

Clearinghouse Questions concerning DFAS:

1. For each DFAS site (including the three gaining sites), please provide a completed questionnaire in response to the analysis of Military Value for each DFAS installation.
2. Please provide a breakdown of how each DFAS site (including the three gaining sites) had its Facility Condition determined to be "Green, Red or Amber."
3. Please provide a cost estimate to upgrade each installation to condition Green.
4. Joint Staff Integrated Vulnerability Assessments have recently been completed on all of the DFAS sites. Please provide information on each DFAS site (including the three gaining sites) indicating whether or not the site now meets DoD Force Protection Standards and, if not, what the site needs to do to meet the standards. While many of the sites may not have met force protection standards at the time the data was collected, it appears many do today.
5. Please provide detailed information on how the cost savings for not having to implement force protection measures at leased facilities were calculated.
6. Please provide the average turnover rate for DFAS and per each site, including three gaining sites.
7. Please provide updated statistics for the following:
 - A. Eligible Employment Population in Aroostook County, ME, which is currently reported as 0 and Patuxent River, MD which is currently reported as 0.
 - B. Hiring time in Kansas City, which is currently reported as 132.5 days.
8. How were occupancy costs per square foot determined?
9. Please provide information on how personnel movements from the losing sites to the three gaining sites were determined?
10. Please justify why three DISN Points of Presence accounts for 13% of military value.
11. Please explain why locality pay only accounts for 11% of military value, when half of the DFAS budget is personnel and salary costs.



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, G-8
700 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0700
HSA-JCSG-D-05-441

DCN 4641

DAPR-ZB

July 8, 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR OSD BRAC Clearinghouse

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0476 - Inquiries From the BRAC
Commission Staff - 5 July 2005

1. Reference e-mail from Mr. Ethan Saxon, BRAC Commission Staff, 5 July 2005.

2. Issues/Questions and Responses:

a. For each DFAS site (including the three gaining sites), please provide a completed questionnaire in response to the analysis of Military Value for each DFAS installation.

Response: Per conversation with Mr. Saxon the HSA JCSG representatives will meet with Mr. Saxon and Ms. Wasleski on 8 July to provide and discuss requested information.

b. Please provide a breakdown of how each DFAS site (including the three gaining sites) had its Facility Condition determined to be "Green, Red, or Amber."

Response: This information will be forthcoming from DFAS. HSA JCSG will forward as soon as the information is available.

c. Please provide a cost estimate to upgrade each installation to condition Green.

Response: This information will be forthcoming from DFAS. HSA JCSG will forward as soon as the information is available.

d. Joint Staff Integrated Vulnerability Assessments have recently been completed on all of the DFAS sites. Please provide information on each DFAS site (including the three gaining sites) indicating whether or not the site now meets DoD Force Protection Standards and, if not, what the site needs to do to meet the standards. While many of the sites may not have met force protection standards at the time the data was collected, it appears many do today.

Response: This information will be forthcoming from DFAS. HSA JCSG will forward as soon as the information is available.

e. Please provide detailed information on how the cost savings for not having to implement force protection measures at leased facilities were calculated.

DAPR-ZB

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0476 – Inquiries From the BRAC Commission Staff - 5 July 2005

Response: The DFAS COBRA did not include any savings or cost avoidances attributable to force protection requirements no longer required at closing facilities. HSA JCSG representatives will discuss further, as appropriate, during meeting with BRAC Commission representatives on 8 July 05.

f. Please provide the average turnover rate for DFAS and per each site, including three gaining sites.

Response: This information will be forthcoming from DFAS. HSA JCSG will forward as soon as the information is available.

g. Please provide updated statistics for the following:

(1) Eligible Employment Population in Aroostook County, ME, which is currently reported as 0 and Patuxent River, MD, which is currently reported as 0.

Response: All data for this Military Value metric was gathered by accessing the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (USDOL/BoLS) website. The MSA listings for each state were reviewed to determine if the name of the site/location was included in the MSA title. Once an MSA with site name included in the title was identified, the "Civilian Labor Force" data listed for the MSA as of May 2004 was recorded. If the site name was not part of the MSA title, the site's zip code was used to map it to the appropriate MSA workforce information. Data extracted from the USDOL website represents a snap shot in time, May 2004. Therefore, a copy of the website extract associated with each location and a summary of workforce pool numbers identified for sites meeting the rule as outlined have been retained. A copy of the HSA JCSG MFR that outlines the methodology and containing copies of the website extracts will be provided and discussed, if appropriate, during meeting with BRAC Commission representatives on 8 July 05.

