


*Commissioner's  
Base Visit Book*



**Fort Monmouth, New Jersey  
Recommendations**

*Commissioner Lloyd W. Newton*

**3 June 2005**



3-June 0530	Pickup	Hilton	Gary Dinsick	Grant Mulkey 660-349-9164
0545-0630	Travel to Departure	Andrews AFB		
0650	Departure	Andrews AFB C 21		Mission Number: EAA 157552
0715-0750	Departure	Lakehurst	Backup Van Congressman Smith to accompany	Helicopter tour of Ft. Monmouth
0750-0800	Continental Breakfast	Mallette Hall Conference Room A		
0800-0945	Opening Remarks	Mallette Hall Conference Room A	MG Mazzucchi, Mr. Muller	
0945-1000	En route to Building 1210	Walk	MG Mazzucchi, Mr. Ferlise, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Devine	
1000-1020	Software Engineering Center (SEC) Demonstrations	Building 1210	Mr. Thomas	
1020-1030	En route to Building 210	Military Vehicle	MG Mazzucchi, Mr. Ferlise, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Martin, Ms. Devine	
1030-1050	Tour of Joint Satellite Communications Engineering Center (JSEC)	Building 210	Ms. Cathy Young	
1050-1100	En route to McAfee Center	Military Vehicle	MG Mazzucchi, Mr. Ferlise, Mr. Martin, Ms. Devine	
1100-1200	Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Lab, Lightweight Counter Mortar Radar,	McAfee Center Building 600	MG Mazzucchi, Mr. Ferlise, Mr. Lisuzzo Mr. Muller, Mr. Martin, Ms. Devine	



Team Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR)  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

**THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI**  
AND  
**GENERAL LLOYD W. NEWTON (U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED)**  
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commissioners

*Sen. Corzine*  
*Sen. Lautenberg*  
*Chris Smith*  
*Saxon*  
*Pallone*

**FRIDAY, 03 JUNE 2005**

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION	PARTICIPATION
0715	<b>Arrival</b>  <u>Met by:</u> Mr. Victor J. Ferlise, Deputy to the Commanding General (CG) for Operations & Support, Communications-Electronics Life Cycle Management Command (C-E LCMC) AND Mr. Gary Martin, Acting Director, Communications-Electronics Research, Development & Engineering Center (CERDEC), Research, Development & Engineering Command (RDECOM)	Lakehurst Naval Air Station	The Honorable Anthony J. Principi, BRAC Commission Chairman GEN Lloyd W. Newton, USAF, Retired, BRAC Commissioner Mr. R. Gary Dinsick, BRAC Staffer
0715-0735	En route to Charles Wood Helipad	Helicopter	Same
0735-0750	<b>Arrival</b>  <u>Met by:</u> MG Michael Mazzucchi, Commanding & Program Executive Office (PEO) Command, Control & Communications-Tactical (C3T), C-E LCMC  En route to Building 1207	Charles Wood Helipad	Same
0750-0800	Continental Breakfast	Mallette Hall Conference Room A	Same

*Gary Dinsick*  
*C-703-675-4006*

Team Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR)  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

**THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI**  
**AND**  
**GENERAL LLOYD W. NEWTON (U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED)**  
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commissioners

**FRIDAY, 03 JUNE 2005**

TIME	EVENT	LOCATION	PARTICIPATION
0800-0945	<p>Opening Remarks MG Mazzucchi BRAC Commissioners</p> <p>Team C4SIR Mission Video &amp; Briefing MG Mazzucchi Mr. Muller</p>	Conference Room A	<p>The Honorable Principi GEN Newton Mr. Dinsick Ms. Elizabeth Bieri, BRAC Staffer Mr. Wesley Hood, BRAC Staffer MG Mazzucchi Mr. Ferlise Mr. Edward Bair, PEO Intelligence, Electronic Warfare &amp; Sensors (IEW&amp;S), C-E LCMC Mr. Kevin Carroll, PEO Enterprise Information Systems (EIS) Mr. Edward Elgart, Director, Acquisition Center (AC) Mr. Anthony LaPlaca, Director, Logistics &amp; Readiness Center (LRC) Mr. Edward Thomas, Director, Software Engineering Center (SEC) Mr. Mark Sagan, Chief Counsel, C-E LCMC Mr. Martin Mr. Anthony Lisuzzo, Director for Intelligence and Information Warfare, CERDEC, RDECOM COL Vallery Lowman, PEO C3T, C-E LCMC Mr. Henry Muller, Acting Associate Technical Director, CERDEC, RDECOM Ms. Deborah Devlin, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCSPER/G-1) Ms. Patricia Devine, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations &amp; Plans (DCSOPS/G-3)</p>

Team Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR)  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

**THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI**  
**AND**  
**GENERAL LLOYD W. NEWTON (U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED)**  
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commissioners

**FRIDAY, 03 JUNE 05**


TIME	EVENT	LOCATION	PARTICIPATION
0945-1000	<b>BREAK</b> En route to Building 1210	Walk	Commissioners and Staff MG Mazzucchi Mr. Ferlise Mr. Thomas Ms. Devine
1000-1020	Software Engineering Center (SEC) Demonstrations Mr. Thomas	Building 1210	Same
1020-1030	En route to Building 210	Military Vehicle	Commissioners and Staff MG Mazzucchi Mr. Ferlise Ms. Devine
1030-1050	Tour of Joint Satellite Communications Engineering Center (JSEC) Ms. Cathy Young, Assistant Project Manager for Satellite Communications Systems (PM DCATS)	Building 210	Commissioners and Staff MG Mazzucchi Mr. Ferlise Mr. Carroll Mr. Martin Ms. Devine
1050-1100	En route to McAfee Center	Military Vehicle	Commissioners and Staff MG Mazzucchi Mr. Ferlise Mr. Martin Ms. Devine
1100-1200	Improvise Explosive Device (IED) Lab Lightweight Counter Mortar Exhibit Aircraft Survivability Anechoic Chamber  Foliage Penetrating Radar  Closing Remarks MG Mazzucchi	McAfee Center Building 600  Conference Room	Commissioners and Staff MG Mazzucchi Mr. Ferlise Mr. Martin Mr. Lisuzzo Mr. Muller Ms. Devine
1200-1215	<b>BREAK</b>	McAfee Center	

Team Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR)  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey

**THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI**  
**AND**  
**GENERAL LLOYD W. NEWTON (U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED)**  
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commissioners

**FRIDAY, 03 JUNE 2005**

<b>TIME</b>	<b>EVENT</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>PARTICIPATION</b>
1215-1245	WORKING LUNCH Community Presentation	Building 600	Commissioners and Staff Senator Frank Lautenberg Senator Jon Corzine Congressman Frank Pallone, Jr. Congressman Rush Holt Congressman Chris Smith Mr. Robert Giordano Admiral Gaffney, USN Retired Mr. Thomas Gagliano Mr. Frank Muzzi
1330	En route to Eatontown Municipal Building	Commissioner Staff Vehicle	Commissioners and Staff
1400	Press Conference	Eatontown Municipal Building	Commissioners and Staff



# **DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION**

## **BASE SUMMARY SHEET**

### **Fort Monmouth, New Jersey**

#### **INSTALLATION MISSION**

Fort Monmouth is the center of gravity for the development of the Army's Command and Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Sensors and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems. Much of the Army's research and development of these hi-tech systems is done at Fort Monmouth by members of Team C4ISR.

Several of the most technologically, advanced systems currently being used today in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom and Homeland Defense were developed at Fort Monmouth. Team C4ISR equips the joint warfighter with tomorrow's technology by providing the architectural framework and systems engineering to ensure joint interoperability and integration across the battle space.

The organizations that make up "Team C4ISR" are collocated at Fort Monmouth to create the synergy that allows rapid prototyping, fielding and modernization of systems that save lives on the battlefield. The Team executes its mission through a collaborative process of technology, lifecycle development, acquisition excellence, and logistics power projection.

Team C4ISR's contributions to today's joint warfighting capabilities are part of Fort Monmouth's long history of research and technology development. In 1917 Fort Monmouth, then called Camp Vail was home to the Army's Signal School. The War Department declared the camp a permanent military post in 1925 designating it Fort Monmouth in honor of soldiers who fought during the American Revolution on the nearby fields.

