Fort Monmouth, NJ

Issue: Potential for the Commission to retain Fort Monmouth based upon:

- The Technical Joint Cross Service Group (TJCSG) ranked Monmouth number one in military value (MV) analysis in various technical capabilities such as Information Systems and Sensors, Electronics, and Electronic Warfare (EW).
- The loss of intellectual capital and the costs associated with training a replacement workforce. There is no gain by moving these activities to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD.
- Physically co-locating and consolidating Research, Development and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (RDAT&E) activities into Centers of Excellence impedes the healthy competition that naturally occurs when activities are dispersed at different sites/installations.

Key Points:

- The DoD recommendation to close Ft Monmouth is linked to the movement of the Ordnance School from APG and makes use of vacated buildings.
- The Military Value of APG is higher than Ft Monmouth as rated by the Army. Both the Technical JCSG and the Army determined the APG is the best site for the land C4ISR Center.
- The history of BRAC has taught us that intellectual capital loss is a temporary, manageable problem. We have moved other activities successfully and will work closely with the commands, communities, and personnel involved to conduct this move effectively and efficiently.
- APG has existing research and test facilities that accommodate the consolidation of Army research at APG and the Baltimore area.

DoD Position: Transforming DoD Research, Development, Acquisition, Testing and Evaluations (RDAT&E) organizations into Joint Centers of Excellence is a high priority for both DoD and the U.S. Army. The synergy between private industry and the Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), MD, is yielding new technology and systems that are protecting our troops during the Global War on Terrorism. The Army needs a consolidated Command, Control, Communications and Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Center of Excellence. Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, has the right characteristics and capacities to support the consolidation.

Through careful analysis of the various courses of action, both the Army and the TJCSG determined Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, was the best site for the land Command, Control, Communications and Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Center. While Fort Monmouth may score higher on selected technical capabilities than APG using the Technical JCSG's military value assessment, the military

value of APG using the criteria contained in the Army's holistic military value assessment, is significantly higher than Fort Monmouth because it has the multi-functional qualities, and capabilities and capacity (which is lacking at Fort Monmouth) that make it the best site for the Army's C4ISR RDAT&E Center of Excellence and other activities as well.

The loss of intellectual capital is expected in every realignment; however, it is a temporary setback which can be recovered from the local workforce. There is a nationally recognized science and technology (S&T) workforce concentrated in and around Harford County, host to the APG. Nearly half a million professionals working in the management, business, computer and mathematics, science and engineering sectors live within a 90 minute drive of APG.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Maryland ranks first among the states with the highest percentage (24%) of professional and technical workers in the state's labor pool. The U.S. Department of Commerce found in 2003 that Maryland is statistically tied with Massachusetts as the top state in the nation for educational attainment. Nearly 38% of Maryland's population 25 years of age and above have earned a bachelor's degree or higher. Maryland offers a high quality workforce and hosts several companies that support both current C4ISR activities at Fort Monmouth and APG-based operations. Historically, the state of Maryland and its affected communities successfully consolidated 16 geographic locations into a single integrated Research, Development, Acquisition, Technology and Evaluation (RDAT&E) center at the Patuxent River Naval Base during implementation of BRAC 1993 and 1995 recommendations.

Co-locating testing and evaluation facilities with program managers and researchers is a key part of the TJCSG strategy -- to create full spectrum RDAT&E centers where feasible. APG supports this strategy while Fort Monmouth does not. Three Program Executive Offices (PEOs) -- including the Joint PEO for Chemical/Biological Defense -- and their subordinate program managers also will be located at APG. It is essential to have a consolidated RDA center focused on land C4ISR bringing together the Communications-Electronics Research Development and Engineering Center (CERDEC) from Fort Monmouth, NJ, and the Night Vision and Electronic Sensors Directorate (NVESD) from Fort Belvoir, VA, and the information systems research assets already at APG and personnel from Fort Knox, KY, who perform human systems research in networks. Leaving NVESD out of this recommendation and moving only the Fort Monmouth functions will keep the Army's sensors research and engineering functions geographically isolated from the parent command assigned this critical mission.

With the BRAC recommendation to close Fort Monmouth, the level of activity in research and engineering at APG will be expanded to include communications, electronics, night vision, and chemical/biological defense, in addition to the existing

activities in Army Research Laboratory's Weapons and Material Research, and Human Research Engineering Directorates as well as the HQ, Army Research, Development and Engineering Command (RDECOM).

The Test and Evaluation capabilities that exist at APG today and the BRAC 2005 recommendation to consolidate the Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) Headquarters at APG are complementary and can be readily expanded to provide direct support to additional C4ISR programs while in the early development stages of acquisition.

Impact To DoD: Maintaining the status quo will prevent the Army from establishing an important RDAT&E Center of Excellence sacrificing $1.02 billion in NPV savings and retaining redundant infrastructure.

Recommendation Supporting Information

09-May-05

Fort Monmouth, NJ

Competing Recommendations and Other Information:

This recommendation incorporates the Fort Monmouth realignments from the following previously approved candidate recommendations: TECH-0035R, TECH-0047, TECH-0052, and S&S-0035R.

This recommendation is enabled by the Technical proposal forming an Army Land C4ISR Center.

Other DoD and Non-Army organizations on Ft. Monmouth will be disestablished, relocated or remain in place without garrison support. These include several small Air Force and Navy elements, an Army Audit Agency Office, a recruiting office, the 842nd Transportation Battalion office, and a Corps of Engineers office. Also moved are several DoD and other US government offices, the largest being a Department of Justice Office containing 108 US Civilain employees.

Force Structure Capabilities:

This recommendation ensures that the Department will retain necessary capabilities to support the Force Structure Plan. The closure of Ft. Monmouth shuts down 1.3 Million square feet of administrative facilities and recommends the occupation of excess administrative space at Aberdeen Proving Ground. The totality of the recommendations for administrative and research facilities retains sufficient capacity to ensure the Department has the capability to support the Force Structure Plan.

MVA Results:

This recommendation enhances the military value of the Army and the Department of Defense. The movement of the USMA Prepatory School to West Point enhances Army military value by moving the school to an installation with a higher value for Institutional Training (Ft. Monmouth-49th, West Point-11th). The military value analysis for the Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation functions was conducted by the Technical Joint Cross Service Group (Tab1). The military value analysis for the supply and storage functions was conducted by the Supply and Storage Joint Cross service Group (Tab 2). Finally, the Army analyzed overall military value (Tab 3).

Capacity Analysis Results:

Aberdeen has excess administrative space and 5003 buildable acres. West Point has 353,000 square feet of excess general purpose instructional facilities and another 746,000 square feet of administrative space. Detailed capacity information is at Tabs 4 - 6.

Recommendation Supporting Information

09-May-05

Fort Monmouth, NJ

TAB A - Military Value for Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Test and Evaluations Functions

TAB B Military Value for Supply and Storage Functions

TAB C - Army Overall Military Value

TAB D - Capacity Results for Research, Development, and Acquisition and Test and Evaluation Functions

TAB E Capacity Results for Supply and Storage Functions

TAB F - Army Capacity Analysis Results

**** End of Report ****

Army Human Systems Research Military Value

SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	0.6502
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	**0.4053**
FORT MONMOUTH	**0.1412**
FORT BELVOIR	**0.1182**
FORT KNOX	**0.1144**
ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER	**0.1006**

29 locations were exempted from consideration as a consequence of a TJCSG decision not to analyze locations with less than 31 full time equivalent work years in a function. It was the military judgment of the TJCSG that the benefit to be derived from consideration of those facilities was far outweighed by the cost of that analysis.

Army Information Systems Technology D&A Military Value

FORT MONMOUTH	**0.4845**
CECOM San Diego	0.2933
Fort Lewis	0.2933
REDSTONE ARSENAL	**0.2330**
FORT BELVOIR	**0.2268**
FT HOOD	0.2187
FT GORDON	0.2158
FORT HUACHUCA	0.1821
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	**0.1622**
Fort Lee	0.1389
Warner Robbins AFB	0.1301
CECOM Los Angeles	0.1301
USA_4_Arlington	**0.0733**
ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER	**0.0723**

20 locations were exempted from consideration as a consequence of a TJCSG decision not to analyze locations with less than 31 full time equivalent work years in a function. It was the military judgment of the TJCSG that the benefit to be derived from consideration of those facilities was far outweighed by the cost of that analysis.

Army Information Systems Technology Research Military Value

FORT MONMOUTH	**0.4574**
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	**0.2864**
ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER	**0.2563**
WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	0.1527
FORT BELVOIR	**0.0744**

16 locations were exempted from consideration as a consequence of a TJCSG decision not to analyze locations with less than 31 full time equivalent work years in a function. It was the military judgment of the TJCSG that the benefit to be derived from consideration of those facilities was far outweighed by the cost of that analysis.

Army Sensors, Electronics, and EW D&A Military Value

FORT MONMOUTH	**0.4337**
REDSTONE ARSENAL	**0.3402**
FORT BELVOIR	**0.2524**
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	**0.2250**
Warner Robbins AFB	0.2247
CECOM Los Angeles	0.2247

18 locations were exempted from consideration as a consequence of a TJCSG decision not to analyze locations with less than 31 full time equivalent work years in a function. It was the military judgment of the TJCSG that the benefit to be derived from consideration of those facilities was far outweighed by the cost of that analysis.

Army Sensors, Electronics, and EW Research Military Value

ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER	**0.5018**
FORT BELVOIR	**0.3972**
FORT MONMOUTH	**0.3392**
REDSTONE ARSENAL	**0.2378**

12 locations were exempted from consideration as a consequence of a TJCSG decision not to analyze locations with less than 31 full time equivalent work years in a function. It was the military judgment of the TJCSG that the benefit to be derived from consideration of those facilities was far outweighed by the cost of that analysis.