(2) Hiring time in Kansas City, which is currently reported as 132.5 days.

Response: The information as stated above has been certified as correct by HQ DFAS. HSA JCSG representatives will discuss further, as appropriate, during meeting with BRAC Commission representatives on 8 July 05.

h. How were occupancy costs per square foot determined?

Response: Information is forthcoming and will be provided to the BRAC Commission representatives on 11 July 05.

i. Please provide information on how personnel movements from the losing sites to the three gaining sites were determined?

Response: Information is forthcoming and will be provided to the BRAC Commission representatives on 11 July 05.

j. Please justify why three DISN Points of Presence account for 13% of military value.

DAPR-ZB

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0476 – Inquiries From the BRAC
Commission Staff - 5 July 2005

Response: HSA JCSG representatives will discuss during meeting with BRAC
Commission representatives on 8 July 05.

k. Please explain why locality pay only accounts for 11% of military value, when half of
the DFAS budget is personnel and salary costs.

Response: HSA JCSG representatives will discuss during meeting with BRAC
Commission representatives on 8 July 05.

3. Coordination: N/A


CARLA K. COULSON
COL GS
Deputy, Headquarters and
Support Activities JCSG

Consolidated Facilities Construction/Maintenance/Repair Costs by Year

	Arlington	Bratenahl	Charleston	Cleveland	Columbus	Dayton	Denver	Indianapolis	Kansas City
		No construction/maintenance/repair costs identified		GSA Site; Construction/maintenance/repairs included in lease cost			Construction/maintenance/repair costs anticipated to be covered by Buckley AFB	GSA Site; Construction/maintenance/repairs included in lease cost	GSA Site; Construction/maintenance/repairs included in lease cost
2004	\$30,000	\$0	\$238,273	\$0	\$0	\$34,500	\$0	\$0	\$0
2005	\$130,000	\$0	\$61,064	\$0	\$150,000	\$57,868	\$0	\$0	\$0
2006	\$130,000	\$0	\$72,758	\$0	\$0	\$30,434	\$0	\$0	\$0
2007	\$130,000	\$0	\$1,573,392	\$0	\$0	\$30,434	\$0	\$0	\$0
2008	\$130,000	\$0	\$70,871	\$0	\$650,000	\$30,434	\$0	\$0	\$0
2009	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2010	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2011	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$550,000	\$0	\$2,016,358	\$0	\$800,000	\$183,670	\$0	\$0	\$0
	RED	GREEN	RED	GREEN	RED	YELLOW	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN
<i>Total Required to achieve GREEN status</i>	<i>\$451,000</i>		<i>\$1,917,358</i>		<i>\$701,000</i>				

Data Sources BES FY04-05; POM FY06-08

Red: Major Construction or maintenance/repairs greater than \$250-K within the next five years;
 Yellow: Major Construction or maintenance/repairs greater than \$100 to \$250-K within the next five years;
 Green: Major Construction or maintenance/repairs less than \$100 within the next five years.

Consolidated Facilities Construction/Maintenance/Repair Costs by Year

	Lawton	Lexington	Limestone	Norfolk	Oakland	Omaha	Orlando	Pacific	Pensacola
		No construction/maintenance/repair costs identified			GSA Site; Construction/maintenance/repairs included in lease cost				
2004	\$0	\$0	\$42,472	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$165,112	\$251,520	\$179,431
2005	\$0	\$0	\$273,954	\$20,340	\$0	\$0	\$619,595	\$53,520	\$1,100,600
2006	\$0	\$0	\$634,678	\$0	\$0	\$142,000	\$35,595	\$53,520	\$1,370,600
2007	\$240,000	\$0	\$57,954	\$0	\$0	\$142,000	\$35,595	\$28,520	\$35,600
2008	\$0	\$0	\$18,378	\$100,000	\$0	\$142,000	\$35,595	\$28,520	\$0
2009	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2010	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2011	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$240,000	\$0	\$1,027,436	\$120,340	\$0	\$426,000	\$891,492	\$415,600	\$2,686,231
	YELLOW	GREEN	RED	YELLOW	GREEN	RED	RED	RED	RED
<i>Total Required to achieve GREEN status</i>	\$141,000		\$928,436	\$21,340		\$327,000	\$792,492	\$316,600	\$2,587,231