The post's location in high-tech New Jersey provides ready access to the premier institutions in academia and industry and a skilled workforce to provide Team C4ISR with an unprecedented knowledge base to develop the most advanced warfighting systems.

The fort is located a few miles west of the "Jersey Shore," one hour south of New York City and an hour and a half east of Philadelphia with easy access to several, major rail and air hubs. Nearby Maguire Air Force Base and Fort Dix provide the acreage for large scale C4ISR experimentation.

Fort Monmouth is home to a variety of other Army, Department of Defense and government activities, but the primary tenants are the members of Team C4ISR:

CECOM - The Army's Communications Electronics Command (CECOM), although geographically dispersed at various locations throughout the U.S. and around the world, is the host and largest activity at Fort Monmouth. The Software Engineering Center (SEC);

Information Systems Engineering Command (ISEC); Logistics and Readiness Center (LRC); Tobyhanna Army Depot; and CECOM Acquisition Center (AC) are all part of CECOM.

CERDEC - The Communications and Electronics Research and Development Center (CERDEC) has made many contributions in research in development, such as Night Vision goggles, counter equipment for improvised explosive devices, shortstop electronic protection systems, and well sensor systems to provide soldiers with a safe method for rapidly inspecting wells and underground locations in OIF/OEF. CERDEC is part of the Research, Development and Engineering Command (RDECOM), headquartered at Aberdeen Proving Grounds but the CERDEC at Fort Monmouth is its largest activity.

PEOs - Team C4ISR's other members are three of the Army's Program Executive Offices (PEO) two of which are headquartered at Fort Monmouth; The PEO for Command, Control, Communications Tactical (PEO C3T) and the PEO for Intelligence, Electronic Warfare and Sensors (PEO IEWS). The third is the PEO for Enterprise Information Systems (PEO EIS), headquartered at Ft Belvoir, with Program Managers located at Fort Monmouth.

Other Fort Monmouth tenants include the Defense Information Systems Agency, the Joint Interoperability Engineering Organization which furthers joint interoperability through an alliance with its Navy and Air Force counterparts and a jointly staffed Commanders in Chief Interoperability Program Office (CIPO).

The United States Military Academy Preparatory School (USMAPS), which trains 250 cadet candidates each year for entrance as freshmen into the United States Military Academy at West Point, NY, also calls Fort Monmouth home.

The 754th Explosive Ordnance Disposal, which provides emergency response to military and federal civilian agencies throughout New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine and Pennsylvania is also one of Fort Monmouth's tenants.

The facilities at Fort Monmouth also serve the families and service members from Earle Naval Weapons Station in Colts Neck, NJ and the Coast Guard at Sandy Hook with the commissary, Post Exchange and Patterson Army Health Clinic. Patterson also serves the more than 7,000 retirees in the area with its new VA clinic.

The Garrison provides installation management and support to Team C4ISR elements, and tenant organizations on post. The Garrison is responsible for Base Operations, Contractor Support and Real Property that includes main post and the Charles Wood Area, as well as various programs and services to enhance the quality of life for soldiers and civilians at Fort Monmouth.

A full array of modern Morale, Welfare and Recreation activities are available on post including: A 900-seat Expo theater; a Centralized Hospitality and Catering Office; a renovated Auto Craft Center with new car wash; a 20-lane bowling center with new lounge area; dining and meeting room upgrades at the Officers' Club; a new Child Development Center which accommodates 244 children; and an 18-hole golf course, which has a new pro shop, golf cart storage area and renovated locker rooms.

Fort Monmouth is considered a leader among Army installations in providing infrastructure development and support to the Team C4ISR mission of equipping the joint warfighter with tomorrow's technology. Following the goals, objectives and strategy outlined in Army Vision 2010 and Joint Vision 2010, Fort Monmouth is moving forward with the Army vision for future.

## **DOD RECOMMENDATION**

### ***Close Fort Monmouth, NJ.***

1. Relocate the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY. Relocate the Joint Network Management System Program Office to Fort Meade, MD. Relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Repairables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as Inventory Control Point functions, detachment of Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate Information Systems, Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research and Development & Acquisition (RDA) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate the elements of the Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems and consolidate into the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Belvoir, VA.

2. 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.

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

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

5. 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.

## DOD JUSTIFICATION

1. The closure of Fort Monmouth allows the Army to pursue several transformational and BRAC objectives. These include: Consolidating training to enhance coordination, doctrine development, and 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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 multipurpose 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.

## COST CONSIDERATIONS DEVELOPED BY DOD

One-Time Costs:	\$ <u>822.3</u> million
Net Savings (Cost) during Implementation:	\$ <u>395.6</u> million
Annual Recurring Savings:	\$ <u>143.7</u> million
Return on Investment Year:	2015 (6 years)
Net Present Value over 20 Years:	\$ <u>1,025</u> million

## MANPOWER IMPLICATIONS OF THIS RECOMMENDATION (EXCLUDES CONTRACTORS)

	<u>Military</u>	<u>Civilian</u>	<u>Students</u>
<b>Baseline</b>	417	4652	203
Reductions	179	440	0
Realignments	238	4212	203
<b>Total</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>4652</b>	<b>203</b>

## ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

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.

## REPRESENTATION

Governor: Acting Governor Richard J. Codey  
Senators: The Honorable Jon Corzine and Frank Lautenberg  
Representative: The Honorable Rush Holt, 12<sup>th</sup> District (abuts the 6<sup>th</sup> District of The Honorable Frank Pallone, Jr.)

## **ECONOMIC IMPACT**

### **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.

## **MILITARY ISSUES**

None noted.


**COMMUNITY CONCERNS/ISSUES**

Loss of skilled workforce/jobs  
Uniqueness of mission

**ITEMS OF SPECIAL EMPHASIS**

Fort Monmouth is host to a number of tenant organizations.

Wes Hood/Army/3 June 2005



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

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

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

### **Fort Monmouth, NJ**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Fort Hood, TX**


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


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

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

State Installation	Action	Out		In		Net Gain/(Loss)		Net Mission Contractor	Total Direct
		Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ	Mil	Civ		
<b>New Jersey</b>									
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)
<b>New Jersey Total</b>		<b>(823)</b>	<b>(4,845)</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>1,132</b>	<b>(47)</b>	<b>(3,713)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(3,760)</b>
<b>New Mexico</b>									
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)
<b>New Mexico Total</b>		<b>(2,457)</b>	<b>(550)</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>(2,420)</b>	<b>(374)</b>	<b>(55)</b>	<b>(2,849)</b>

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





**7.2 Military Value Assessment**

Military Value analysis, as described in Section 6.6, provided a starting point for developing potential BRAC actions.

*7.2.1 Military Value of Installations (MVI)*

The MVI model ranked Army installations from 1-to-97, based on an analysis of 40 attributes across all installations. The MVI ranking was the first product of the MVA. The MVI results are listed below.

First Quartile			Second Quartile				
1	Ft Bliss	14	Ft Campbell	26	Ft Jackson	38	Ft Belvoir
2	Ft Lewis	15	Ft Drum	27	McAlester AAP	39	Letterkenny AD
3	Ft Hood	16	Ft Polk	28	Ft Rucker	40	Red River AD
4	Ft Stewart / HAAF	17	Ft Irwin	29	Ft Richardson	41	Sierra AD
5	Ft Bragg	18	Aberdeen PG	30	Redstone Arsenal	42	Tooele AD
6	Yuma PG	19	Ft Sill	31	Hawthorne AD	43	Ft Sam Houston
7	Ft Carson	20	Schofield Barracks	32	Crane AAP	44	Deseret Chem Depot
8	Dugway PG	21	Ft Huachuca	33	Ft Eustis	45	Bluegrass AD
9	Ft Benning	22	Ft AP Hill	34	Ft Gordon	46	Walter Reed AMC
10	White Sands MR	23	Ft Dix	35	Ft Leonard Wood	47	Picatinny Arsenal
11	Ft Wainwright	24	Ft McCoy	36	Ft Lee	48	Watervliet Arsenal
12	Ft Knox	25	Anniston AD	37	Tobyhanna AD	49	Ft Meade
13	Ft Riley					50	Ft Monmouth