Draft Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only -- Do Not Release Under FOIA

TAB 2 - Military Value for Supply and Storage Functions

S&S JCSG Military Value Scores and Ranking for all ICPs

Name of Activity	Military Score	Military Value Ranking
Hill AFB	.2090	1 0f 16
Fort Monmouth	.2035	2 0f 16
NAVICP Philadelphia	.1994	3 0f 16
Robins AFB	.1956	4 of 16
DSC Columbus	.1909	5 of 16
NAVICP Mechanicsburg	.1884	6 of 16
Tinker AFB	.1855	7 of 16
Redstone Arsenal	.1793	8 of 16
DSC Richmond	.1778	9 of 16
MCLB Albany	.1770	10 of 16
Detroit Arsenal	.1701	11 of 16
Rock Island	.1666	12 of 16
DSC Philadelphia	.1588	13 of 16
Lackland AFB	.0853	14 of 16
Fort Huachuca	.0722	15 0f 16
Soldier System Center	.0301	16 0f 16

Draft Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only -- Do Not Release Under FOIA

Draft Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only -- Do Not Release Under FOIA

TAB 3 - Overall Army Military Value

Army Military Value Results

Includes the overall value for each of 87 installations and 10 leases.

Includes the ranking for each of six Army Capabilities for each of 87 installations and 10 leases.

Installation	Rank	Overall Score	Rank	Training Score	Rank	Future Score	Rank	PP Score	Rank	Logisitics Score	Rank	Cost Score	Rank	WB Score
Ft Bliss	1	6.25	3	8.71	7	6.07	13	6.21	7	2.65	21	6.32	41	4.26
Ft Lewis	2	5.76	8	6.56	9	5.87	1	8.29	14	1.87	16	6.57	59	3.28
Ft Hood	3	5.70	10	6.19	1	7.67	5	7.04	16	1.83	38	5.74	50	3.71
Ft Stewart / Hunter AAF	4	5.48	13	5.84	2	6.95	3	7.78	17	1.83	41	5.65	89	2.27
Ft Bragg	5	5.37	9	6.30	10	5.84	2	7.81	25	1.25	35	5.81	77	2.64
Yuma PG	6	5.31	2	9.36	8	5.90	67	1.92	5	2.90	69	4.66	95	1.57
Ft Carson	7	5.26	6	7.10	20	4.35	7	7.00	19	1.80	66	4.82	51	3.62
Dugway PG	8	5.25	5	8.12	10	5.84	64	1.98	4	2.93	18	6.55	56	3.32
Ft Benning	9	5.24	7	6.57	25	4.03	4	7.50	27	1.18	34	5.84	20	5.11
White Sands MR	10	5.16	4	8.39	15	5.23	48	2.43	3	3.26	39	5.72	92	1.89
Ft Wainwright	11	5.09	1	9.71	17	4.69	57	2.14	6	2.78	97	2.50	76	2.64
Ft Knox	12	4.91	14	5.77	23	4.21	12	6.44	12	1.92	14	6.67	52	3.59
Ft Riley	13	4.89	16	5.49	3	6.43	8	6.71	30	1.15	68	4.72	82	2.40
Ft Campbell	14	4.81	17	5.10	4	6.14	6	7.03	28	1.18	59	5.08	84	2.37
Ft Drum	15	4.71	12	6.05	5	6.13	26	4.68	31	1.15	71	4.57	53	3.47
Ft Polk	16	4.67	15	5.76	6	6.11	21	5.16	31	1.15	54	5.22	87	2.28
Ft Irwin	17	4.56	11	6.18	24	4.18	38	3.76	8	2.60	83	4.00	8	5.69
Aberdeen PG	18	4.18	25	3.06	16	4.92	19	5.22	13	1.90	2	7.79	33	4.75
Ft Sill	19	4.03	18	5.03	57	2.26	9	6.62	29	1.17	53	5.30	78	2.49
Schofield Barracks	20	3.95	19	4.88	33	3.82	18	5.26	18	1.82	96	2.96	66	2.97
Ft Huachuca	21	3.86	20	4.34	19	4.54	39	3.60	38	0.99	30	5.96	42	4.22
Ft AP Hill	22	3.68	21	4.06	14	5.34	45	2.83	33	1.13	49	5.40	57	3.32
Ft Dix	23	3.47	29	2.12	34	3.74	16	5.81	64	0.16	23	6.31	4	6.08
Ft Mc Coy	24	3.21	23	3.53	35	3.65	34	3.96	41	0.72	78	4.28	68	2.95
Anniston AD	25	3.19	35	1.04	61	2.01	11	6.46	2	3.42	7	7.05	94	1.68
Ft Jackson	26	3.14	24	3.16	31	3.86	40	3.51	65	0.15	32	5.88	58	3.31
McAlester AAP	27	3.10	37	0.95	18	4.64	20	5.18	21	1.63	26	6.22	85	2.34
Ft Rucker	28	3.07	22	3.63	50	2.53	47	2.73	39	0.94	13	6.71	64	3.02
Ft Richardson	29	3.00	27	2.75	29	3.91	33	3.99	62	0.18	73	4.48	54	3.46
Redstone Arsenal	30	2.99	30	2.00	40	3.20	42	3.15	42	0.71	1	8.47	44	4.09
Hawthorne AD	31	2.97	26	2.87	12	5.56	61	1.99	35	1.11	86	3.65	83	2.39
Crane AD	32	2.92	32	1.22	27	3.97	30	4.39	9	2.38	63	4.98	86	2.31
Ft Eustis	33	2.91	43	0.77	49	2.57	10	6.55	58	0.23	27	6.17	17	5.17
Ft Gordon	34	2.80	28	2.62	30	3.88	77	1.77	54	0.33	42	5.64	26	5.01
Ft Leonard Wood	35	2.79	31	1.60	13	5.44	76	1.78	26	1.19	70	4.61	34	4.70
Ft Lee	36	2.79	49	0.59	39	3.21	14	6.08	67	0.15	37	5.74	37	4.57
Tobyhanna AD	37	2.79	69	0.36	81	1.06	32	4.38	1	4.24	6	7.29	39	4.39
Ft Belvoir	38	2.70	46	0.67	32	3.82	37	3.93	44	0.63	5	7.41	47	3.76
Letterkenny AD	39	2.69	42	0.78	36	3.63	28	4.51	34	1.13	52	5.34	48	3.75
Red River AD	40	2.61	39	0.88	60	2.02	15	5.81	24	1.31	50	5.38	73	2.67
Sierra AD	41	2.49	34	1.07	26	4.00	27	4.57	47	0.55	94	3.37	80	2.44
Tooele AD	42	2.48	40	0.87	41	3.19	31	4.38	45	0.62	46	5.54	70	2.81
Ft Sam Houston	43	2.42	33	1.21	65	1.84	44	2.97	57	0.24	3	7.78	14	5.31
Deseret Chem Plant	44	2.36	41	0.80	28	3.96	46	2.82	63	0.16	57	5.10	30	4.84
Bluegrass AD	45	2.34	53	0.43	80	1.09	17	5.54	43	0.68	56	5.12	12	5.35
Walter Reed AMC	46	2.33	81	0.31	48	2.60	35	3.93	73	0.14	9	6.94	29	4.91
Picatinny Arsenal	47	2.33	50	0.49	21	4.34	79	1.62	50	0.44	15	6.66	16	5.18
Watervliet Arsenal	48	2.25	79	0.33	63	1.96	25	4.69	53	0.33	28	6.13	43	4.11

Draft Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only -- Do Not Release Under FOIA

