facilities. The new AFRC shall have the capability to accommodate Army National Guard units from the following Wisconsin Army National Guard Armories; the Madison Armory (Bowman Street), Madison Armory / OMS 9, and the Madison Armory (2400 Wright Street), if the state decides to relocate those units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Wisconsin. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army’s force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes two Army Reserve Centers and realigns three Wisconsin Army National Guard Armories and constructs a multi-service, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Center (AFRC) in Madison, WI. The Department understands that the State of Wisconsin will realign the Madison Armory (Bowman Street) by relocating the 64th Troop Command; the Madison Armory / OMS 9, by re-locating the 54th Civil Support Team, the Madison Armory (2400 Wright Street) by re-locating the 641st Troop Command. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these facilities to the new AFRC.

This is a joint proposal with the Navy that supports actions to close the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Madison, WI, the Navy Reserve Center, La Crosse, WI and the Navy Reserve Center in Dubuque, IA. This recommendation reduces costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing two separate facilities and units from three overcrowded facilities into one modern AFRC.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$12.7M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$10.7M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a saving of \$37.7M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$10.8M with a payback expected immediately. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$139.7M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 173 jobs (125 direct and 48 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Madison, WI metropolitan statistical area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation has no impact on air quality, cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.03M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **RC Transformation in Wyoming**

**Recommendation:** Close Wyoming Army National Guard (WYARNG) Army Aviation Support Facility (AASF) in Cheyenne, WY (DA leased facility) and relocate Army National Guard units and aviation functions to a new WYARNG AASF, Readiness Center, and Field Maintenance Shop (FMS) on F.E. Warren Air Force Base, WY. The new readiness center/FMS shall have the capability to accommodate Army National Guard units from the Joint Force Headquarters Complex in Cheyenne, WY, if the state decides to relocate those units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities in the State of Wyoming. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a state-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation closes a WYARNG AASF, two WYARNG armories and constructs an AASF, readiness center and FMS on F.E. Warren Air Force Base, WY. This recommendation reduces costs for maintaining existing facilities by collapsing an AASF and consolidating with other units in the Cheyenne area into a single facility onto an existing Air Force Base. The Department understands that the State of Wyoming will close the Thermopolis Armory (vacant-no units relocating) and the Joint Force Headquarters Armory (adjacent to F.E. Warren Air Force Base). The new facility will have the capability to accommodate these units if the state decides to relocate those units.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$22.2M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$72.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$53.8M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$4.5M with a payback expected in 21 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of \$9.0M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 49 jobs (34 direct and 15 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Cheyenne, WY metropolitan statistical area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

**Community Infrastructure Assessment:** A review of the community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support

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

**Environmental Impact:** A minor air permit revision may be needed at F.E. Warren. Noise contours at F.E. Warren may change as a result of the change in mission. Additional operations may impact T&E species and/or critical habitats at F.E. Warren. The hazardous waste program at F.E. Warren may need to be modified. This recommendation has no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.6M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **Single Drill Sergeant School**

**Recommendation:** Realign Fort Benning, GA, and Fort Leonard Wood, MO, by relocating the Drill Sergeant School at each location to Fort Jackson, SC.

**Justification:** This recommendation consolidates Drill Sergeant's Training from three locations (Fort Benning, Fort Jackson, and Fort Leonard Wood) to one location (Fort Jackson), which fosters consistency, standardization and training proficiency. It enhances military value, supports the Army's force structure plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address future unforeseen requirements. This recommendation supports Army Transformation by collocating institutional training, MTOE units, RDTE organizations and other TDA units in large numbers on single installations to support force stabilization and engage training. It improves training capabilities while eliminating excess capacity at institutional training installations, and provides the same or better level of service at a reduced cost.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$1.8M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a saving of \$7.6M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$2.5M with a payback expected within one year. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$31.3M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recover, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 171 jobs (121 direct and 50 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Columbus GA-AL Metropolitan area, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 237 jobs (183 direct and 54 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Fort Leonard Wood, MO Metropolitan area, which is 0.9 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** An Air Conformity determination and New Source Review and permitting effort will be required at Fort Jackson. This recommendation has no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.3M for environmental compliance costs. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **U.S. Army Garrison Michigan (Selfridge)**

**Recommendation:** Close United States Army Garrison Michigan at Selfridge, which is located on Selfridge Air National Guard Base. Retain an enclave to support the Dynamic Structural Load Simulator (Bridging) Laboratory and the Water Purification Laboratory on Selfridge.