**Table 7-1. MVI Ranking, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quartiles**

Third Quartile			Fourth Quartile				
51	Ft McPherson	64	Pine Bluff Arsenal	76	Lima Tank Plant	89	Riverbank AAP
52	Ft Gillem	65	Ft McNair	77	Corpus Christi AD	90	Lease - Bailey's Crossroads
53	Rock Island Arsenal	66	Ft Myer	78	Scranton AAP	91	Lease - ARO
54	MOT Sunny Point	67	Kansas AAP	79	USAG Michigan	92	Lease - Crystal City Complex
55	Pueblo Chem Depot	68	Ft Monroe	80	Radford AAP	93	Lease - Hoffman Complex
56	Ft Detrick	69	Lake City AAP	81	Ft Shafter	94	Lease - ARPERCEN
57	Soldier System Center	70	Iowa AAP	82	Ft Buchanan	95	Lease - PEO STRICOM
58	Charles E. Kelly Support	71	Lone Star AAP	83	Holston AAP	96	Lease - Army JAG Agency
59	Milan AAP	72	Adelphi Labs	84	Presidio Of Monterey	97	Lease - Army JAG School
60	Mississippi AAP	73	Ft Hamilton	85	Umatilla Chem Depot		
61	West Point	74	Detroit Arsenal	86	Lease - HQ, ATEC		
62	Ft Leavenworth	75	Carlisle Barracks	87	Tripler AMC		
63	Newport Chem Depot			88	Lease - Rosslyn Complex		

**Table 7-2. MVI Ranking, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Quartiles**

7.2.2 Military Value Portfolio (MVP)

The MVP model provided the Army a starting point for developing stationing actions. Using the MVI results, Army requirements, and other inputs, the MVP produced a portfolio that maximized MV subject to a set of capacity constraints. It is important to remember that the MVP model did not produce deliberative decisions. MVP was the start point of the analysis. Being in the portfolio did not assure retention of an installation; being outside the portfolio did not assure closure. The model was instructive, but did not include unique capabilities of individual installations. Military judgment, as employed by the Army BRAC SRG, JCSGs, ISG, and IEC, was used to complete the Military Value analysis and selection of installations for closure or realignment.


The final Army Portfolio is listed in Table 7-3, and the installations not included are shown in Table 7-4.

Rank	Installation	Rank	Installation	Rank	Installation	Rank	Installation
1	Ft Bliss	17	Ft Irwin	33	Ft Eustis	50	Ft Monmouth
2	Ft Lewis	18	Aberdeen PG	34	Ft Gordon	51	Ft McPherson
3	Ft Hood	19	Ft Sill	35	Ft Leonard Wood	54	MOT Sunny Point
4	Ft Stewart / HAAF	20	Schofield Barracks	36	Ft Lee	56	Ft Detrick
5	Ft Bragg	21	Ft Huachuca	37	Tobyhanna AD	59	Milan AAP
6	Yuma PG	22	Ft AP Hill	38	Ft Belvoir	61	West Point
7	Ft Carson	23	Ft Dix	39	Letterkenny AD	64	Pine Buff Arsenal
8	Dugway PG	24	Ft McCoy	40	Red River AD	65	Ft Mc Nair
9	Ft Benning	25	Anniston AD	41	Sierra AD	66	Ft Myer
10	White Sands MR	26	Ft Jackson	42	Tooele AD	69	Lake City AAP
11	Ft Wainwright	27	McAlester AAP	43	Ft Sam Houston	77	Corpus Christi AD
12	Ft Knox	28	Ft Rucker	45	Bluegrass AD	78	Scranton AAP
13	Ft Riley	29	Ft Richardson	46	Walter Reed AMC	80	Radford AAP
14	Ft Campbell	30	Redstone Arsenal	47	Picatinny Arsenal	83	Holston AAP
15	Ft Drum	31	Hawthorne AD	48	Watervliet Arsenal	87	Tripler AMC
16	Ft Polk	32	Crane AAP	49	Ft Meade		

Table 7-3. Army Installation Portfolio

Rank	Installation	Rank	Installation	Rank	Installation
44	Deseret Chem Depot	70	Iowa AAP	86	Lease - HQ, ATEC
52	Ft Gillem	71	Lone Star AAP	88	Lease - Rosslyn Complex
53	Rock Island Arsenal	72	Adelphi Labs	89	Riverbank AAP
55	Pueblo Chem Depot	73	Ft Hamilton	90	Lease - Bailey's Crossroads
57	Soldier Systems Center	74	Detroit Arsenal	91	Lease - Army Research Office
58	Charles E. Kelly Support	75	Carlisle Barracks	92	Lease - Crystal City Complex
60	Mississippi AAP	76	Lima Tank Plant	93	Lease - Hoffman Complex
62	Ft Leavenworth	79	USAG Michigan	94	Lease - ARPERCEN
63	Newport Chem Depot	81	Ft Shafter	95	Lease - PEO STRICOM
67	Kansas AAP	82	Ft Buchanan	96	Lease - Army JAG Agency
68	Ft Monroe	84	Presidio Of Monterey	97	Lease - Army JAG School
		85	Umatilla Chem Depot		

Table 7-4. Army Installations Outside the Portfolio



**FORT MONMOUTH, NJ** **TEAM C4ISR** **Equipping the Joint Warfighter with Tomorrow's Technology**



[SOLDIERS & FAMILIES](#)

[VETERANS](#)

[EMPLOYEES](#)

[VISITORS](#)

[BUSINESS OPS](#)



Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance

<b>CERDEC</b>	<b>CECOM</b>	<b>PEO C3I</b>
<b>GARRISON</b>	<b>PEO EIS</b>	<b>PEO I&amp;W&amp;S</b>

<a href="#">About</a>
<a href="#">Multimedia</a>
<a href="#">Tenants</a>
<a href="#">Local Info</a>
<a href="#">History</a>
<a href="#">News and Events</a>
<a href="#">Links</a>
<a href="#">Contact Us</a>
<a href="#">Team C4ISR Home</a>

This is a U.S. government computer system - all activities are monitored.

[Security and Privacy Notice](#) [Disclaimer Notice](#) [Accessibility Statement](#) [C4ISR Webmaster](#)

*Last Date Modified: April 7, 2005*



## ABOUT

Fort Monmouth is the center of gravity for the development of the Army's Command and Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Sensors and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems. Much of the Army's research and development of these hi-tech systems is done at Fort Monmouth by members of Team C4ISR.

Several of the most technologically advanced systems currently being used today in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom and Homeland Defense were developed at Fort Monmouth. Team C4ISR equips the joint warfighter with tomorrow's technology by providing the architectural framework and systems engineering to ensure joint interoperability and integration across the battle space.

The organizations that make up "Team C4ISR" are collocated at Fort Monmouth to create the synergy that allows rapid prototyping, fielding and modernization of systems that save lives on the battlefield. The Team executes its mission through a collaborative process of technology, lifecycle development, acquisition excellence, and logistics power projection.


Team C4ISR's contributions to today's joint warfighting capabilities are part of Fort Monmouth's long history of research and technology development. In 1917 Fort Monmouth, then called Camp Vail was home to the Army's Signal School. The War Department declared the camp a permanent military post in 1925 designating it Fort Monmouth in honor of soldiers who fought during the American Revolution on the nearby fields.

The post's location in high-tech New Jersey provides ready access to the premier institutions in academia and industry and a skilled workforce to provide Team C4ISR with an unprecedented knowledge base to develop the most advanced warfighting systems.

The fort is located a few miles west of the "Jersey Shore," one hour south of New York City and an hour and a half east of Philadelphia with easy access to several, major rail and air hubs. Nearby Maguire Air Force Base and Fort Dix provide the acreage for large scale C4ISR experimentation.

Fort Monmouth is home to a variety of other Army, Department of Defense and government activities, but the primary tenants are the members of Team C4ISR:

CECOM - The Army's Communications Electronics Command (CECOM), although geographically dispersed at various locations throughout the U.S. and around the world, is the host and largest activity at Fort Monmouth. The Software Engineering Center (SEC); Information Systems Engineering Command (ISEC); Logistics and Readiness Center (LRC); Tobvanna Army Depot; and CECOM Acquisition Center



Did you know FBCB2 developed at Fort Monmouth reduces friendly fire incidents by representing the location of friendly and enemy positions on a computer map?