Ft Meade	49	2.25	78	0.34	38	3.28	51	2.34	67	0.15	17	6.55	2	6.27
Ft Monmouth	49	2.25	62	0.36	58	2.20	36	3.93	48	0.53	11	6.88	46	3.80
Ft McPherson	51	2.22	83	0.30	82	0.97	22	5.10	81	0.14	12	6.75	28	4.92
Ft Gillem	52	2.20	82	0.30	83	0.92	23	5.01	61	0.18	20	6.37	13	5.32
Rock Island Arsenal	53	2.14	59	0.37	73	1.38	29	4.41	37	1.00	19	6.50	72	2.67
MOT Sunny Point	54	2.09	69	0.36	51	2.46	24	4.74	81	0.14	60	5.07	90	2.25
Pueblo Chem Depot	55	2.03	36	1.02	37	3.54	54	2.24	49	0.48	74	4.46	91	2.21
Ft Detrick	56	1.98	69	0.36	62	1.98	58	2.12	59	0.22	4	7.42	18	5.16
Soldier Systems Center	57	1.96	66	0.36	79	1.18	43	3.09	76	0.14	8	7.00	19	5.16
Charles Kelley	58	1.93	69	0.36	84	0.86	41	3.34	73	0.14	43	5.61	1	6.64
Milan AAP	59	1.92	54	0.40	55	2.36	53	2.27	15	1.86	48	5.52	93	1.87
Mississippi AAP	60	1.91	69	0.36	44	2.96	49	2.39	55	0.30	24	6.28	79	2.46
West Point	61	1.88	38	0.93	43	3.09	78	1.67	69	0.15	75	4.42	49	3.73
Ft Leavenworth	62	1.85	60	0.37	47	2.60	82	1.55	66	0.15	47	5.54	5	5.78
Newport Chem Depot	63	1.85	51	0.46	22	4.34	91	1.09	83	0.14	55	5.16	75	2.66
Pine Buff Arsenal	64	1.84	46	0.67	64	1.86	75	1.79	11	1.98	22	6.32	97	0.91
Ft Mc Nair	65	1.83	52	0.44	56	2.27	63	1.98	83	0.14	33	5.87	38	4.52
Ft Myer	66	1.81	62	0.36	59	2.12	65	1.98	76	0.14	31	5.89	27	5.00
Kansas AAP	67	1.80	45	0.68	54	2.38	97	0.74	23	1.46	36	5.81	60	3.28
Ft Monroe	68	1.79	62	0.36	70	1.57	50	2.36	73	0.14	45	5.57	10	5.48
Lake City AAP	69	1.78	66	0.36	46	2.70	93	0.91	46	0.58	51	5.37	11	5.45
Iowa AAP	70	1.78	44	0.68	45	2.73	94	0.88	20	1.66	79	4.18	55	3.37
Lone Star AAP	71	1.73	69	0.36	42	3.18	95	0.86	22	1.48	67	4.77	73	2.67
Adelphi Labs	72	1.71	56	0.37	69	1.74	60	2.00	60	0.22	44	5.59	36	4.62
Ft Hamilton	73	1.69	85	0.27	53	2.40	66	1.92	83	0.14	80	4.16	15	5.30
Detroit Arsenal	74	1.63	61	0.36	75	1.35	87	1.32	71	0.14	10	6.92	31	4.79
Carlisle	75	1.62	55	0.38	71	1.53	80	1.57	76	0.14	40	5.70	21	5.05
Lima Tank Plant	76	1.60	84	0.30	72	1.42	62	1.99	36	1.07	61	5.07	61	3.23
Corpus Christi ADA	77	1.59	62	0.36	85	0.65	90	1.18	10	2.09	25	6.26	65	3.02
Scranton AAP	78	1.55	80	0.33	68	1.75	81	1.56	51	0.41	72	4.53	35	4.63
USAG Michigan	79	1.51	69	0.36	78	1.20	89	1.28	83	0.14	29	6.04	31	4.79
Radford AAP	80	1.51	86	0.24	52	2.41	92	1.02	40	0.85	64	4.97	71	2.75
Ft Shafter	81	1.48	58	0.37	74	1.35	55	2.18	76	0.14	65	4.91	62	3.22
Ft Buchanan	82	1.47	66	0.36	89	0.32	56	2.17	69	0.15	76	4.35	3	6.23
Holston AAP	83	1.44	77	0.34	67	1.78	95	0.86	56	0.28	58	5.08	40	4.37
Presidio Of Monterey	84	1.35	56	0.37	77	1.22	52	2.33	71	0.14	81	4.11	81	2.43
Umatilla Chem Depot	85	1.31	48	0.62	66	1.78	88	1.32	76	0.14	84	3.85	88	2.27
Riverbank AAP	89	1.18	87	0.18	76	1.30	86	1.48	51	0.41	62	5.06	96	1.13
Tripler AMC	87	1.26	69	0.36	86	0.58	58	2.12	83	0.14	77	4.34	66	2.97
Lease - HQ, ATEC	86	1.27	87	0.18	87	0.58	68	1.91	88	0.00	82	4.04	22	5.02
Lease - Rosslyn Complex	88	1.20	87	0.18	88	0.48	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	22	5.02
Lease - Bailey's Crossroads	90	1.16	87	0.18	91	0.00	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	7	5.74
Lease - Army Research	91	1.15	87	0.18	91	0.00	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	9	5.53
Lease - Crystal City Complex	92	1.11	87	0.18	91	0.00	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	22	5.02
Lease - Hoffman complex	92	1.11	87	0.18	91	0.00	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	22	5.02
Lease - ARPERCEN	94	1.06	87	0.18	91	0.00	83	1.49	88	0.00	95	3.22	6	5.75
Lease - PEO STRICOM	95	1.01	87	0.18	90	0.29	83	1.49	88	0.00	87	3.46	45	4.02
Lease - Army JAG Agency	96	0.94	87	0.18	91	0.00	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	69	2.83
Lease - Army JAG School	97	0.91	87	0.18	91	0.00	83	1.49	88	0.00	85	3.80	63	3.07

TAB 4 - Capacity for Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation Functions

Facility Name	Current Capacity SqFt	Current Usage SqFt	Max Potential Capacity SqFt	Capacity Available to Surge SqFt	Required to Surge SqFt	Excess Capacity SqFt
SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	150,511	205,538	150,511	(55,027)	226,092	(75,581)
FORT MONMOUTH	**1,092,988**	**589,466**	**1,092,988**	**503,522**	**648,413**	**444,575**
ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER	**343,645**	**199,721**	**343,645**	**143,924**	**219,693**	**123,952**
WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	**147,158**	**19,840**	**147,158**	**127,318**	**21,824**	**125,334**
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	**9,714,389**	**1,142,141**	**9,714,389**	**8,572,249**	**1,256,355**	**8,458,035**
FORT DETRICK	431,550	370,948	431,550	60,602	408,042	23,508
FORT BELVOIR	**589,570**	**270,043**	**589,570**	**319,527**	**297,048**	**292,523**
USA_4_Arlington	**175,669**	**21,440**	**175,669**	**154,229**	**23,584**	**152,085**
FT GORDON	197,994	53,440	197,994	144,554	58,784	139,210
USA_3_Orlando	225,871	116,928	225,871	108,943	128,621	97,250
REDSTONE ARSENAL	**1,817,021**	**1,840,958**	**1,817,021**	**(23,937)**	**2,025,054**	**(208,033)**
FORT RUCKER	167,903	69,531	167,903	98,372	76,484	91,419
DETROIT ARSENAL	425,784	476,640	425,784	(50,856)	524,304	(98,520)
FT HOOD	481,813	83,787	481,813	398,026	92,165	389,648
FORT HUACHUCA	84,321	86,994	84,321	(2,673)	95,693	(11,372)
FORT MONMOUTH San Diego	441,460	96,693	441,460	344,767	106,363	335,097

TAB 5 – Capacity Results for Supply and Storage Functions

S&S JCSG Capacity Analysis Results. Individual activity infrastructure was analyzed by examining the productivity of key resource inputs, e.g. labor (man-hours) and actual space (office, warehouse, etc.). A low rate of productivity for key resource inputs was assumed to indicate either inefficient use of resources and/or excess resource capacities. The capacity methodology utilized a standard product and standard resource productivity rates to determine excess capacity in the Supply function. The S&S JCSG concluded that sufficient excess Supply capacity existed to warrant development of BRAC scenarios derived from optimization modeling maximized military value while minimizing the number of open activities. Capacity analysis results are provided below.

Location	Purchasing / budgeting labor (FTE)	Supply labor (FTE)	Technical labor (FTE)	Work space (SF)
CO MCLB ALBANY GA	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	7	231	184	626,043
Current Usage	45	72	33	31,578
Max Potential Capacity	7	231	184	626,043
Capacity Available to Surge	(38)	159	151	594,465
Capacity Required to Surge	9	15	7	6,316
Excess Capacity	(38)	159	151	594,465
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	(47)	144	144	588,149
DEFENSE SUPPLY CENTER COLUMBUS	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	723	528	637	307,230
Current Usage	531	854	391	373,318
Max Potential Capacity	723	528	637	307,230
Capacity Available to Surge	192	(326)	246	(66,088)
Capacity Required to Surge	107	171	78	74,663
Excess Capacity	192	(326)	246	(66,088)
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	86	(497)	168	(140,751)
DEFENSE SUPPLY CENTER PHILADELPHIA	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	1,044	891	365	253,699
Current Usage	1,143	1,837	841	803,037
Max Potential Capacity	1,044	891	365	253,699
Capacity Available to Surge	(99)	(947)	(475)	(549,338)

Capacity Required to Surge	228	367	168	160,607
Excess Capacity	(99)	(947)	(475)	(549,338)
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	(327)	(1,314)	(643)	(709,945)
DEFENSE SUPPLY CENTER RICHMOND	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	758	989	188	437,318
Current Usage	424	681	312	297,679
Max Potential Capacity	758	989	188	437,318
Capacity Available to Surge	334	308	(124)	139,639
Capacity Required to Surge	84	136	62	59,535
Excess Capacity	334	308	(124)	139,639
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	250	172	(186)	80,104
DETROIT ARSENAL (ILSC)	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	115	363	766	155,216
Current Usage	11	18	8	7,691
Max Potential Capacity	115	363	766	155,216
Capacity Available to Surge	104	345	758	147,525
Capacity Required to Surge	2	3	2	1,538
Excess Capacity	104	345	758	147,525
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	102	342	756	145,987
FT HUACHUCA (CSLA)	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	3	85	27	37,500
Current Usage	9	14	7	6,296
Max Potential Capacity	3	85	27	37,500
Capacity Available to Surge	(6)	71	20	31,204
Capacity Required to Surge	2	3	1	1,260
Excess Capacity	(6)	71	20	31,204
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	(8)	68	19	29,944
FT MONMOUTH (CECOM-ICP)	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	90	325	474	520,547
Current Usage	12	20	9	8,783
Max Potential Capacity	90	325	474	520,547
Capacity Available to Surge	78	305	465	511,764
Capacity Required to Surge	3	4	2	1,757
Excess Capacity	78	305	465	511,764

Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	75	301	463	510,007
Hill AFB-NICP				
Current Capacity	252	414	220	162,648
Current Usage	24	38	18	16,726
Max Potential Capacity	252	414	220	162,648
Capacity Available to Surge	228	376	202	145,922
Capacity Required to Surge	5	8	3	3,345
Excess Capacity	228	376	202	145,922
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	223	368	199	142,577
Lackland AFB-NICP				
Current Capacity	na	16	na	810
Current Usage	na	7	na	3,171
Max Potential Capacity	na	16	na	810
Capacity Available to Surge	na	9	na	(2,361)
Capacity Required to Surge	na	2	na	634
Excess Capacity	na	9	na	(2,361)
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	na	7	na	(2,995)
NAVICP_MECH				
Current Capacity	169	282	164	179,354
Current Usage	67	108	49	47,285
Max Potential Capacity	169	282	164	179,354
Capacity Available to Surge	102	174	115	132,069
Capacity Required to Surge	14	22	10	9,457
Excess Capacity	102	174	115	132,069
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	88	152	105	122,612
NAVICP_PHIL				
Current Capacity	169	330	140	180,180
Current Usage	70	113	52	49,453
Max Potential Capacity	169	330	140	180,180
Capacity Available to Surge	99	217	88	130,727
Capacity R equired to Surge	14	23	10	9,890
Excess Capacity	99	217	88	130,727
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	85	194	78	120,837
REDSTONE ARSENAL (AMCOM-ICP)				
Current Capacity	2	286	588	107,919
Current Usage	9	15	7	6,437