**Justification:** This recommendation closes the US Army Garrison Michigan (USAG-M) at Selfridge, which is located at Selfridge Air National Guard Base. The USAG-M at Selfridge is federally owned property located on Selfridge Air National Guard Base. USAG-M at Selfridge is the primary provider of housing and other support and services to certain military personnel and their dependents located in the Detroit area. There is sufficient housing in the Detroit Metropolitan area to support military personnel stationed in the area. Closing USAG-Michigan at Selfridge avoids the cost of continued operation and maintenance of other unnecessary support facilities. A Bridging Lab and Water Purification Lab located on Selfridge, which are part of the Tank Automotive Army Research and Development Center at Detroit Arsenal will be retained and enclaved. Six garrison personnel (Garrison Commander and staff) will be relocated to Detroit Arsenal. This recommendation enhances military value, supports the Army's force structure plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address future unforeseen requirements.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$9.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of \$91.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$18.1M with a payback expected immediately. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$260.9M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 601 jobs (376 direct and 225 indirect) over the 2006-2011 period in the Warren-Farmington Hills-Troy, MI Metropolitan Division which is 0.04 percent of the economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** Closure will require consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office to ensure that the historic sites are protected. Restoration and/or monitoring of contaminated groundwater will likely be required after closure in order to prevent significant long-term impacts to the environment. This recommendation has no impact on air quality; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.65M for environmental compliance costs. These costs were included in the payback calculation. USAG Michigan at Selfridge reports \$13.3M in environmental restoration costs. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an installation is closed, realigned, or remains open, these costs were not included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **USAR Command and Control New England**

**Recommendation:** Close the Westover Armed Forces Reserve Center, Chicopee, Massachusetts, the MacArthur United States Army Reserve Center, Springfield, Massachusetts, the United States Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity, Windsor Locks, Connecticut, and realign the Malony United States Army Reserve Center on Devens Reserve Forces Training Area by disestablishing the 94th Regional Readiness Command, and relocate all units from the closed facilities to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. Establish an Army Reserve Sustainment Brigade headquarters in the new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. Realign Devens Reserve Forces Training Area by relocating the 5th JTF, 654th ASG and the 382nd MP Battalion to the new Armed Forces

Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. The new Armed Forces Reserve Center shall have the capability to accommodate Massachusetts Army National Guard units from the Massachusetts Army National Guard Armory in Agawam Massachusetts, if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities and command and control structure throughout the Southeast Region of the United States. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a nation-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation supports the Army Reserve's Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four by disestablishing one major peacetime administrative headquarters, the 94th Regional Readiness Command and creating a new deployable headquarters on Westover Air Reserve Base.

This recommendation closes one Armed Forces Reserve Center in Chicopee, one United States Army Reserve Center in Springfield, Massachusetts; one United States Army Reserve Area Maintenance Support Activity in Windsor Locks, Connecticut and constructs a multi-component, multi-functional Armed Forces Reserve Center on Westover Air Reserve Base. The Marine Corps Reserve units located in the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Chicopee will relocate to the new AFRC on Westover Air Reserve Base. The Department understands that the State of Massachusetts will close one Massachusetts Army National Guard Armory in Agawam, Massachusetts. The Armed Forces Reserve Center will have the capability to accommodate these units if the State decides to relocate the units from the closed facilities into the new AFRC.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$21.6M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$96.1M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$61.2M. Annual recurring savings to the

Department after implementation are \$8.4M with a payback expected in 13 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$21.8M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Cambridge: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 243 jobs (155 direct and 88 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Cambridge-Newton-Framingham Massachusetts Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

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

**Environmental Impact:** A minor air permit revision may be needed at Westover. Additional operations may impact historic sites and sensitive resource areas and constrain operations at Westover. The hazardous waste program at Westover may need to be modified. Additional operations may impact wetlands, which may restrict operations. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.6M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **USAR Command and Control – Northeast**