<a href="#">About</a>
<a href="#">Multimedia</a>
<a href="#">Tenants</a>
<a href="#">Local Info</a>
<a href="#">History</a>
<a href="#">News and Events</a>
<a href="#">Links</a>
<a href="#">Contact Us</a>
<a href="#">Team C4ISR Home</a>

(AC) are all part of CECOM.

CERDEC - The Communications and Electronics Research and Development Center (CERDEC) has made many contributions in research in development, such as Night Vision goggles, counter equipment for improvised explosive devices, shortstop electronic protection systems, and well sensor systems to provide soldiers with a safe method for rapidly inspecting wells and underground locations in OIF/OEF. CERDEC is part of the Research, Development and Engineering Command (RDECOM), headquartered at Aberdeen Proving Grounds but the CERDEC at Fort Monmouth is its largest activity.

PEOs - Team C4ISR's other members are three of the Army's Program Executive Offices (PEO) two of which are headquartered at Fort Monmouth; The PEO for Command, Control, Communications Tactical (PEO C3T) and the PEO for Intelligence, Electronic Warfare and Sensors (PEO IEWS). The third is the PEO for Enterprise Information Systems (PEO EIS), headquartered at Ft Belvoir, with Program Managers located at Fort Monmouth.

Other Fort Monmouth tenants include the Defense Information Systems Agency, the Joint Interoperability Engineering Organization which furthers joint interoperability through an alliance with its Navy and Air Force counterparts and a jointly staffed Commanders in Chief Interoperability Program Office (CIPO).

The United States Military Academy Preparatory School (USMAPS), which trains 250 cadet candidates each year for entrance as freshmen into the United States Military Academy at West Point, NY, also calls Fort Monmouth home.

The 754th Explosive Ordnance Disposal , which provides emergency response to military and federal civilian agencies throughout New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine and Pennsylvania is also one of Fort Monmouth's tenants.

The facilities at Fort Monmouth also serve the families and service members from Earle Naval Weapons Station in Colts Neck, NJ and the Coast Guard at Sandy Hook with the commissary, Post Exchange and Patterson Army Health Clinic. Patterson also serves the more than 7,000 retirees in the area with its new VA clinic.

The Garrison provides installation management and support to Team C4ISR elements, and tenant organizations on post. The Garrison is responsible for Base Operations, Contractor Support and Real Property that includes main post and the Charles Wood Area, as well as various programs and services to enhance the quality of life for soldiers and civilians at Fort Monmouth.

A full array of modern Morale, Welfare and Recreation activities are available on post including: A 900-seat Expo theater; a Centralized Hospitality and Catering Office; a renovated Auto Craft Center with new car wash; a 20-lane bowling center with new lounge area; dining and meeting room upgrades at the Officers' Club; a new Child Development Center which accommodates 244 children; and an 18-hole golf course, which has a new pro shop, golf cart storage area and renovated locker rooms.

Fort Monmouth is considered a leader among Army installations in providing infrastructure development and support to the Team C4ISR mission of equipping the joint warfighter with tomorrow's technology. Following the goals, objectives and strategy outlined in Army Vision 2010 and Joint Vision 2010, Fort

Monmouth is moving forward with the Army vision for future.

This is a U.S. government computer system - all activities are monitored.

[Security and Privacy Notice](#)   [Disclaimer Notice](#)   [Accessibility Statement](#)   [C4ISR Webmaster](#)

*Last Date Modified: April 7, 2005*

	<b>FORT MONMOUTH, NJ</b>		<b>TEAM C4ISR</b>		Equipping the Joint Warfighter with Tomorrow's Technology	
	<b>SOLDIERS &amp; FAMILIES</b>	<b>VETERANS</b>	<b>VISITORS</b>	<b>EMPLOYEES</b>	<b>BUSINESS OPS</b>	

### TENANT ORGANIZATIONS

**Communications and Electronics Command**  
<http://www.monmouth.army.mil/CELCMC/>

**754TH EOD**  
<https://www.perscomonline.army.mil/OPod/eod.htm>

**United States Military Academy Prep**  
<http://www.usma.edu/USMAPS/>

**Patterson Army Health Clinic**  
<http://www.narmc.amedd.army.mil/patterson/>

**Communications Electronics Research and Development Center**  
<http://www.monmouth.army.mil/cecom/rdec/rdecDA.html>

**Program Executive Office for Command, Control, Communications Tactical**  
<http://peoc3t.monmouth.army.mil/>

**Program Executive Office for Intelligence Electronic Warfare and Sensors**  
<https://peoiews.monmouth.army.mil/hqs/default.htm>

**Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems**  
<https://my.eis.army.mil/pws/index.htm>

**Combatant Command Interoperability Program Office**  
<https://cecom100.monmouth.army.mil/cipo/ciporedesign>

**Project Manager Unit of Action, Network Systems'Integration**  
<http://www.monmouth.army.mil/C4ISR/pmnsi.shtml>

**Garrison**  
<https://cecom100.monmouth.army.mil/usagfmima/sites/local/>



Did you know Team C4ISR added exterior intercom capability to 120 M1A1 tanks used in OIF allowing troops to communicate with crewman to call for fire support?

<a href="#">About</a>
<a href="#">Multimedia</a>
<a href="#">Tenants</a>
<a href="#">Local Info</a>
<a href="#">History</a>
<a href="#">News and Events</a>
<a href="#">Links</a>
<a href="#">Contact Us</a>
<a href="#">Team C4ISR Home</a>

This is a U.S. government computer system - all activities are monitored.

[Security and Privacy Notice](#) [Disclaimer Notice](#) [Accessibility Statement](#) [C4ISR Webmaster](#)

*Last Date Modified: April 7, 2005*

# Fort Monmouth and Team C4ISR

## Timeline


June 1917	The Signal Corps opens a camp at Little Silver to train the 1st and 2nd Reserve Signal Battalions.
September 1917	The Chief Signal Officer names the camp at Little Silver for Alfred Vail.
1918	The Signal Corps Radio Laboratory is relocated from Washington to Camp Alfred Vail, with early emphasis on the standardization of vacuum tubes for military radios.
1918-1919	The Pigeon Breeding and Training Section is established to train pigeons and handlers.
November 1918	The 122d Aero Squadron is transferred from the Signal Corps to the Army Air Service. The squadron is relocated from Camp Vail to Floyd Bennett Field.
October 1919	The Signal Corps School is relocated from Fort Leavenworth to Camp Vail, and the Chief Signal Officer authorizes the purchase of the Camp Vail property.
1924	The Signal Corps Board is established at Camp Vail.
August 1925	Camp Vail attains permanent status and is renamed Fort Monmouth.
1926	The SCR-136 and SCR-134 ground to ground and ground to air radios enter production. These are the military's first extended range voice radios.
1928	Radiosonde, carried aloft by balloon, is the first major application of electronics to the study of weather and the upper atmosphere.
1928	The Barker Circle Barracks become the first of the permanent structures at Fort Monmouth.
August 1929	The Signal Corps' Electrical Laboratories (Washington) and the Research Laboratory (New York) merge with the Radio Laboratories at Fort Monmouth to form the "Signal Corps Laboratories."
1935	Squier Hall is built for the Laboratories. The original 1917-vintage lab buildings are razed.
1936	The Headquarters building (Russel Hall) is built.
1936	The labs develop the SCR-300 handheld "walkie-talkie" for front-line troops.
1937	The labs develop a "mystery ray" -- a prototype of the Radio Direction and Ranging (RADAR) sets SCR-268 and SCR-270 -- to locate and track airplanes.
1941	The SCR-510 FM back-pack radio is developed to provide reliable, static free tactical communications.
1941-1945	The Signal Corps schools at Fort Monmouth train more than 70,000 troops for war.