Max Potential Capacity	2	286	588	107,919
Capacity Available to Surge	(7)	271	581	101,482
Capacity Required to Surge	2	3	1	1,288
Excess Capacity	(7)	271	581	101,482
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	(9)	268	580	100,194
Robins AFB-NICP				
Current Capacity	146	966	124	214,020
Current Usage	117	188	86	82,393
Max Potential Capacity	146	966	124	214,020
Capacity Available to Surge	29	778	38	131,627
Capacity Required to Surge	24	38	17	16,478
Excess Capacity	29	778	38	131,627
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	5	740	21	115,149
ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL (TACOM-ICP)				
Current Capacity	187	245	410	315,729
Current Usage	247	397	182	173,661
Max Potential Capacity	187	245	410	315,729
Capacity Available to Surge	(60)	(153)	228	142,068
Capacity Required to Surge	50	79	36	34,733
Excess Capacity	(60)	(153)	228	142,068
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	(110)	(232)	192	107,335
SOLDIER SYSTEM COMMAND (TACOM-ICP)				
Current Capacity	na	66	3	81,259
Current Usage	na	1	0*	412
Max Potential Capacity	na	66	3	81,259
Capacity Available to Surge	na	65	3	80,847
Capacity Required to Surge	na	0	1	82
Excess Capacity	na	65	3	80,847
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	na	65	2	80,765
Tinker AFB-NICP				
Current Capacity	196	817	78	105,088
Current Usage	45	72	33	31,363
Max Potential Capacity	196	817	78	105,088
Capacity Available to Surge	151	745	45	73,725
Capacity Required to Surge	9	14	6	6,272

Excess Capacity	151	745	45	73,725
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	142	731	39	67,453

n/a – no resources reported for that function

* - In this case the amount of work required of SOLDIER SYSTEM COMMAND (TACOM-ICP) by the capacity model (see S&S JCSG Capacity Report dated 29 November 2004 for a full discussion of the capacity model) was equivalent to .43 FTEs, rounded down to 0.

( ) Denotes negative number.

TAB 6 – Army Capacity Analysis Results

INSTALLATION	1711 General Purpose Instruction Building	1712 Applied Instruction Building	1717 Organizational Classroom	2111 Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	2141 Vehicle Maintenance Shop	6100 General Administrative Building	6101 Small Unit Headquarters Building	6102 Large Unit Headquarters Building	7210 Enlisted Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	7213 Student Barracks	7218 Recruit/ Trainee Barracks	7220 Dining Facility	7240 Officer Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	8521 Vehicle Parking, Surfaced
Aberdeen Proving Ground	86	-33	61	-161	-3	283	-30	-7	116	-184	0	-42	-24	-130
Adelphi Laboratory Center	0	0	0	0	-17	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anniston Army Depot	0	0	0	0	-23	-35	-1	0	-4	0	0	-6	-4	263
Blue Grass Army Depot	-9	0	0	0	-2	-60	-10	-3	0	0	0	-22	0	-73
Carlisle Barracks	-53	0	0	0	0	-48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles E Kelly Spt Fac	6	0	0	0	2	35	0	0	-5	0	0	0	-5	-154
Corpus Christi Army Depot	0	0	0	-60	0	21	-1	0	0	0	0	-6	0	-287
Crane Army Ammunition Activity	0	0	-2	0	-5	28	-17	-6	0	0	0	-33	0	-204
Deseret Chemical Depot	0	0	1	0	0	-22	0	0	0	0	0	-13	0	-154
Detroit Arsenal	-9	0	9	21	0	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-159
Dugway Proving Ground	-1	19	0	0	4	-12	-19	-7	37	0	0	-17	28	-99
Fort A P Hill	6	0	22	4	-9	27	-18	9	-8	0	5	-16	3	-257
Fort Belvoir	185	-32	-1	97	100	10	-63	-9	65	-71	0	5	-133	212
Fort Benning	-146	-130	-2	124	-21	-29	-39	62	140	-429	-507	53	-247	592
Fort Bliss	-203	59	38	4	-27	242	-303	-7	217	-221	0	-198	-227	1,631
Fort Bragg	-245	-37	57	70	-896	-1,132	-1,651	-228	-1,350	-1,411	-12	-49	0	1,315
Fort Buchanan	-1	-1	0	-2	-14	-69	-9	-12	-4	-8	0	-21	-35	-376
Fort Campbell	-57	-6	-114	-197	-589	-146	-751	-137	-367	-61	0	2	-463	673
Fort Carson	-4	0	-33	62	-69	53	-283	95	25	-12	0	-37	-287	1,254
Fort Detrick	-1	0	0	0	0	-211	-2	0	-23	0	0	-7	-12	-4
Fort Dix	-25	53	-3	-13	-131	-30	20	3	-27	-415	0	-207	1	-310
Fort Drum	-38	-16	-54	-18	-146	-114	-587	-124	-556	-44	0	-174	-262	-198
Fort Eustis	-69	-1,363	-6	-29	-59	-67	179	-47	132	-516	0	-88	-65	766
Fort Gillem	8	10	0	0	0	-109	23	-49	0	0	0	-6	0	-4
Fort Gordon	-285	-148	-25	0	-134	33	-151	-72	134	-287	0	-94	-155	702
Fort Hamilton	-5	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	-12	-245
Fort Hood	-116	57	-202	-408	-605	-231	-1,683	-561	-894	-133	0	-240	-834	-3,270
Fort Huachuca	-9	121	-28	72	-92	122	-217	-27	-119	-8	0	-29	-176	576
Fort Jackson	149	161	36	0	-1	-45	-397	-6	46	-792	-687	-70	21	8
Fort Knox	19	89	-54	-105	205	680	-744	22	-3	-35	-245	44	-113	1,360
Fort Leavenworth	-6	-1	0	0	-2	-32	-70	-9	44	-11	0	-25	-153	-475
Fort Lee	-160	-98	-27	0	-45	-8	-130	17	29	-437	0	-68	-50	-93
Fort Leonard Wood	-262	-174	-29	0	44	-84	-406	-82	-320	-12	-395	-285	0	824
Fort Lewis	37	53	-1	88	236	150	-361	64	150	-65	0	-152	-435	1,202
Fort McCoy	65	49	-7	40	30	-24	-124	-18	-20	-254	0	-206	-11	225
Fort McNair	-31	-10	0	0	0	51	-8	0	37	0	0	0	0	-28
Fort McPherson	0	0	-9	0	0	6	0	-13	33	0	0	-13	0	-125
Fort Meade	159	-43	0	0	10	-114	-15	67	-2	0	0	-22	-4	288
Fort Monmouth	0	1	-24	0	-3	1	-10	0	111	0	0	-6	0	-322
Fort Monroe	-21	1	0	0	4	241	-2	0	-7	-3	0	7	-44	-165
Fort Myer	0	0	4	0	-2	129	-73	-15	232	0	0	0	0	-110
Fort Polk	-17	-17	-60	26	-31	-137	-176	-28	-209	-105	0	-127	-18	136
Fort Richardson	-18	-5	-22	-7	91	40	72	56	327	14	0	-5	-14	213
Fort Riley	-4	0	-1	60	-23	28	-168	11	-245	-3	0	-28	-7	-92
Fort Rucker	-30	77	-19	-255	-6	286	-82	37	76	-75	0	-9	-366	55
Fort Sam Houston	-32	-49	19	0	-22	766	10	32	72	0	0	17	0	184
Fort Shafter	-21	0	-23	0	-38	-276	-66	-12	9	0	0	-13	-6	32
Fort Sill	-85	0	-33	84	-154	156	-327	200	133	-169	-260	1	0	1,236

DCN: 11916

INSTALLATION	1711 General Purpose Instruction Building	1712 Applied Instruction Building	1717 Organizational Classroom	2111 Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	7141 Vehicle Maintenance Shop	6100 General Administrative Building	6101 Small Unit Headquarters Building	6102 Large Unit Headquarters Building	7210 Enlisted Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	7213 Student Barracks	7218 Recruit/ Trainee Barracks	7230 Dining Facility	7240 Officer Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	8521 Vehicle Parking, Surfaced
Fort Stewart	23	4	-91	-36	-364	-241	-682	-154	-930	-15	0	8	-360	-119
Fort Wainwright	3	-2	-2	-192	-24	16	5	26	292	-1	0	23	-78	82
Hawthorne Army Depot	25	0	0	0	32	96	1	0	30	0	0	0	31	-133
Holston AAP	0	0	0	0	0	83	-1	0	0	0	0	-6	0	-103
Iowa AAP	0	2	1	0	17	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-24
Kansas AAP	0	0	0	0	21	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Lake City AAP	2	1	0	0	17	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-31
Letterkenny Army Depot	0	0	0	0	0	-34	-7	0	11	0	0	0	0	0
Lima Army Tank Plt	0	8	0	0	52	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-83
Lone Star AAP	0	0	0	0	16	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	396
Louisiana AAP	0	0	0	0	35	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192
McAlester AAP	56	0	-1	0	31	24	7	0	0	-6	0	-6	0	-248
Milan AAP	0	0	1	0	17	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-139
Military Ocean Tml Sunny Point	0	0	0	0	-2	0	-6	-3	0	0	0	-17	0	0
Mississippi AAP	8	0	0	0	10	211	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-81
Newport Chem Depot	0	0	0	0	5	24	0	0	0	0	0	-13	0	-150
NTC and Fort Irwin, CA	-32	7	-28	-1	-492	-178	-447	-90	-264	0	48	-236	-37	223
Picatinny Arsenal	0	0	0	0	-27	228	0	-8	7	0	0	0	1	-61
Pine Bluff Arsenal	-8	-1	0	0	0	66	-6	0	9	0	0	0	-5	-7
Presidio of Monterey	-140	-50	0	0	0	49	0	-7	-82	-124	61	-8	0	36
Pueblo Chem Depot	0	0	0	0	106	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	796
Radford AAP	7	0	0	0	0	161	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	-105
Red River Army Depot	-1	0	0	0	3	-45	0	0	0	0	0	-6	0	924
Redstone Arsenal	-38	-12	0	0	-42	-551	-34	-19	68	-38	0	0	0	86
Riverbank AAP	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-61
Rock Island Arsenal	-1	77	7	0	0	547	0	0	-5	0	0	0	0	-18
Schofield Barracks	-22	0	-103	-124	-289	-394	-192	-93	387	-10	0	-27	0	-1,048
Scranton AAP	0	0	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-152
Sierra Army Depot	2	0	0	0	-33	36	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0
Soldier Systems Center	0	0	-2	0	0	-26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tobyhanna Army Depot	-2	0	0	0	-2	-8	-4	-3	0	-10	0	-8	0	18
Tooele Army Depot	-3	0	0	0	-6	-86	-7	0	-6	0	0	-11	0	-3
Tripler Army Medical Center	0	0	0	0	0	-97	0	7	-42	-10	0	0	0	-256
Umatilla Chem Depot	3	0	0	0	23	8	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	-4
US Army Garrison Selfridge	0	0	-4	0	-2	10	0	-8	129	0	0	17	0	-5
Walter Reed AMC	32	25	12	0	11	44	17	13	-21	-42	0	-22	-216	-224
Watervliet Arsenal	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Point Mil Reservation	353	-169	0	65	29	746	-23	-3	-195	-4	0	148	-82	-142
White Sands Missile Range	28	0	0	-2	47	-139	-15	-3	49	0	0	3	53	-8
Yuma Proving Ground	0	0	0	0	0	57	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0