**Recommendation:** Realign Pitt USARC, Coraopolis, PA by disestablishing the HQ 99th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Northeast Regional Readiness Command Headquarters at Fort Dix, NJ. Close Camp Kilmer, NJ and relocate the HQ 78th Division at Fort Dix, NJ. Realign Fort Totten, NY by disestablishing the HQ 77th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Maneuver Enhancement Brigade at Fort Dix, NJ. Realign Fort Sheridan IL by relocating the 244th Aviation Brigade to Fort Dix, NJ. Realign Fort Dix, NJ by relocating Equipment Concentration Site 27 to the New Jersey Army National Guard Mobilization and Training Equipment Site joint facility at Lakehurst, NJ. Close Charles Kelly Support Center and relocate units to Pitt US Army Reserve Center, PA. Close Carpenter USARC, Poughkeepsie, NY, close McDonald USARC, Jamaica, NY, close Fort Tilden USARC, Far Rockaway, NY, close Muller USARC, Bronx, NY, and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center at Fort Totten, NY. Close the United States Army Reserve Center on Fort Hamilton, NY and relocate the New York Recruiting Battalion Headquarters and Army Reserve units into a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Hamilton, NY. The new AFRC shall have the capacity to accommodate units from the NYARNG 47th Regiment Marcy Armory, Brooklyn and the Brooklyn Bedford Armory/OMS, Brooklyn NY if the state decides to relocate those National Guard units.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities and command and control structure throughout the Northeast Region of the United States. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a nation-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation transforms Army Reserve command and control by consolidating four major headquarters onto Fort Dix, NJ; this recommendation supports the Army Reserve's nationwide Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four. The realignment of Pitt USARC, Coraopolis, PA by the disestablishment of the 99th Regional Readiness Command allows for the establishment of the Northeast Regional Readiness Command Headquarters at Fort Dix, NJ which will further support the re-engineering and streamlining of the Command and Control structure of the Army Reserves throughout the United States. This restructuring will allow for the closure of Camp Kilmer, NJ and the relocation of the HQ 78th Division to Fort Dix and establishment of one of the new Army Reserve Sustainment Units of Action which establishes a new capability for the Army Reserve while increasing the support capabilities of the Army Reserve to the Active Army. To further support restructuring; the realignment of Fort Totten and the disestablishment of the HQ 77th RRC will enable the establishment of a Maneuver Enhancement Brigade at Fort Dix resulting in a new operational capability for the Army Reserve. The realignment of Fort Sheridan, IL by relocating the 244th Aviation Brigade to Fort Dix coupled with the Department of the Navy recommendation to close NAS Willow Grove, PA and relocate Co A/228th Aviation to Fort Dix; consolidates Army aviation assets in one location. Other actions supporting restructuring include realigning maintenance functions on Fort Dix, the closure of Charles Kelly Support Center, PA and relocation of multiple subordinate units to Pitt USARC, PA; and the closure of five US Army Reserve Centers in the greater New York City area with relocation of those units to Fort Totten. These actions will significantly enhance training, mobilization, equipment readiness and deployment.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by closing one Camp, five Army Reserve Centers, realigning five facilities and relocating forces to multiple installations throughout the Northeast Region of the United States. These actions will also improve business processes. The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new command structures will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives. The Department understands that the State of New York will close NYARNG Armories: 47th Regiment Marcy Armory, Brooklyn and Brooklyn Bedford Armory/OMS 12. The Armed Forces Reserve Centers will have the capability to accommodate

these units if the State decides to relocate the units from these closed facilities into a new AFRC on Fort Hamilton, NY.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation. Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$168.3M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidance associated with meeting Anti Terror / Force Protection construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communication requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs, would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$171.2M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$44.3M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$35.9M with a payback expected in 5 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$302.1M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in the maximum potential job reductions (direct and indirect) over the 2006-2011 period, as follows:

| <u>Economic Area</u>   | <u>Direct Job Reductions</u> | <u>Indirect Job Reductions</u> | <u>Total Job Reductions</u> | <u>% of Economic Area Employment</u> |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Edison, NJ Metropolitan Division                               | 44                           | 32                             | 76                          | Less than 0.1                        |
| New York-White Plains, NY-NJ Metropolitan Statistical Area     | 149                          | 72                             | 221                         | Less than 0.1                        |
| Lake County-Kenosha County, IL-WI Metropolitan Division        | 34                           | 53                             | 87                          | Less than 0.1                        |
| Pittsburgh Metropolitan Statistical Area                       | 530                          | 317                            | 847                         | Less than 0.1                        |
| Poughkeepsie-Newburgh-Middletown Metropolitan Statistical Area | 9                            | 5                              | 14                          | Less than 0.1                        |

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** This recommendation will require Air Conformity determination and New Source Review analysis and permitting at Fort Hamilton, Fort Totten, and Fort Dix. If facility demolition is required to enable new construction at Fort Hamilton, this may impact historic resources, causing construction delays and increased costs. Historic resources at Fort Dix and Fort Totten must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, possibly causing construction delays and increased costs. Closure of Kelly Support Center will require consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office to ensure that historic properties are continued to be protected. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required at Fort Hamilton and Fort Totten to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve US EPA water quality standards. Restoration and or monitoring of groundwater is required at Charles Kelly Support Center. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$1.3M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Although no restoration costs were reported for Charles Kelly Support Center, future costs are likely. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **USAR Command and Control – Northwest**