1941	Property is purchased for Camp Coles, Camp Wood and Camp Evans.
October 1941	The Signal Corps activates Field Laboratories One, Two, and Three.
February 1942	Field Lab Two is moved from Squier Hall to Camp Wood and named the "Eatontown Signal Laboratory." Field Lab Three is moved to Camp Evans from Fort Hancock, Twin Lights, Highlands, and Rumson.
March 1942	The "Signal Corps Laboratories" become the "Signal Corps Radar Laboratory" and the "Signal Corps General Development Laboratory."
September 1942	Field Lab One is moved from Squier to Camp Coles (formerly Giblon Farm), near Red Bank.
December 1942	The Toms River Signal Laboratory is activated; moved from Squier to Spring Lake, 22 April 1943; deactivated on 1 September 1943.
April 1943	The Signal Corps Ground Maintenance Agency is established as an element of the Signal Corps Eastern Signal Service, Philadelphia.
January 1946	The Diana project at Camp Evans launches the era of space-age communications through radar contact with the moon.
1946	The automatic mortar locating radar, MPQ-10, is developed.
1948	Fort Monmouth develops the first weather radar.
1948	The development of synthetic quartz at Fort Monmouth frees the military from reliance on foreign imports.
1948-1949	Fort Monmouth scientists develop a technique (still used) for mass production (auto-assembly) of integrated circuits.
1949	The Watson Labs (Air Force Avionics) are relocated from Camp Wood to Rome, NY.
1950-1953	In Korea, the PRC-6/8/10 radios replace the SCR-510; the first tactical application of mortar locators.
1953-1954	The "Hexagon," a major laboratory now known as the Myer Center, is built for the Signal Corps Engineering Labs in Camp Charles Wood. A huge classroom and barracks complex is built on Main Post for the Signal School.
1957	The Pigeon Training Service is discontinued. Pigeons are sold or donated to zoos.
1958	Patterson Army Hospital is constructed. The Army Advent Management Agency (precursor of SATCOM) moves into the old hospital (Allison Hall).
1958	Solar cells developed at Fort Monmouth power the Vanguard I during its five years in orbit.
December 1958	Project Signal Communication by Orbiting Relay Equipment (SCORE), launched on 18 December, broadcasts President Eisenhower's Christmas message round the world.
February 1959	Vanguard II, the first weather satellite, is launched with a Fort Monmouth electronics package.
1959-1960	Fort Monmouth scientists participate in the world-wide

	synchronization of atomic clocks which establishes a global standard for time.
1960	TIROS I, developed under Fort Monmouth's technical supervision, sends back the world's first televised weather pictures via the Space Sentry terminal at Evans.
1960	MOBIDIC, the world's first van-mounted mobile computer, begins an experiment in automating combat support functions at Field Army and theater levels.
1960	COURIER proves that high-volume communications (100,000 words a minute) can be relayed through space.
1962	The Signal Corps Engineering Labs demonstrate an experimental, 10-pound radar that can spot moving targets on the ground more than a mile away.
August 1962	The Army disbands the technical services and establishes the Electronics Command (ECOM) at Fort Monmouth to manage Signal research and development and logistics support.
1963	The AN/VRC-12/PRC-25 radio family is first deployed to Military Assistance Groups in South Vietnam.
1965-1972	Vietnam receives the first tactical deployment of ECOM systems -- night vision devices, personnel locators, intrusion detectors, portable radars, computers, SATCOM terminals, helmet radios (PRT-4/PRR-9), and pulse-code modulated (digital) communications terminals.
1968	Mallard, a quadripartite project, is established at Fort Monmouth to develop cellular phone technologies for the battlefield.
1973	Congress kills Mallard in favor of the Tri-Service Communications (TRI-TAC) Program.
1974	ECOM leases the GSA Office Building in Tinton Falls to house logistics and management support organizations. It closes operations in Philadelphia and Camp Coles.
1974-1976	The Signal School moves to Fort Gordon.
1976	The Military Academy Preparatory School (USMAPS) moves to Fort Monmouth.
1976	The Army Tactical Data Systems (ARTADS) Program Manager is established to oversee battlefield automation.
1976	FIREFINDER artillery and mortar locating radar systems are fielded.
January 1978	ECOM is fragmented on the recommendation of the Army Materiel Acquisition Review Committee (AMARC) to form three Commands and one Activity.
July 1978	The Electronics Materiel Readiness Activity, Vint Hill Farms Station, VA, is transferred to the C-E Materiel Readiness Command.
1979	The U.S. Army Chaplain Center and School moves to Fort Monmouth.
1980	The Communications Research and Development Command

	(CORADCOM) engineers the establishment of Software Support Centers throughout the Army Materiel Command (AMC).
1981	The first Tactical Fire Direction (TACFIRE) system is fielded.
1981	AMARC reorganizations are undone. The C-E Materiel Readiness Command and CORADCOM merge to form the Communications-Electronics Command (CECOM).
1982	CECOM fields the first TTC-39 TRI-TAC switches.
1982	The 513th Military Intelligence Group moves to Fort Monmouth and subsequently becomes a brigade.
1983	CECOM awards the first contract for production of Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio Systems (SINCGARS) to replace radios of the VRC-12 family.
1985	The Laboratory Command (LABCOM) replaces ERADCOM and the Night Vision and Electronic Warfare Labs return to CECOM along with the Signals Warfare Lab. LABCOM retains Atmospheric Sciences (Fort Huachuca) and Electronics Technology (Fort Monmouth).
1985	CECOM awards Mobile Subscriber Equipment (MSE) contracts in a revolutionary \$4.5 billion procurement. MSE supplants TRI-TAC.
1987	CECOM loses Project Managers to three newly established Program Executive Offices and develops a "matrix support" mechanism.
October 1987	Vint Hill Farms Station becomes a CECOM sub-installation.
1988	The First MSE Coherent Unit Set is fielded to III Corps (1st Cavalry Division), Fort Hood.
1989	Fort Monmouth garners the Army Chief of Staff award in the first Army Community of Excellence competition.
1990-1991	Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm prove Signal Corps/CECOM products.
1991	The last of the AMARC organizations, the Avionics R&D Activity (AVRADA), is united with CECOM.
1993	BRAC orders the closing of Camp Evans, Vint Hill Farms, and the Tinton Falls Office Building as well as the relocation of personnel to Main Post and Charles Wood. CECOM acquires some missions and personnel from the Belvoir RD&E Center.
1994	CECOM is given the technical lead in "Battlefield Digitization."
1994	The 513th Military Intelligence Brigade moves to Fort Gordon.
1994-1997	CECOM components in the GSA office building, Tinton Falls, are relocated to main post.
1995	The Chaplain Center and School move to Fort Jackson (a BRAC '93 action). CECOM begins construction of a new IEW Lab building and renovation of the old Signal School complex.
1995	BRAC orders the relocation of the avionics logistics support mission from St. Louis to Fort Monmouth.
1995	PEO C3S is formed by the merger of PEO COMM and PEO CCS.
1996	The CECOM Logistics and Readiness Center wins the President's

	Quality Improvement Prototype award.
1996	The Signal Organization Mission Assessment (SOMA) realigns the Information Systems Command. CECOM acquires the Information Systems Engineering Command (Fort Huachuca) and the Information Systems Management Activity (Fort Monmouth).
1997	Vint Hill Farms Station is formally closed.
1997	ARL's Sensors and Electronic Devices Directorate (formerly, the Electronics Technology and Devices Laboratory) are relocated from Fort Monmouth to Adelphi, Md.
1997	The McAfee Center (building 600) is dedicated.
1997	Operational control of Tobyhanna Army Depot is transferred to CECOM from the Industrial Operations Command (a QDR initiative).
1997-2000	The Army-wide Wholesale Logistics Modernization Program is managed by CECOM.
1998	The Defense Finance and Accounting Service missions at Fort Monmouth are transferred to St. Louis.
1998	The Military Traffic Management Command's 600 <sup>th</sup> Transportation Group is relocated to Fort Monmouth from Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal.
2001	Fort Monmouth (Patterson Army Health Clinic) is chosen as the site for the NJ Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic.
2001	Team C4ISR aids in the search and rescue efforts at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.
November 2003	Fort Monmouth is designated a New Jersey Center for Defense Technologies and Security Readiness on 10 November 2003.
July 2004	Monmouth County's first Veterans' Affairs Health Clinic opens at Fort Monmouth.
2 February 2005	The US Army Communications-Electronics Life Cycle Management Command (CE LCMC) is activated, formally aligning PEO IEWS, PEO C3T, and the Communications-Electronics Command under unified leadership. Team C4ISR teammates include the Communications Electronics Research, Development, and Engineering Center; PM Defense Communications and Army Transmissions Systems; and PM Defense and Army Switched Systems will continue to be LCMC partners throughout the activation.