TAB 1 – Military Value Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation Functions

Army Human Systems Research Military Value

SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	0.6502
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	**0.4053**
FORT MONMOUTH	**0.1412**
FORT BELVOIR	**0.1182**
FORT KNOX	**0.1144**
ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER	**0.1006**

29 locations were exempted from consideration as a consequence of a TJCSG decision not to analyze locations with less than 31 full time equivalent work years in a function. It was the military judgment of the TJCSG that the benefit to be derived from consideration of those facilities was far outweighed by the cost of that analysis.

Army Information Systems Technology D&A Military Value

FORT MONMOUTH	**0.4845**
CECOM San Diego	0.2933
Fort Lewis	0.2933
REDSTONE ARSENAL	**0.2330**
FORT BELVOIR	**0.2268**
FT HOOD	0.2187
FT GORDON	0.2158
FORT HUACHUCA	0.1821
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	**0.1622**
Fort Lee	0.1389
Warner Robbins AFB	0.1301
CECOM Los Angeles	0.1301
USA_4_Arlington	**0.0733**
ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER	**0.0723**

20 locations were exempted from consideration as a consequence of a TJCSG decision not to analyze locations with less than 31 full time equivalent work years in a function. It was the military judgment of the TJCSG that the benefit to be derived from consideration of those facilities was far outweighed by the cost of that analysis.

Army Information Systems Technology Research Military Value

FORT MONMOUTH	**0.4574**
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	**0.2864**
ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER	**0.2563**
WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	0.1527
FORT BELVOIR	**0.0744**

16 locations were exempted from consideration as a consequence of a TJCSG decision not to analyze locations with less than 31 full time equivalent work years in a function. It was the military judgment of the TJCSG that the benefit to be derived from consideration of those facilities was far outweighed by the cost of that analysis.

Army Sensors, Electronics, and EW D&A Military Value

FORT MONMOUTH	**0.4337**
REDSTONE ARSENAL	**0.3402**
FORT BELVOIR	**0.2524**
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	**0.2250**
Warner Robbins AFB	0.2247
CECOM Los Angeles	0.2247

18 locations were exempted from consideration as a consequence of a TJCSG decision not to analyze locations with less than 31 full time equivalent work years in a function. It was the military judgment of the TJCSG that the benefit to be derived from consideration of those facilities was far outweighed by the cost of that analysis.

Army Sensors, Electronics, and EW Research Military Value

ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER	**0.5018**
FORT BELVOIR	**0.3972**
FORT MONMOUTH	**0.3392**
REDSTONE ARSENAL	**0.2378**

12 locations were exempted from consideration as a consequence of a TJCSG decision not to analyze locations with less than 31 full time equivalent work years in a function. It was the military judgment of the TJCSG that the benefit to be derived from consideration of those facilities was far outweighed by the cost of that analysis.

Draft Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only -- Do Not Release Under FOIA

TAB 2 - Military Value for Supply and Storage Functions

S&S JCSG Military Value Scores and Ranking for all ICPs

Name of Activity	Military Score	Military Value Ranking
Hill AFB	.2090	1 0f 16
Fort Monmouth	.2035	2 0f 16
NAVICP Philadelphia	.1994	3 0f 16
Robins AFB	.1956	4 of 16
DSC Columbus	.1909	5 of 16
NAVICP Mechanicsburg	.1884	6 of 16
Tinker AFB	.1855	7 of 16
Redstone Arsenal	.1793	8 of 16
DSC Richmond	.1778	9 of 16
MCLB Albany	.1770	10 of 16
Detroit Arsenal	.1701	11 of 16
Rock Island	.1666	12 of 16
DSC Philadelphia	.1588	13 of 16
Lackland AFB	.0853	14 of 16
Fort Huachuca	.0722	15 0f 16
Soldier System Center	.0301	16 0f 16

Draft Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only -- Do Not Release Under FOIA

Draft Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only -- Do Not Release Under FOIA

TAB 3 - Overall Army Military Value

Army Military Value Results

Includes the overall value for each of 87 installations and 10 leases.

Includes the ranking for each of six Army Capabilities for each of 87 installations and 10 leases.

Installation	Rank	Overall Score	Rank	Training Score	Rank	Future Score	Rank	PP Score	Rank	Logisitics Score	Rank	Cost Score	Rank	WB Score
Ft Bliss	1	6.25	3	8.71	7	6.07	13	6.21	7	2.65	21	6.32	41	4.26
Ft Lewis	2	5.76	8	6.56	9	5.87	1	8.29	14	1.87	16	6.57	59	3.28
Ft Hood	3	5.70	10	6.19	1	7.67	5	7.04	16	1.83	38	5.74	50	3.71
Ft Stewart / Hunter AAF	4	5.48	13	5.84	2	6.95	3	7.78	17	1.83	41	5.65	89	2.27
Ft Bragg	5	5.37	9	6.30	10	5.84	2	7.81	25	1.25	35	5.81	77	2.64
Yuma PG	6	5.31	2	9.36	8	5.90	67	1.92	5	2.90	69	4.66	95	1.57
Ft Carson	7	5.26	6	7.10	20	4.35	7	7.00	19	1.80	66	4.82	51	3.62
Dugway PG	8	5.25	5	8.12	10	5.84	64	1.98	4	2.93	18	6.55	56	3.32
Ft Benning	9	5.24	7	6.57	25	4.03	4	7.50	27	1.18	34	5.84	20	5.11
White Sands MR	10	5.16	4	8.39	15	5.23	48	2.43	3	3.26	39	5.72	92	1.89
Ft Wainwright	11	5.09	1	9.71	17	4.69	57	2.14	6	2.78	97	2.50	76	2.64
Ft Knox	12	4.91	14	5.77	23	4.21	12	6.44	12	1.92	14	6.67	52	3.59
Ft Riley	13	4.89	16	5.49	3	6.43	8	6.71	30	1.15	68	4.72	82	2.40
Ft Campbell	14	4.81	17	5.10	4	6.14	6	7.03	28	1.18	59	5.08	84	2.37
Ft Drum	15	4.71	12	6.05	5	6.13	26	4.68	31	1.15	71	4.57	53	3.47
Ft Polk	16	4.67	15	5.76	6	6.11	21	5.16	31	1.15	54	5.22	87	2.28
Ft Irwin	17	4.56	11	6.18	24	4.18	38	3.76	8	2.60	83	4.00	8	5.69
Aberdeen PG	18	4.18	25	3.06	16	4.92	19	5.22	13	1.90	2	7.79	33	4.75
Ft Sill	19	4.03	18	5.03	57	2.26	9	6.62	29	1.17	53	5.30	78	2.49
Schofield Barracks	20	3.95	19	4.88	33	3.82	18	5.26	18	1.82	96	2.96	66	2.97
Ft Huachuca	21	3.86	20	4.34	19	4.54	39	3.60	38	0.99	30	5.96	42	4.22
Ft AP Hill	22	3.68	21	4.06	14	5.34	45	2.83	33	1.13	49	5.40	57	3.32
Ft Dix	23	3.47	29	2.12	34	3.74	16	5.81	64	0.16	23	6.31	4	6.08
Ft Mc Coy	24	3.21	23	3.53	35	3.65	34	3.96	41	0.72	78	4.28	68	2.95
Anniston AD	25	3.19	35	1.04	61	2.01	11	6.46	2	3.42	7	7.05	94	1.68
Ft Jackson	26	3.14	24	3.16	31	3.86	40	3.51	65	0.15	32	5.88	58	3.31
McAlester AAP	27	3.10	37	0.95	18	4.64	20	5.18	21	1.63	26	6.22	85	2.34
Ft Rucker	28	3.07	22	3.63	50	2.53	47	2.73	39	0.94	13	6.71	64	3.02
Ft Richardson	29	3.00	27	2.75	29	3.91	33	3.99	62	0.18	73	4.48	54	3.46
Redstone Arsenal	30	2.99	30	2.00	40	3.20	42	3.15	42	0.71	1	8.47	44	4.09
Hawthorne AD	31	2.97	26	2.87	12	5.56	61	1.99	35	1.11	86	3.65	83	2.39
Crane AD	32	2.92	32	1.22	27	3.97	30	4.39	9	2.38	63	4.98	86	2.31
Ft Eustis	33	2.91	43	0.77	49	2.57	10	6.55	58	0.23	27	6.17	17	5.17
Ft Gordon	34	2.80	28	2.62	30	3.88	77	1.77	54	0.33	42	5.64	26	5.01
Ft Leonard Wood	35	2.79	31	1.60	13	5.44	76	1.78	26	1.19	70	4.61	34	4.70
Ft Lee	36	2.79	49	0.59	39	3.21	14	6.08	67	0.15	37	5.74	37	4.57
Tobyhanna AD	37	2.79	69	0.36	81	1.06	32	4.38	1	4.24	6	7.29	39	4.39
Ft Belvoir	38	2.70	46	0.67	32	3.82	37	3.93	44	0.63	5	7.41	47	3.76
Letterkenny AD	39	2.69	42	0.78	36	3.63	28	4.51	34	1.13	52	5.34	48	3.75
Red River AD	40	2.61	39	0.88	60	2.02	15	5.81	24	1.31	50	5.38	73	2.67
Sierra AD	41	2.49	34	1.07	26	4.00	27	4.57	47	0.55	94	3.37	80	2.44
Tooele AD	42	2.48	40	0.87	41	3.19	31	4.38	45	0.62	46	5.54	70	2.81
Ft Sam Houston	43	2.42	33	1.21	65	1.84	44	2.97	57	0.24	3	7.78	14	5.31
Deseret Chem Plant	44	2.36	41	0.80	28	3.96	46	2.82	63	0.16	57	5.10	30	4.84
Bluegrass AD	45	2.34	53	0.43	80	1.09	17	5.54	43	0.68	56	5.12	12	5.35
Walter Reed AMC	46	2.33	81	0.31	48	2.60	35	3.93	73	0.14	9	6.94	29	4.91
Picatinny Arsenal	47	2.33	50	0.49	21	4.34	79	1.62	50	0.44	15	6.66	16	5.18
Watervliet Arsenal	48	2.25	79	0.33	63	1.96	25	4.69	53	0.33	28	6.13	43	4.11