**Recommendation:** Close Vancouver Barracks and relocate the 104th Division (IT) to Fort Lewis, WA. Relocate all other units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center in Vancouver, WA. Close Fort Lawton by disestablishing the 70th Regional Readiness Command, relocate all other units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Lewis, WA and establish a Maneuver Enhancement Brigade. Realign Fort Snelling, MN by disestablishing the 88<sup>th</sup> Regional Readiness Command and establish the Northwest Regional Readiness Command Headquarters at Fort McCoy, WI. Realign the Wichita US Army Reserve Center by disestablishing the 89th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Sustainment Unit of Action at the Wichita Army Reserve Center in support of the Northwest Regional Readiness Command at Fort McCoy, WI. Realign Fort Douglas, UT by disestablishing the 96th Regional Readiness Command and establishing a Sustainment Unit of Action in support of the Northwest Regional Readiness Command at Fort McCoy, WI.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities and command and control structure throughout the Northwest Region of the United States. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a nation-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation supports the Army Reserve's Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four. This recommendation transforms Army Reserve command and control by consolidating two major headquarters onto Fort Lewis, Washington. This sets the conditions for establishing one of three new operationally capable Army Reserve Maneuver Enhancement Brigades which will increase the support capabilities of the Army Reserve to the Active Army and is a new operational capability for the Army Reserve. The realignment of Fort Snelling, MN by the disestablishment of the 88th Regional Readiness Command allows for the establishment of the Northwest Regional Readiness Command Headquarters at Fort McCoy, WI which will support the re-engineering and streamlining of the Command and Control structure of the Army Reserves throughout the United States.

This recommendation also realigns Fort Douglas Utah and the Wichita Army Reserve Center, establishing Sustainment Units of Action in those locations in support of the Northwest Regional Readiness Command Headquarters. Relocation of multiple subordinate units from Vancouver Barracks and Fort Lawton, WA to new Armed Forces Reserve Centers contributes significantly to enhanced training, mobilization and deployment.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by closing two Reserve facilities and relocating the units onto an Active component installation and thereby significantly reducing operating costs and creating improved business processes. The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new command structures will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$70.7M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and

communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$80.4M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$43.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$11.1M with a payback expected in 9 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$65.0M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 184 jobs (107 direct and 77 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 409 jobs (254 direct and 155 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Minneapolis-St. Paul MN-WI Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 95 jobs (51 direct and 44 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Tacoma, WA Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of the economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 154 jobs (78 direct and 76 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Wichita, KS Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 95 jobs (53 direct and 42 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Salt Lake City, UT Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** The existence of archeological and historic resources, coupled with regional tribal interest, existing restrictions and a lack of a Programmatic Agreement, may result in increased time delays and negotiated restrictions at Fort Lewis and Fort McCoy. Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service may be required regarding threatened and endangered species at Fort Lewis.. This recommendation has no impact on air quality; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.1M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Fort Lawton reports \$2.7M in environmental restoration costs. Vancouver Barracks reports \$18.4M in environmental restoration costs. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an installation is closed, realigned, or remains open, these costs were not included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **USAR Command and Control – Southeast**

**Recommendation:** Realign Birmingham Armed Forces Reserve Center Alabama by disestablishing the 81<sup>st</sup> Regional Readiness Command, and establishing the Army Reserve Southeast Regional Readiness Command in a new Armed Forces Reserve Center on Fort Jackson, SC. Close Louisville United States Army Reserve Center and relocate the 100th DIV(IT) headquarters to Fort Knox, KY.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities and command and control structure throughout the Southeast Region of the United States. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army’s force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a nation-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation supports the Army Reserve’s Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four. This recommendation transforms Army Reserve command and control by relocating one major headquarters from inadequate facilities in Birmingham, Alabama to Fort Jackson, South Carolina. This supports the initiative to consolidate command structure and responsibilities on Active Army installations, which will in turn increase the support capabilities of the Army Reserve to the Active Army while establishing a new operational capability for the Army Reserve. The relocation of the

100th Division (Institutional Training) to Fort Knox, KY supports the re-engineering and streamlining of support delivered by Army Reserve training base units in order to significantly enhance training in support of mobilization and deployment.

