



BRAC 2005 - Query Response Manager



Response to E0468

Question:

Two separate actions affecting Fort Lee – the Combat Service Support Center (E&T 0064) and the Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern (HSA 0109v2) – have identified military construction projects at Ft Lee. Both initiatives construct a chapel (FAC 7361), an exchange sales facility (FAC 7346), an indoor physical fitness facility (FAC7346), a nursery and child care facility (FAC 7371), a recreation center (FAC 7417), and a dental facility (FAC 5400).

1. Are these facilities duplicative? Is the requirement really only one of each type facility?
2. For the Consolidate Defense Commissary Agency Eastern, only one military space transfers. All the remaining transfers are civilian. Quality of life facilities are not constructed for civilians who normally only have access to these type facilities on a space available basis. What is the justification for constructing the quality of life facilities cited above for this action?
3. Have civilian spaces been applied to justify quality of life construction in other scenarios?.

Answer:

1. Military construction for community facilities was determined based on the net impact of all recommendations that affect an installation. These requirements were then spread across all of those recommendations that moved units onto the installation. The total requirement at Ft. Lee for Chapels, exchange facilities, physical fitness facilities, etc. is a sum of what is constructed in each of the recommendations that move personnel to Ft. Lee. The facilities are not duplicative.
2. The civilian population of an installation is eligible to use the community facilities on Army installations. Civilians are eligible to use fitness facilities and chapels, are eligible for child care on a space-available basis, and generate requirements for other facilities that are used by organizations that have civilian employees. Further, a significant portion of civilian employees of the US Army are dependents or retirees who are eligible to use all of the community facilities on an installation.
3. Yes, civilian employees were a consideration in determining community facility requirements for all scenarios affecting Army installations.

References:

DCN 5360

Approved By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James H. [unclear]". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'J' and a distinct 'H'.

Date: 22-Jul-05