Draft Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only -- Do Not Release Under FOIA

Ft Meade	49	2.25	78	0.34	38	3.28	51	2.34	67	0.15	17	6.55	2	6.27
Ft Monmouth	49	2.25	62	0.36	58	2.20	36	3.93	48	0.53	11	6.88	46	3.80
Ft McPherson	51	2.22	83	0.30	82	0.97	22	5.10	81	0.14	12	6.75	28	4.92
Ft Gillem	52	2.20	82	0.30	83	0.92	23	5.01	61	0.18	20	6.37	13	5.32
Rock Island Arsenal	53	2.14	59	0.37	73	1.38	29	4.41	37	1.00	19	6.50	72	2.67
MOT Sunny Point	54	2.09	69	0.36	51	2.46	24	4.74	81	0.14	60	5.07	90	2.25
Pueblo Chem Depot	55	2.03	36	1.02	37	3.54	54	2.24	49	0.48	74	4.46	91	2.21
Ft Detrick	56	1.98	69	0.36	62	1.98	58	2.12	59	0.22	4	7.42	18	5.16
Soldier Systems Center	57	1.96	66	0.36	79	1.18	43	3.09	76	0.14	8	7.00	19	5.16
Charles Kelley	58	1.93	69	0.36	84	0.86	41	3.34	73	0.14	43	5.61	1	6.64
Milan AAP	59	1.92	54	0.40	55	2.36	53	2.27	15	1.86	48	5.52	93	1.87
Mississippi AAP	60	1.91	69	0.36	44	2.96	49	2.39	55	0.30	24	6.28	79	2.46
West Point	61	1.88	38	0.93	43	3.09	78	1.67	69	0.15	75	4.42	49	3.73
Ft Leavenworth	62	1.85	60	0.37	47	2.60	82	1.55	66	0.15	47	5.54	5	5.78
Newport Chem Depot	63	1.85	51	0.46	22	4.34	91	1.09	83	0.14	55	5.16	75	2.66
Pine Buff Arsenal	64	1.84	46	0.67	64	1.86	75	1.79	11	1.98	22	6.32	97	0.91
Ft Mc Nair	65	1.83	52	0.44	56	2.27	63	1.98	83	0.14	33	5.87	38	4.52
Ft Myer	66	1.81	62	0.36	59	2.12	65	1.98	76	0.14	31	5.89	27	5.00
Kansas AAP	67	1.80	45	0.68	54	2.38	97	0.74	23	1.46	36	5.81	60	3.28
Ft Monroe	68	1.79	62	0.36	70	1.57	50	2.36	73	0.14	45	5.57	10	5.48
Lake City AAP	69	1.78	66	0.36	46	2.70	93	0.91	46	0.58	51	5.37	11	5.45
Iowa AAP	70	1.78	44	0.68	45	2.73	94	0.88	20	1.66	79	4.18	55	3.37
Lone Star AAP	71	1.73	69	0.36	42	3.18	95	0.86	22	1.48	67	4.77	73	2.67
Adelphi Labs	72	1.71	56	0.37	69	1.74	60	2.00	60	0.22	44	5.59	36	4.62
Ft Hamilton	73	1.69	85	0.27	53	2.40	66	1.92	83	0.14	80	4.16	15	5.30
Detroit Arsenal	74	1.63	61	0.36	75	1.35	87	1.32	71	0.14	10	6.92	31	4.79
Carlisle	75	1.62	55	0.38	71	1.53	80	1.57	76	0.14	40	5.70	21	5.05
Lima Tank Plant	76	1.60	84	0.30	72	1.42	62	1.99	36	1.07	61	5.07	61	3.23
Corpus Christi ADA	77	1.59	62	0.36	85	0.65	90	1.18	10	2.09	25	6.26	65	3.02
Scranton AAP	78	1.55	80	0.33	68	1.75	81	1.56	51	0.41	72	4.53	35	4.63
USAG Michigan	79	1.51	69	0.36	78	1.20	89	1.28	83	0.14	29	6.04	31	4.79
Radford AAP	80	1.51	86	0.24	52	2.41	92	1.02	40	0.85	64	4.97	71	2.75
Ft Shafter	81	1.48	58	0.37	74	1.35	55	2.18	76	0.14	65	4.91	62	3.22
Ft Buchanan	82	1.47	66	0.36	89	0.32	56	2.17	69	0.15	76	4.35	3	6.23
Holston AAP	83	1.44	77	0.34	67	1.78	95	0.86	56	0.28	58	5.08	40	4.37
Presidio Of Monterey	84	1.35	56	0.37	77	1.22	52	2.33	71	0.14	81	4.11	81	2.43
Umatilla Chem Depot	85	1.31	48	0.62	66	1.78	88	1.32	76	0.14	84	3.85	88	2.27
Riverbank AAP	89	1.18	87	0.18	76	1.30	86	1.48	51	0.41	62	5.06	96	1.13
Tripler AMC	87	1.26	69	0.36	86	0.58	58	2.12	83	0.14	77	4.34	66	2.97
Lease - HQ, ATEC	86	1.27	87	0.18	87	0.58	68	1.91	88	0.00	82	4.04	22	5.02
Lease - Rosslyn Complex	88	1.20	87	0.18	88	0.48	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	22	5.02
Lease - Bailey's Crossroads	90	1.16	87	0.18	91	0.00	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	7	5.74
Lease - Army Research	91	1.15	87	0.18	91	0.00	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	9	5.53
Lease - Crystal City Complex	92	1.11	87	0.18	91	0.00	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	22	5.02
Lease - Hoffman complex	92	1.11	87	0.18	91	0.00	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	22	5.02
Lease - ARPERCEN	94	1.06	87	0.18	91	0.00	83	1.49	88	0.00	95	3.22	6	5.75
Lease - PEO STRICOM	95	1.01	87	0.18	90	0.29	83	1.49	88	0.00	87	3.46	45	4.02
Lease - Army JAG Agency	96	0.94	87	0.18	91	0.00	68	1.91	88	0.00	87	3.46	69	2.83
Lease - Army JAG School	97	0.91	87	0.18	91	0.00	83	1.49	88	0.00	85	3.80	63	3.07

TAB 4 - Capacity for Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation Functions

Facility Name	Current Capacity SqFt	Current Usage SqFt	Max Potential Capacity SqFt	Capacity Available to Surge SqFt	Required to Surge SqFt	Excess Capacity SqFt
SOLDIER SYSTEMS CENTER	150,511	205,538	150,511	(55,027)	226,092	(75,581)
FORT MONMOUTH	**1,092,988**	**589,466**	**1,092,988**	**503,522**	**648,413**	**444,575**
ADELPHI LABORATORY CENTER	**343,645**	**199,721**	**343,645**	**143,924**	**219,693**	**123,952**
WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER	**147,158**	**19,840**	**147,158**	**127,318**	**21,824**	**125,334**
ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	**9,714,389**	**1,142,141**	**9,714,389**	**8,572,249**	**1,256,355**	**8,458,035**
FORT DETRICK	431,550	370,948	431,550	60,602	408,042	23,508
FORT BELVOIR	**589,570**	**270,043**	**589,570**	**319,527**	**297,048**	**292,523**
USA_4_Arlington	**175,669**	**21,440**	**175,669**	**154,229**	**23,584**	**152,085**
FT GORDON	197,994	53,440	197,994	144,554	58,784	139,210
USA_3_Orlando	225,871	116,928	225,871	108,943	128,621	97,250
REDSTONE ARSENAL	**1,817,021**	**1,840,958**	**1,817,021**	**(23,937)**	**2,025,054**	**(208,033)**
FORT RUCKER	167,903	69,531	167,903	98,372	76,484	91,419
DETROIT ARSENAL	425,784	476,640	425,784	(50,856)	524,304	(98,520)
FT HOOD	481,813	83,787	481,813	398,026	92,165	389,648
FORT HUACHUCA	84,321	86,994	84,321	(2,673)	95,693	(11,372)
FORT MONMOUTH San Diego	441,460	96,693	441,460	344,767	106,363	335,097

TAB 5 – Capacity Results for Supply and Storage Functions

S&S JCSG Capacity Analysis Results. Individual activity infrastructure was analyzed by examining the productivity of key resource inputs, e.g. labor (man-hours) and actual space (office, warehouse, etc.). A low rate of productivity for key resource inputs was assumed to indicate either inefficient use of resources and/or excess resource capacities. The capacity methodology utilized a standard product and standard resource productivity rates to determine excess capacity in the Supply function. The S&S JCSG concluded that sufficient excess Supply capacity existed to warrant development of BRAC scenarios derived from optimization modeling maximized military value while minimizing the number of open activities. Capacity analysis results are provided below.