1991	Fort Devens	CLOSE
1991	Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station Keyport	REALIGN
1993	Naval Reserve Center Chicopee	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center New Bedford	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Pittsfield	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Quincy	CLOSE
1993	Navy/Marine Corps Reserve Center Lawrence	CLOSE
1995	Naval Air Station South Weymouth	CLOSE
1995	Hingham Cohasset	CLOSE
1995	Sudbury Training Annex	CLOSE

#### MICHIGAN

1988	Pontiac Storage Facility	CLOSE
1991	Ground Vehicle Propulsion Basic and Applied Research, Warren	REALIGN
1991	Wurtsmith Air Force Base	CLOSE
1993	Naval Air Facility Detroit	CLOSE
1993	Defense Logistics Agency Information Processing Center, Battle Creek	CLOSE
1993	K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base	CLOSE
1995	Detroit Arsenal	REALIGN
1995	Naval Reserve Center Cadillac	CLOSE
1995	Naval Air Facility Detroit	REDIRECT

#### MISSOURI

1988	NIKE Kansas City 30	CLOSE
1988	St. Louis Area Support Center Wherry Housing	CLOSE
1991	Aviation Systems Command and Troop Command Support, St. Louis	REALIGN
1991	Richard-Gebaur Air Reserve Station	CLOSE
1993	Defense Information Technology Service Organization, Kansas City Information Processing Center	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Joplin	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center St. Joseph	CLOSE
1995	Aviation-Troop Support Command	DISESTAB

#### MONTANA

1993	Naval Reserve Center Great Falls	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Missoula	CLOSE
1995	Malmstrom Air Force Base	REALIGN
1995	Fort Missoula	CLOSURE

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE

1988	Pease Air Force Base	CLOSE
1993	Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning, and Procurement Portsmouth	DISESTAB

#### NEW JERSEY

1988	Fort Dix	REALIGN
1988	Fort Monmouth	REALIGN
1988	NIKE NY 54 Housing	CLOSE


1988	NIKE NY 60 Housing	CLOSE
1988	NIKE NY 79/80 Housing	CLOSE
1988	NIKE NY 93/94	CLOSE
1988	NIKE Philadelphia 41/43	CLOSE
1991	Electronic Technology Device Laboratory, Fort Monmouth	REALIGN
1991	Fort Dix	REALIGN
1991	Naval Air Engineering Center, Lakehurst	REALIGN
1991	Naval Air Propulsion Center, Trenton	REALIGN
1993	Fort Monmouth	REALIGN
1993	Naval Reserve Center Atlantic City	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Perth Amboy	CLOSE
1993	Naval Air Warfare Center - Aircraft Division, Trenton	CLOSE
1995	Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal	CLOSE
1995	Fort Dix	REALIGN
1995	Camp Kilmer	CLOSE
1995	Camp Pedricktown	CLOSE

#### NEW MEXICO

1988	Fort Wingate Ammunition Storage Depot	CLOSE
1991	Battlefield Environmental Effects Element of the Atmospheric Science Laboratory, White Sands Missile Range	REALIGN
1991	Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility Albuquerque	CLOSE
1993	Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility Albuquerque (retain as a tenant of the Air Force)	REDIRECT

#### NEW YORK

1988	Dry Hill Family Housing	CLOSE
1988	Manhattan Beach Housing	CLOSE
1988	Naval Station New York (Brooklyn)	CLOSE
1988	NIKE NY 01 Housing	CLOSE
1988	NIKE NY 25 Housing	CLOSE
1988	NIKE NY 99 Housing	CLOSE
1993	Griffiss Air Force Base	REALIGN
1993	Naval Reserve Center Jamestown	CLOSE
1993	Naval Reserve Center Poughkeepsie	CLOSE
1993	Naval Station Staten Island	CLOSE
1993	Plattsburgh Air Force Base	CLOSE
1993	Readiness Command Region Scotia (Region 2)	CLOSE
1993	Department of Defense Family Housing and Family Housing Office, Niagara Falls	CLOSE
1995	Seneca Army Depot	CLOSE
1995	Roslyn Air Guard Station	CLOSE
1995	Griffiss Air Force Base (Airfield Support for 10th Infantry [Light] Division)	REDIRECT
1995	Griffiss Air Force Base (485th Engineering Installation Group)	REDIRECT
1995	Bellmore Logistics Activity	CLOSE
1995	Fort Totten	CLOSE
1995	Naval Reserve Center Staten Island	CLOSE
1995	Real-Time Digitally Controlled Analyzer Processor Activity, Buffalo	CLOSE



# BRAC update

## Commanders address workforce concerns

by Debbie Sheehan

### Public Affairs Office

The topics were varied, but the message was the same. The Fort Monmouth workforce is concerned about its future, one way or another.

Maj. Gen. Michael R. Mazzucchi and Garrison Commander Col. Ricki L. Sullivan hosted a Fort Monmouth town meeting on May 18, which originated in Pruden Auditorium and was broadcast to various locations around post.

Mazzucchi said he had a chance to address the workforce with a monologue the day it was announced that the fort was on the list of recommendations of posts to be closed. Now it was a chance for a dialogue, and to address specific questions from the workforce.

Sullivan began his presentation by stating what had been said before. "This has nothing to do with you, or the quality of your work. This is a 'big picture' type of thing. Please do not take it personally." The background slides he used to outline his presentation stated the 2002 National Defense Authorization Act authorized a single Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round this year.

BRAC 2005 would look into military value, the required infrastructure to support Force needs; jointness, maximizing joint use and reducing inter-Service duplication and cost savings. BRAC criteria include the priority consideration of "military value." This pertains to current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness, including impact on joint war-fighting, training and readiness.

The next two points were the availability and condition of the land, facilities and airspace at both existing and potential receiving locations and the ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization and future total force requirements.

Of course, cost of operations is a factor as well as potential savings. Other impacts are what closing a base will do to the local communities, the environmental condition of existing posts and how the infrastructure of a post and community of receiving destinations can support an influx of personnel.

Sullivan said he had seen "a few long faces" since the announcement that Fort Monmouth was on the closure list. If the DoD's recommendation stands, organizations currently located here would either transfer to new locations or be discontinued.

"That is a reality we will be talking about in the next several months," Sullivan said. During this period the BRAC Commission will be reviewing the DoD's recommendations to see if they conform to selection criteria. There will be public hearings and site visits. The Commission can only add a closure to the list if seven of nine agree. They can remove a recommended closure if five of nine agree.

The post will be visited by at least two members of the BRAC Commission. They will be on hand to learn more about the installation mission and to visit with community leaders to learn the impact of closing the post on the community.

Mazzucchi said Sullivan was in the process of creating an action team to create operational plans and to be in place to answer questions when they arose. Both Mazzucchi and Sullivan promised that they

would keep the workforce up to date on developments.

They said the main thing was to remain calm, and not to make rash judgments. Reviewing options is a good way to plan for the future. "Don't go selling your house. You have at least another two years before any changes need to be made, if they need to be made," said Sullivan. "Remember, this is a marathon, not a sprint."

The attendees were urged to continue to attend briefings, read this paper for information and to become familiar with the "do's and don'ts" of BRAC ethics.

These include avoiding conflicts of interest, such as participating in efforts to insulate the post from BRAC in any official capacity while you are "on the clock." Even if you are just acting as a private citizen, you cannot use your official position to influence others. It is out of line to use government resources, e-mail contacts or any information to which you are privy because of official duties; and you cannot use your authority to try to influence or coerce subordinates.

During the question and answer portion of the town meeting, many just wanted an opportunity to make an observation, including questioning the wisdom of attempting to move so many scientists and engineers out of a state whose population has garnered so many patents.

Mazzucchi said anyone who had done personal research should "bring on the factoids" to the action team who may be able to use them in some context. When asked if there would be environmental studies done at Aberdeen Proving Ground before any potential moves were made, Sullivan said the Army Corps of Engineers would be inspecting all the posts and making sure they are environmentally up to code.

He also stressed that the DA has said any moves would not involve temporary accommodations. "They are not going to move you into a doublewide trailer somewhere." Those viewing the proceedings were informed that if the move to Maryland took place, their base pay would be a bit lower (because of reduced locality pay) and that Army personnel officials will look into the possibility of job swaps, especially to keep families together should both spouses work here and potentially be transferred to different locations.