Consolidated Facilities Construction/Maintenance/Repair Costs by Year

	Rock Island	Rome	San Bernadino	San Antonio	San Diego	Seaside	St Louis
	No construction/maintenance/repair costs identified			GSA Site; Construction/maintenance/repairs included in lease cost	GSA Site; Construction/maintenance/repairs included in lease cost	No construction/maintenance/repair costs identified	GSA Site; Construction/maintenance/repairs included in lease cost
2004	\$0	\$74,485	\$215,386	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2005	\$0	\$249,020	\$99,779	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2006	\$0	\$669,645	\$99,779	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2007	\$0	\$967,345	\$99,779	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2008	\$0	\$65,120	\$99,779	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2009	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2010	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2011	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$2,025,615	\$614,502	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	GREEN	RED	RED	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN	GREEN
<i>Total Required to achieve GREEN status</i>		\$1,926,615	\$515,502				

DCN 4641

DFAS Turnover July 2004 through June 2005

(losses to DFAS)

DFAS Location	Total Employees	7 2004	8 2004	9 2004	10 2004	11 2004	12 2004	1 2005	2 2005	3 2005	4 2005	5 2005	6 2005	Total Separations	Separation Rate 7/2004-6/2005
ARLINGTON	413	5	9	11	5	3	10	3	4	3	6	4	3	66	16.0%
CHARLESTON	370	7	6	7	6	3	5	10	4	1	3	1	1	54	14.6%
CLEVELAND	1,191	1	5	20	4	2	4	5	4	4	18	7	6	80	6.7%
CLEVELAND BRATENAHL	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0%
COLUMBUS	2,103	9	15	30	6	4	6	7	6	11	35	10	7	146	6.9%
DAYTON	299	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	1	4	2	3	30	10.0%
DENVER	1,269	7	4	32	13	3	11	21	36	2	12	5	3	149	11.7%
INDIANAPOLIS	2,511	5	22	23	6	12	10	10	7	17	20	12	7	151	6.0%
KANSAS CITY	685	-	8	8	4	3	3	2	1	4	10	1	5	49	7.2%
LAWTON/FT SILL	264	3	3	2	3	2	6	2	5	1	3	2	3	35	13.3%
LEXINGTON	43	-	1	1	-	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	6	14.0%
LIMESTONE	296	1	2	-	2	3	-	2	2	1	2	1	4	20	6.8%
NORFOLK	335	4	7	16	6	15	4	2	1	1	2	4	4	66	19.7%
OAKLAND	53	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	3	5.7%
OMAHA	230	2	1	1	1	2	3	1	5	4	8	2	1	31	13.5%
ORLANDO	256	6	4	20	3	3	3	3	-	2	4	3	-	51	19.9%
PACIFIC (Ford Island)	173	1	3	1	1	3	-	1	-	1	1	-	3	15	8.7%
PATUXENT RIVER	57	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	3.5%
PENSACOLA	345	2	4	3	-	-	1	3	-	2	3	3	2	23	6.7%
PENSACOLA SAUFLEY FLD	188	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	5	2.7%
RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	58	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	3.4%
ROCK ISLAND	323	3	3	12	1	1	3	-	1	-	8	3	1	36	11.1%
ROME	359	-	-	2	2	2	-	3	2	2	4	2	4	23	6.4%
SAN ANTONIO	360	4	1	2	4	1	16	20	1	2	2	1	-	54	15.0%
SAN BERNARDINO	159	2	9	16	1	4	2	2	6	-	4	3	-	49	30.8%
SAN DIEGO	332	3	5	4	3	-	5	1	2	2	1	-	2	28	8.4%
SEASIDE	44	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	3	6.8%
ST LOUIS	349	1	4	4	6	2	3	2	2	2	9	8	5	48	13.8%
	13,075	68	119	221	81	70	101	105	93	63	161	76	67	1,225	9.4%

Criteria for Closing Sites



- Final site closure date is the completion of moving out of the prime business functions – some clean up operations may continue beyond the listed date
- For planning purposes, personnel numbers out = personnel numbers in. Actual personnel movement will depend on multiple factors and could not be calculated at time data calls were answered
- Move smaller sites early in process to gain experience
- Target sites with performance problems and/or infrastructure issues early in process
- Move field sites before central sites when possible
- Support Services will follow last group out as site clean up
- Create strategic redundancy of functions
- Ensure sites with end lease dates (i.e. San Antonio) are moved early in process and at a minimum prior to end of lease to avoid penalties/other costs
- Support systems must be operational at the receiving site before “turning off” the system at losing site