Location	Purchasing / budgeting labor (FTE)	Supply labor (FTE)	Technical labor (FTE)	Work space (SF)
CO MCLB ALBANY GA	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	7	231	184	626,043
Current Usage	45	72	33	31,578
Max Potential Capacity	7	231	184	626,043
Capacity Available to Surge	(38)	159	151	594,465
Capacity Required to Surge	9	15	7	6,316
Excess Capacity	(38)	159	151	594,465
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	(47)	144	144	588,149
DEFENSE SUPPLY CENTER COLUMBUS	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	723	528	637	307,230
Current Usage	531	854	391	373,318
Max Potential Capacity	723	528	637	307,230
Capacity Available to Surge	192	(326)	246	(66,088)
Capacity Required to Surge	107	171	78	74,663
Excess Capacity	192	(326)	246	(66,088)
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	86	(497)	168	(140,751)
DEFENSE SUPPLY CENTER PHILADELPHIA	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	1,044	891	365	253,699
Current Usage	1,143	1,837	841	803,037
Max Potential Capacity	1,044	891	365	253,699
Capacity Available to Surge	(99)	(947)	(475)	(549,338)

Capacity Required to Surge	228	367	168	160,607
Excess Capacity	(99)	(947)	(475)	(549,338)
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	(327)	(1,314)	(643)	(709,945)
DEFENSE SUPPLY CENTER RICHMOND	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	758	989	188	437,318
Current Usage	424	681	312	297,679
Max Potential Capacity	758	989	188	437,318
Capacity Available to Surge	334	308	(124)	139,639
Capacity Required to Surge	84	136	62	59,535
Excess Capacity	334	308	(124)	139,639
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	250	172	(186)	80,104
DETROIT ARSENAL (ILSC)	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	115	363	766	155,216
Current Usage	11	18	8	7,691
Max Potential Capacity	115	363	766	155,216
Capacity Available to Surge	104	345	758	147,525
Capacity Required to Surge	2	3	2	1,538
Excess Capacity	104	345	758	147,525
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	102	342	756	145,987
FT HUACHUCA (CSLA)	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	3	85	27	37,500
Current Usage	9	14	7	6,296
Max Potential Capacity	3	85	27	37,500
Capacity Available to Surge	(6)	71	20	31,204
Capacity Required to Surge	2	3	1	1,260
Excess Capacity	(6)	71	20	31,204
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	(8)	68	19	29,944
FT MONMOUTH (CECOM-ICP)	-	-	-	-
Current Capacity	90	325	474	520,547
Current Usage	12	20	9	8,783
Max Potential Capacity	90	325	474	520,547
Capacity Available to Surge	78	305	465	511,764
Capacity Required to Surge	3	4	2	1,757
Excess Capacity	78	305	465	511,764

Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	75	301	463	510,007
Hill AFB-NICP				
Current Capacity	252	414	220	162,648
Current Usage	24	38	18	16,726
Max Potential Capacity	252	414	220	162,648
Capacity Available to Surge	228	376	202	145,922
Capacity Required to Surge	5	8	3	3,345
Excess Capacity	228	376	202	145,922
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	223	368	199	142,577
Lackland AFB-NICP				
Current Capacity	na	16	na	810
Current Usage	na	7	na	3,171
Max Potential Capacity	na	16	na	810
Capacity Available to Surge	na	9	na	(2,361)
Capacity Required to Surge	na	2	na	634
Excess Capacity	na	9	na	(2,361)
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	na	7	na	(2,995)
NAVICP_MECH				
Current Capacity	169	282	164	179,354
Current Usage	67	108	49	47,285
Max Potential Capacity	169	282	164	179,354
Capacity Available to Surge	102	174	115	132,069
Capacity Required to Surge	14	22	10	9,457
Excess Capacity	102	174	115	132,069
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	88	152	105	122,612
NAVICP_PHIL				
Current Capacity	169	330	140	180,180
Current Usage	70	113	52	49,453
Max Potential Capacity	169	330	140	180,180
Capacity Available to Surge	99	217	88	130,727
Capacity R equired to Surge	14	23	10	9,890
Excess Capacity	99	217	88	130,727
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	85	194	78	120,837
REDSTONE ARSENAL (AMCOM-ICP)				
Current Capacity	2	286	588	107,919
Current Usage	9	15	7	6,437

Max Potential Capacity	2	286	588	107,919
Capacity Available to Surge	(7)	271	581	101,482
Capacity Required to Surge	2	3	1	1,288
Excess Capacity	(7)	271	581	101,482
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	(9)	268	580	100,194
Robins AFB-NICP				
Current Capacity	146	966	124	214,020
Current Usage	117	188	86	82,393
Max Potential Capacity	146	966	124	214,020
Capacity Available to Surge	29	778	38	131,627
Capacity Required to Surge	24	38	17	16,478
Excess Capacity	29	778	38	131,627
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	5	740	21	115,149
ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL (TACOM-ICP)				
Current Capacity	187	245	410	315,729
Current Usage	247	397	182	173,661
Max Potential Capacity	187	245	410	315,729
Capacity Available to Surge	(60)	(153)	228	142,068
Capacity Required to Surge	50	79	36	34,733
Excess Capacity	(60)	(153)	228	142,068
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	(110)	(232)	192	107,335
SOLDIER SYSTEM COMMAND (TACOM-ICP)				
Current Capacity	na	66	3	81,259
Current Usage	na	1	0*	412
Max Potential Capacity	na	66	3	81,259
Capacity Available to Surge	na	65	3	80,847
Capacity Required to Surge	na	0	1	82
Excess Capacity	na	65	3	80,847
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	na	65	2	80,765
Tinker AFB-NICP				
Current Capacity	196	817	78	105,088
Current Usage	45	72	33	31,363
Max Potential Capacity	196	817	78	105,088
Capacity Available to Surge	151	745	45	73,725
Capacity Required to Surge	9	14	6	6,272

Excess Capacity	151	745	45	73,725
Excess Capacity at 20% Surge	142	731	39	67,453

n/a – no resources reported for that function
* - In this case the amount of work required of SOLDIER SYSTEM COMMAND (TACOM-ICP) by the capacity model (see S&S JCSG Capacity Report dated 29 November 2004 for a full discussion of the capacity model) was equivalent to .43 FTEs, rounded down to 0.
( ) Denotes negative number.

TAB 6 – Army Capacity Analysis Results

INSTALLATION	1713 General Purpose Instruction Building	1712 Applied Instruction Building	1717 Organizational Classroom	2111 Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	2141 Vehicle Maintenance Shop	6100 General Administrative Building	6101 Small Unit Headquarters Building	6102 Large Unit Headquarters Building	7210 Enlisted Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	7213 Student Barracks	7218 Recruit/ Trainee Barracks	7220 Dining Facility	7240 Officer Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	8521 Vehicle Parking, Surfaced
Aberdeen Proving Ground	86	-43	61	-161	-3	283	-30	-7	116	-184	0	-42	-24	-130
Adelphi Laboratory Center	0	0	0	0	-17	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anniston Army Depot	0	0	0	0	-23	-35	-1	0	-4	0	0	-6	-4	263
Blue Grass Army Depot	-9	0	0	0	-2	-60	-10	-3	0	0	0	-22	0	-73
Carlisle Barracks	-53	0	0	0	0	-48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charles E Kelly Spt Fac	6	0	0	0	2	35	0	0	-5	0	0	0	-5	-154
Corpus Christi Army Depot	0	0	0	-60	0	21	-1	0	0	0	0	-6	0	-287
Crane Army Ammunition Activity	0	0	-2	0	-5	28	-17	-6	0	0	0	-33	0	-204
Deseret Chemical Depot	0	0	1	0	0	-27	0	0	0	0	0	-13	0	-154
Detroit Arsenal	-8	0	9	21	0	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-150
Dugway Proving Ground	-1	19	0	0	4	-12	-15	-7	37	0	0	-17	28	-99
Fort A P Hill	6	0	22	4	-9	27	-18	9	-8	0	5	-16	3	-257
Fort Belvoir	185	-37	-1	97	100	10	-63	-9	65	-71	0	5	-133	212
Fort Benning	-146	-130	-2	124	-21	-29	-391	62	140	-429	-507	53	-247	592
Fort Bliss	-203	59	38	4	-27	242	-303	-7	217	-221	0	-198	-222	1,631
Fort Bragg	-245	-37	57	70	-896	-1,133	-1,651	-226	-1,350	-1,411	-12	-49	0	1,315
Fort Buchanan	-1	-1	0	-2	-14	-63	-9	-12	-4	-8	0	-21	-15	-376
Fort Campbell	-57	-6	-114	-197	-580	-144	-751	-137	-367	-61	0	2	-463	673
Fort Carson	-4	0	-35	62	-69	53	-285	95	25	-12	0	-37	-287	1,254
Fort Detrick	-3	0	0	0	0	-211	-2	0	-23	0	0	-7	-12	-4
Fort Dix	-25	53	-3	-13	-131	-30	20	3	-27	-415	0	-207	1	-310
Fort Drum	-38	-16	-54	-18	-146	-114	-587	-124	-556	-44	0	-174	-262	-198
Fort Eustis	-69	-1,363	-6	-29	-59	-67	179	-47	132	-516	0	-88	-65	766
Fort Gillem	8	10	0	0	0	-109	23	49	0	0	0	-6	0	4
Fort Gordon	-285	-148	-25	0	-134	33	-151	-72	134	-287	0	-94	-155	702
Fort Hamilton	-6	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	3	-12	-245
Fort Hood	-116	57	-207	-408	-605	-231	-1,683	-561	-894	-133	0	-240	-834	-3,270
Fort Huachuca	-9	121	-28	72	-92	122	-217	-27	-119	-8	0	-29	-176	576
Fort Jackson	149	161	36	0	-1	45	-393	-6	46	-292	-687	-20	21	8
Fort Knox	19	89	-54	-105	205	680	-244	22	-3	-35	-245	44	-113	1,360
Fort Leavenworth	-6	-1	0	0	-2	-33	-20	-7	44	-11	0	-75	-153	475
Fort Lee	-160	-98	-27	0	-45	-8	-130	17	29	-437	0	-68	-50	-93
Fort Leonard Wood	-262	-174	-29	0	44	-84	-406	-82	-320	-12	-395	-285	0	824
Fort Lewis	37	53	-1	88	236	150	-363	64	150	-65	0	-152	-435	1,202
Fort McCoy	65	49	-7	40	30	-24	-124	-18	-20	-256	0	-206	-11	225
Fort McNair	-31	-10	0	0	0	51	-8	0	37	0	0	0	0	-28
Fort McPherson	0	0	-9	0	0	6	0	-13	33	0	0	-13	0	-125
Fort Meade	159	-43	0	0	10	-114	-15	67	-2	0	0	-22	-4	288
Fort Monmouth	0	1	-24	0	-3	1	-10	0	111	0	0	-6	0	-327
Fort Monroe	-21	1	0	0	4	241	-2	0	-7	-3	0	7	-44	-165
Fort Myer	0	0	4	0	-2	129	-73	-15	232	0	0	0	0	-110
Fort Polk	-17	-17	-60	26	-31	-137	-176	-28	-209	-105	0	-127	-181	136
Fort Richardson	-18	-5	-27	-7	91	40	72	56	327	14	0	-5	-14	213
Fort Riley	-4	0	-1	60	-23	28	-168	11	-245	-3	0	-78	-7	-92
Fort Rucker	-30	77	-19	-255	-6	286	-82	37	76	-75	0	-9	-366	55
Fort Sam Houston	-37	-49	19	0	-22	766	10	32	72	0	0	17	0	184
Fort Shafter	-31	0	-21	0	-28	-276	-66	-12	-9	0	0	-133	-6	32
Fort Sill	-85	0	-33	84	-154	156	-327	200	133	-169	-260	1	0	1,236