At this time there is no talk of a hiring freeze on impacted bases. There were comments about the high cost of housing near Fort Belvoir, Va., and security concerns. There were also questions about the impact on receiving communities and assurances that studies had been completed to insure that surrounding communities could expand, if necessary to accept more residents, and for schools to be ready to accept more pupils.

In the end, Mazxucchi noted that there are more questions than answers at this point, but that the leadership would not promise what they could not deliver or suggest things they were not capable of doing. He thanked the workforce for coming out to the meeting. "It is hopeful for me to see your faces, to see you laugh, smile and keep perspective. This is not the time to light your hair on fire. It is a time to hold your heads up, and not put your head down and kick a rock. My job is to continue to accomplish our mission and to continue to take care of you, the workforce."

# BRAC 2005: Commander speaks to command, community

by Debbie Sheehan

Public Affairs Office

Friday, May 13, 2005, may be a day that will be forever etched in the minds of many in the Fort Monmouth community.

“This is like one of those days like the day President Kennedy was shot or the day the Challenger space shuttle blew up on the launch pad—a day when you’ll remember where you were when you heard the announcement,” said Maj. Gen. Michael R. Mazzucchi, commanding general of the Communications-Electronics Life Cycle Management Command, in his videoteleconference (VTC) address to command personnel last Friday.

Of course the announcement to which he referred was the recommendation by the Pentagon that Fort Monmouth shut its gates forever.

At an afternoon news conference following the Defense Department announcement, Mazzucchi was asked by a news reporter what he felt when he got the news. He said he just paused for a moment to reflect on the Army’s mission, and on how everything must be devoted to creating a successful environment for supporting the warfighter, even if that were to mean the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission chooses to leave Fort Monmouth on the list of bases that will be closed.

But then he said he thought of the command workforce. “I thought about the food servers at Gibbs Hall, the daycare providers who have built their lives here, and placed their futures, their hopes and dreams, their livelihood and expectations for the future here, and I feel their heartbreak.”

Mazzucchi stressed during the news conference and during his earlier VTC address to command personnel that the recommendation for closure did not reflect on the performance of the workforce here. “This is not a reflection on you or the value of your work. I am sure the decision to make a recommendation to close the post was not an easy one. But I will not deny your professional and personal anxiety,”

During the VTC and the news conference, Mazzucchi stressed that the recommendation for closure was just that--- a recommendation. He said representatives from the BRAC Commission will visit in the coming months, review the data and make their own recommendation, to either pull the fort off the closure list or leave it on.

Regardless of the outcome, Mazzucchi stressed that at least the next couple of years will be business as usual for the workforce. “This is not the time to make any rash personal or professional decisions; it is a time for reflection,” he said.

Pointing to the 374-page document of Defense Department BRAC recommendations during his VTC address to command personnel, Mazzucchi said the senior staff was still sifting through the document, and trying to distill ambiguity from fact.

During the afternoon news conference both Mazzucchi and Col. Ricki Sullivan, Fort Monmouth Garrison Commander, stated that over the coming weeks there will undoubtedly be more questions than ready answers, but they promised to try their utmost to keep everyone informed.

Mazzucchi designated Sullivan as "the point man, the main action agent" for information in the coming weeks. Both Mazzucchi and Sullivan planned to hold a town meeting last Wednesday to help provide more information to the command workforce.

Reflecting on the future in his VTC address, Mazzucchi pointed out that the mission continues to be to support the Soldiers who are putting their lives on the line to defend our country. Referring to the BRAC Commission's deliberations over the next several months and paraphrasing the master of turning a phrase, Yogi Berra, Mazzucchi told the workforce to realize that "it isn't over 'til it's over."

# Fort Monmouth BRAC recommendations announced by DoD

By Timothy Rider

## Public Affairs

The Department of Defense announced its recommendation for Fort Monmouth closure last Friday as part of the Congressionally authorized 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Process.

What follows is a summary of the recommendations as they pertain to Fort Monmouth. It is a summary of detailed recommendations that does not necessarily address impacts affecting all personnel and organizations.

- Communications-Electronics Research, Development & Engineering Center (CERDEC) elements at Fort Monmouth would relocate to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), Md.
- Headquarters and elements of Program Executive Offices for Command, Control and Communications-Tactical and PEO Intelligence, Electronic Warfare and Sensor at Fort Monmouth would relocate to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.
- Logistics and Readiness Center work in support of consumable items, along with the portion of the Acquisition Center's work in providing the contracting support for consumable items, would relocate to the Defense Supply Center in Columbus, Ohio as part of the Defense Logistics Agency.
- Logistics and Readiness Center work in support of depot level reparable items, along with the portion of the Acquisition Center's work in providing the contracting support for depot level reparable items, would relocate to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md. and form a detachment of the Defense Supply Center in Columbus, Ohio, also as a part of the Defense Logistics Agency.
- Remaining elements of the Communications Electronics Life Cycle Management Command at Fort Monmouth would relocate to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.
- Elements of the PEO, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Monmouth would relocate to Fort Belvoir, Va.
- The Joint Network Management System Program Office, representing the Defense Information Systems Agency personnel at Fort Monmouth, would relocate to Fort Meade, Md.
- The U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School would relocate to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y.
- Other, unspecified missions would relocate to currently unspecified locations. These are known as "discretionary moves." Examples of this would be the 754<sup>th</sup> Ordnance Company and the 902<sup>nd</sup> Military Intelligence Detachment.
- As a closing installation, certain activities on the installation would be expected to ultimately be eliminated. Examples include the Commissary, Army and Air Force Exchange Services (PX) and Garrison activities.

The announcement means the Department of Defense has completed its BRAC 2005 process and the

Secretary of Defense has forwarded his recommendations to the independent BRAC Commission chaired by former Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Anthony Principi.

The BRAC Commission will conduct an extensive review of the recommendations and forward their report to the President, due by September 8. The President will then have until September 23 to accept or reject the recommendations in their entirety. Then, if accepted, Congress will have 45 legislative days to reject the recommendations in their entirety before they will become binding on the DoD.

BRAC 2005 recommendations are part of the critical foundation of transforming the Department's infrastructure to meet emerging missions and revised Defense strategies. BRAC 2005 will allow the Department to reconfigure its current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war-fighting capability and efficiency through joint organizational and basing solutions that will facilitate multi-service missions, reduce excess capacity, save money, and redirect resources to modernize equipment and infrastructure and develop the capabilities to meet 21st century threats.

Installation commanders affected by BRAC were notified of their status last Friday shortly after members of Congress were notified. Prior to the announcement, installations were only involved in the process by providing a broad range of specified data and information for evaluation. Installation personnel were not involved in the evaluation or selection of bases affected by BRAC, a process that was closely guarded within DoD to ensure fairness and rigor in evaluating data properly. All information used by the DoD to make its recommendations will be provided to the BRAC Commission as it deliberates the list through the summer.

#### WEB SITES

The following web sites are available to provide more detailed information about the BRAC process and the recommendations announced last week:

Department of Defense BRAC site: <http://www.defenselink.mil/brac>

Army BRAC site: <http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/braco.htm>

Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment BRAC site: <http://www.asaie.army.mil>

U.S. Army Fort Monmouth

**CONTACT: Timothy Rider**  
532-1258**RELEASE NO. 05-13****May 13, 2005****Fort Monmouth BRAC recommendations announced by DoD**

The Department of Defense announced its recommendation for Fort Monmouth closure today as part of the Congressionally authorized 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Process.

What follows is a summary of the recommendations as they pertain to Fort Monmouth. It is a summary of detailed recommendations that does not necessarily address impacts affecting all personnel and organizations.