This recommendation reduces military manpower and associated costs for maintaining existing facilities by closing one Armed Forces Reserve Center, and moving two major commands onto Active Army installations thus significantly reducing operating costs and creating improved business processes. The implementation of this recommendation and creation of these new command structures will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$13.1M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$29.9M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$22.5M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$2.4M with a payback expected in 16 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$1.5M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 499 jobs (305 direct and 194 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Birmingham-Hoover, AL Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 65 jobs (43 direct and 22 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Louisville, KY Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** An Air Conformity determination and New Source Review and permitting effort will be required at Fort Jackson. To preserve historic and archeological resources at Fort Jackson and Fort Knox, additional training restrictions may be imposed and increased construction delays and costs are possible. Tribal consultations may be required at Fort Knox and Fort Jackson. Construction and added operations at Fort Jackson may impact threatened and endangered species at Fort Jackson and result in further training restrictions. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.2M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

### **USAR Command and Control - Southwest**

**Recommendation:** Realign the Joint Force Training Base Los Alamitos, CA by disestablishing the 63<sup>rd</sup> Regional Readiness Command (RRC) Headquarters, Robinson Hall, USARC and activating a Southwest Regional Readiness Command headquarters at Moffett Field, CA in a new AFRC. Realign Camp Pike Reserve Complex, Little Rock, AR by disestablishing the 90th RRC and activating a Sustainment Brigade. Close the Major General Harry Twaddle United States Armed Forces Reserve Center, Oklahoma City, OK, and relocate the 95th DIV (IT) to Fort Sill, OK. Realign Camp Parks Reserve Forces Training Area, CA, by relocating the 91st Div (TSD) to Fort Hunter Liggett, CA.

**Justification:** This recommendation transforms Reserve Component facilities and command and control structure throughout the Southeast Region of the United States. The implementation of this recommendation will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives.

This recommendation is the result of a nation-wide analysis of Reserve Component installations and facilities conducted by a team of functional experts from Headquarters, Department of the Army, the Office of the State Adjutant General, and the Army Reserve Regional Readiness Command.

This recommendation supports the Army Reserve's Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four. This recommendation transforms Army Reserve command and control by eliminating nondeployable command and control headquarters, transforming excess spaces into deployable units and moving institutional training units onto major training areas. It supports the Army Reserve's Command and Control restructuring initiative to reduce Regional Readiness Commands from ten to four by disestablishing two major peacetime administrative headquarters, the 63d Regional Readiness Command in Los Angeles, CA and the 90th Regional Readiness Command in Little Rock, AR and creating a new consolidated headquarters in their place at Moffett Field, CA. It supports the transformation of Army Reserve Operational Force Structure by activating a sustainment brigade in Little Rock, AR in the place of the 90th RRC, which will increase the deployable capability of the Army Reserve to support the Active Army. The Sustainment brigade is a new operational capability for the Army Reserve. This proposal transforms the Army's training support to the Reserve Component by re-locating the 95th DIV (Institutional Training) from the Major General Harry Twaddle United States Army Reserve Center, Oklahoma City, OK to Fort Sill, OK, and relocating the 91st Div (Training Support) from Camp Parks Reserve Forces Training Area, CA, to Fort Hunter Liggett, CA which improves operational effectiveness by putting these Training Divisions at major training sites in their regions.

This recommendation considered feasible locations within the demographic and geographic areas of the closing facilities and affected units. The sites selected were determined as the best locations because they optimize the Reserve Components ability to recruit and retain Reserve Component soldiers and to train and mobilize units impacted by this recommendation.

Although not captured in the COBRA analysis, this recommendation avoids an estimated \$16.8M in mission facility renovation costs and procurement avoidances associated with meeting AT/FP construction standards and altering existing facilities to meet unit training and communications requirements. Consideration of these avoided costs would reduce costs and increase the net savings to the Department of Defense in the 6-year BRAC implementation period, and in the 20-year period used to calculate NPV.

This recommendation provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

**Payback:** The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$55.5M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of \$44.1M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$3.4M with a payback expected in 23 years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$9.8M.

**Economic Impact on Communities:** Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 270 jobs (170 direct and 100 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Santa Ana-Anaheim-Irvine, CA Metropolitan Division, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 335 jobs (177 direct and 158 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Little Rock-North Little Rock, AR Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 69 jobs (43 direct and 26 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Oakland-Fremont-Hayward Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 109 jobs (53 direct and 56 indirect jobs) over the 2006 – 2011 period in the Oklahoma City, OK Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

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

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

**Environmental Impact:** Numerous archeological and historic resources, coupled with regional tribal interest, existing restrictions and a lack of a Programmatic Agreement, may result in increased time delays and negotiated restrictions at Fort Sill. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases may be required at Fort Sill to reduce impacts to water quality. Fort Hunter Liggett is over or in the recharge zone of a sole source aquifer, which may result in future regulatory limitations on training activities. This recommendation has no impact on air quality, dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately \$0.02M for waste management and/or environmental compliance activities. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed. There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation.