INSTALLATION	1711 General Purpose Instruction Building	1712 Applied Instruction Building	1717 Organizational Classroom	2111 Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	2141 Vehicle Maintenance Shop	6100 General Administrative Building	6101 Small Unit Headquarters Building	6102 Large Unit Headquarters Building	7210 Enlisted Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	7213 Student Barracks	7218 Recruit/ Trainee Barracks	7220 Dining Facility	7240 Officer Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	8521 Vehicle Parking, Surfaced
Fort Stewart	23	4	-91	-36	-364	-241	-685	-154	-930	-15	0	8	-360	-119
Fort Wainwright	3	-2	-2	-192	-24	16	5	26	292	-1	0	23	-78	82
Hawthorne Army Depot	25	0	0	0	32	96	1	0	30	0	0	0	31	-133
Holston AAP	0	0	0	0	0	83	-1	0	0	0	0	-6	0	-103
Iowa AAP	0	2	1	0	17	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-24
Kansas AAP	0	0	0	0	21	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Lake City AAP	2	1	0	0	17	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-31
Letterkenny Army Depot	0	0	0	0	0	-34	-7	0	11	0	0	0	0	0
Lima Army Tank Plt	0	8	0	0	52	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-83
Lone Star AAP	0	0	0	0	16	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	396
Louisiana AAP	0	0	0	0	35	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192
McAlester AAP	56	0	-1	0	31	24	7	0	0	-6	0	-6	0	-248
Milan AAP	0	0	1	0	17	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-139
Military Ocean Tml Sunny Point	0	0	0	0	-2	0	-6	-3	0	0	0	-17	0	0
Mississippi AAP	8	0	0	0	10	211	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-83
Newport Chem Depot	0	0	0	0	5	24	0	0	0	0	0	-13	0	-150
NTC and Fort Irwin, CA	-32	7	-28	-1	-492	-178	-447	-90	-264	0	48	-236	-37	223
Picatinny Arsenal	0	0	0	0	-27	228	0	-8	7	0	0	0	1	-61
Pine Bluff Arsenal	-8	-1	0	0	0	66	-6	0	9	0	0	0	-5	-7
Presidio of Monterey	-140	-50	0	0	0	49	0	-7	-82	-124	61	-8	0	36
Pueblo Chem Depot	0	0	0	0	106	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	796
Radford AAP	7	0	0	0	0	161	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	-105
Red River Army Depot	-1	0	0	0	3	-45	0	0	0	0	0	-6	0	924
Redstone Arsenal	-38	-12	0	0	-42	-551	-34	-19	68	-38	0	0	0	86
Riverbank AAP	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-61
Rock Island Arsenal	-1	77	7	0	0	547	0	0	-5	0	0	0	0	-18
Schofield Barracks	-22	0	-103	-124	-289	-394	-192	-93	387	-10	0	-27	0	-1,048
Scranton AAP	0	0	0	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-152
Sierra Army Depot	2	0	0	0	-33	36	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0
Soldier Systems Center	0	0	-2	0	0	-26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tobyhanna Army Depot	-2	0	0	0	-2	-8	-4	-3	0	-10	0	-6	0	18
Tooele Army Depot	-3	0	0	0	-6	-86	-7	0	-6	0	0	-11	0	-3
Tripler Army Medical Center	0	0	0	0	0	-97	0	7	-42	-10	0	0	0	-256
Umatilla Chem Depot	3	0	0	0	23	8	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	-4
US Army Garrison Selfridge	0	0	-4	0	-2	10	0	-8	129	0	0	17	0	-5
Walter Reed AMC	32	25	12	0	11	44	17	13	-21	-42	0	-22	-216	-224
Watervliet Arsenal	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Point Mil Reservation	353	-169	0	65	29	746	-23	-3	-195	-4	0	148	-82	-142
White Sands Missile Range	28	0	0	-2	47	-139	-15	-3	49	0	0	3	53	-8
Yuma Proving Ground	0	0	0	0	0	57	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0

Draft Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only -- Do Not Release Under FOIA

Draft Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only -- Do Not Release Under FOIA

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 Reparables 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.

State Installation	Action	Out Mil	Out Civ	In Mil	In Civ	Net Gain/(Loss) Mil	Net Gain/(Loss) Civ	Net Mission Contractor	Total Direct
New Jersey									
Fort Monmouth	Close	(620)	(4,652)	0	0	(620)	(4,652)	0	(5,272)
Inspector/Instructor Center West Trenton	Close	(11)	(1)	0	0	(11)	(1)	0	(12)
Kilmer U.S. Army Reserve Center, Edison	Close	(23)	(21)	0	0	(23)	(21)	0	(44)
SFC Nelson V. Brittin U.S. Army Reserve Center	Close	(34)	(1)	0	0	(34)	(1)	0	(35)
Atlantic City International Airport Air Guard Station	Gain	(3)	(53)	62	263	59	210	0	269
Fort Dix	Gain	0	0	209	144	209	144	0	353
McGuire Air Force Base	Gain	0	0	498	37	498	37	0	535
Picatinny Arsenal	Gain	0	0	5	688	5	688	0	693
Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst	Realign	(132)	(54)	0	0	(132)	(54)	0	(186)
Naval Weapons Station Earle	Realign	0	(63)	2	0	2	(63)	0	(61)
New Jersey	**Total**	(823)	(4,845)	776	1,132	(47)	(3,713)	0	(3,760)
New Mexico									
Cannon Air Force Base	Close	(2,385)	(384)	0	0	(2,385)	(384)	(55)	(2,824)
Jenkins Armed Forces Reserve Center Albuquerque	Close	(35)	(1)	0	0	(35)	(1)	0	(36)
Kirtland Air Force Base	Gain	(7)	0	37	176	30	176	0	206
Holloman Air Force Base	Realign	(17)	0	0	0	(17)	0	0	(17)
White Sands Missile Range	Realign	(13)	(165)	0	0	(13)	(165)	0	(178)
New Mexico	**Total**	(2,457)	(550)	37	176	(2,420)	(374)	(55)	(2,849)

This list does not include locations where there were no changes in military or civilian jobs.
Military figures include student load changes.

Recommendation Supporting Information

09-May-05

Fort Monmouth, NJ

Competing Recommendations and Other Information:

This recommendation incorporates the Fort Monmouth realignments from the following previously approved candidate recommendations: TECH-0035R, TECH-0047, TECH-0052, and S&S-0035R.

This recommendation is enabled by the Technical proposal forming an Army Land C4ISR Center.

Other DoD and Non-Army organizations on Ft. Monmouth will be disestablished, relocated or remain in place without garrison support. These include several small Air Force and Navy elements, an Army Audit Agency Office, a recruiting office, the 842nd Transportation Battalion office, and a Corps of Engineers office. Also moved are several DoD and other US government offices, the largest being a Department of Justice Office containing 108 US Civilain employees.

Force Structure Capabilities:

This recommendation ensures that the Department will retain necessary capabilities to support the Force Structure Plan. The closure of Ft. Monmouth shuts down 1.3 Million square feet of administrative facilities and recommends the occupation of excess administrative space at Aberdeen Proving Ground. The totality of the recommendations for administrative and research facilities retains sufficient capacity to ensure the Department has the capability to support the Force Structure Plan.

MVA Results:

This recommendation enhances the military value of the Army and the Department of Defense. The movement of the USMA Prepatory School to West Point enhances Army military value by moving the school to an installation with a higher value for Institutional Training (Ft. Monmouth-49th, West Point-11th). The military value analysis for the Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation functions was conducted by the Technical Joint Cross Service Group (Tab1). The military value analysis for the supply and storage functions was conducted by the Supply and Storage Joint Cross service Group (Tab 2). Finally, the Army analyzed overall military value (Tab 3).

Capacity Analysis Results:

Aberdeen has excess administrative space and 5003 buildable acres. West Point has 353,000 square feet of excess general purpose instructional facilities and another 746,000 square feet of administrative space. Detailed capacity information is at Tabs 4 - 6.

Recommendation Supporting Information

09-May-05

Fort Monmouth, NJ

TAB A - Military Value for Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Test and Evaluations Functions

TAB B Military Value for Supply and Storage Functions

TAB C - Army Overall Military Value

TAB D - Capacity Results for Research, Development, and Acquisition and Test and Evaluation Functions

TAB E Capacity Results for Supply and Storage Functions

TAB F - Army Capacity Analysis Results

*** *End of Report* ***