- Communications-Electronics Research, Development & Engineering Center (CERDEC) elements at Fort Monmouth would relocate to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG), Md.
- Headquarters and elements of Program Executive Offices for Command, Control and Communications-Tactical and PEO Intelligence, Electronic Warfare and Sensor at Fort Monmouth would relocate to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.
- Logistics and Readiness Center work in support of consumable items, along with the portion of the Acquisition Center's work in providing the contracting support for consumable items, would relocate to the Defense Supply Center in Columbus, Ohio as part of the Defense Logistics Agency.
- Logistics and Readiness Center work in support of depot level repairable items, along with the portion of the Acquisition Center's work in providing the contracting support for depot level repairable items, would relocate to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md. and form a detachment of the Defense Supply Center in Columbus, Ohio, also as a part of the Defense Logistics Agency.
- Remaining elements of the Communications Electronics Life Cycle Management Command at Fort Monmouth would relocate to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.
- Elements of the PEO, Enterprise Information Systems at Fort Monmouth would relocate to Fort Belvoir, Va.
- The Joint Network Management System Program Office, representing the Defense Information Systems Agency personnel at Fort Monmouth, would relocate to Fort Meade, Md.
- The U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School would relocate to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y.
- Other, unspecified missions would relocate to currently unspecified locations. These are known as "discretionary moves." Examples of this would be the 754<sup>th</sup> Ordinance Company and the 902<sup>nd</sup> Military Intelligence Detachment.
- As a closing installation, certain activities on the installation would be expected to ultimately be eliminated. Examples include the Commissary, Army and Air Force Exchange Services (PX) and Garrison activities.

The announcement means the Department of Defense has completed its BRAC 2005 process and the Secretary of Defense has forwarded his recommendations to the independent BRAC Commission chaired by former Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Anthony Principi.

The BRAC Commission will conduct an extensive review of the recommendations and forward their report to the President, due by September 8. The President will then have until September 23 to accept or reject the recommendations in their entirety. Then, if accepted, Congress will have 45 legislative days to reject the recommendations in their entirety before they will become binding on the DoD.

BRAC 2005 recommendations are part of the critical foundation of transforming the Department's structure to meet emerging missions and revised Defense strategies. BRAC 2005 will allow the Department to refigure its current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war-fighting capability and efficiency through joint organizational and basing solutions that will facilitate multi-service missions, reduce excess

capacity, save money, and redirect resources to modernize equipment and infrastructure and develop the capabilities to meet 21st century threats.

Installation commanders affected by BRAC were notified of their status this morning shortly after members of Congress were notified. Prior to the announcement, installations were only involved in the process by providing a broad range of specified data and information for evaluation. Installation personnel were not involved in the evaluation or selection of bases affected by BRAC, a process that was closely guarded within DoD to ensure fairness and rigor in evaluating data properly. All information used by the DoD to make its recommendations will be provided to the BRAC Commission as it deliberates the list through the summer.

#### WEB SITES

The following web sites are available to provide more detailed information about the BRAC process and the recommendations announced today:

Department of Defense BRAC site: <http://www.defenselink.mil/brac>

Army BRAC site: <http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/braco.htm>

Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment BRAC site: <http://www.asaie.army.mil>

STATEMENT BY MG MAZZUCCHI  
AT NEWS CONFERENCE  
WITH REGIONAL AND NATIONAL MEDIA  
FRIDAY AFTERNOON, 13 MAY

Good afternoon. Thank you for attending this news conference.

I know the Department of Defense announcement this morning that Fort Monmouth is on the list of recommended installations for closure is not welcome news for many members of our command community and our partners and neighbors in surrounding communities.

But, let me offer a few thoughts to help put this news into perspective.

Although these recommendations announced today by the DoD will continue to present all of us with a great opportunity to contribute to a realigned and transformed future warfighting force, we're clearly faced with a difficult and heartbreaking immediate task... as our tenant organizations consider plans to move away from our many outstanding supporters in our neighboring communities and the state of New Jersey.

We know that Fort Monmouth contributes immensely to this region as a source of employment, as a center of innovation and as a center for all the values of selfless service that our uniformed and civilian personnel bring to their work and to their daily lives.

Fort Monmouth also contributes immensely to our Army's efforts in its commitments throughout the world and I am confident that Fort Monmouth personnel will continue to excel in maintaining our commitment to our warfighters who depend upon us. This commitment by our personnel to provide the best equipment, support and quality of life for our warfighters is an endeavor to which this BRAC round is also committed.

I must emphasize that these BRAC recommendations are about reconfiguring our facilities and organizational infrastructure in order to optimize warfighting capability. The recommendations are not a reflection on the value or the quality of work the fort's personnel perform everyday for the Army and our nation's defense.

We remind everyone that these BRAC recommendations are just that---recommendations. They are not final. And, before these recommendations become binding, the BRAC Commission will conduct an extensive review and may, as they have in the past, make changes to the list before they forward their report to the President, due by September 8<sup>th</sup>. The President will then have until September 23<sup>rd</sup> to accept or reject the recommendations in their entirety. Then, if accepted, Congress will have 45 legislative days to reject the recommendations in their entirety before they will become binding on the DoD.

Although we must begin that transition planning, we will be unable to act on those plans until the recommendations become law.

Assuming for a moment that the recommendation is to close Fort Monmouth, and it becomes law, it is important to note that the DoD's goal is to complete transitions within six years after recommendations become binding. This is an important point to emphasize.... because recognizing that the Department of the Army intends to act on final BRAC decisions as soon as possible....it still means that, even if the decision to close Fort Monmouth becomes final, for at least the next few years our Fort Monmouth

personnel can expect that they will continue their normal duties.

It is now time for Fort Monmouth to begin its planning to implement these recommendations. The starting point for that planning is the recognition that our personnel are our most important asset. Know that our planners recognize that the need for our personnel to understand the transition process so that they can adequately plan for their futures is a top priority. Please understand, however, that we will go through a period when we will have many more questions than we can provide answers.

Rest assured: we will provide as much information as possible as soon as it is possible. We must be careful, however, not to announce some information prematurely. It would provide a great disservice to our personnel if they were to act on information we provided in haste which eventually proved false due to changing circumstances. Our personnel specialists are always committed to providing advice at all times regarding issues such as rights to jobs at gaining installations, the priority placement program, Permanent Change of Station allowances and other initiatives and services within the DoD, Department of the Army and Fort Monmouth personnel offices.

Again, we need to put this morning's announcement into proper perspective and to realize that the BRAC process will take many more months to play out...that our important work here will continue well into the foreseeable future...and that we will strive to the utmost to keep our civilian and military personnel and our contractor personnel informed as the process continues.

Thank you for joining us here today.

**FORT MONMOUTH FACT SHEET**

**Numbers of Personnel**---5,085 Federal Civilian Employees  
467 Military Personnel  
More than 2,500 Contractors Working on Post  
Approximately 23,000 Military Retirees Served

**Acreage** 637 Acres—Main Post  
489 Acres—Charles Wood Area  
1126 Total Acres

**Major Tenant Organizations:**

**US Army Garrison Fort Monmouth**

Provides base operations facilities, support and services for the Fort Monmouth community

**US Army Communications-Electronics Life Cycle Management Command**

Acquires, fields, sustains and supports Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance Systems for the Joint Warfighter. This command includes--

**--US Army Program Executive Office for Command, Control and Communications Tactical**

Develops, acquires, fields, and supports secure and interoperable tactical, theater and strategic command and control and communications systems

**--US Army Program Executive Office for Intelligence, Electronic Warfare and Sensors**

Develops, acquires, fields and supports intelligence, electronic warfare and sensor systems to provide integrated surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities to commanders and warfighters

**754th Ordnance Company (Explosive Ordnance Disposal)**

Provides explosive ordnance disposal support to military installations, federal agencies and civilian authorities in the Northeast Region

**US Military Academy Preparatory School**

Prepares selected soldiers, Reservists, National Guard members, and high school graduates to qualify in academic and physical aptitudes for appointment to the U.S. Military Academy

**Patterson Army Health Clinic**

Provides comprehensive health care to military personnel, military retirees and their families

**US Army Communications-Electronics Research, Development and Engineering Center**

Develops and integrates Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance technologies to enable networked warfighting systems.

**US Army Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems**

Develops, acquires, and deploys tactical and non-tactical information technology systems and communications

**FBI—Fort Monmouth Information Technology Center**

Provides automated support for investigative and administrative operations to FBI field offices in Eastern and Mid-Atlantic states

---

**ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF FORT MONMOUTH**

Fort Monmouth's economic impact on New Jersey is measured at \$3.24 billion with responsibility for 22,774 New Jersey jobs for federal fiscal year 2004 according to an analysis by fort personnel.

The analysis relied upon a still-valid methodology used by the New Jersey Commerce and Economic Growth Commission in a similar analysis it completed in cooperation with Fort Monmouth in 2002.

The analysis of overall economic impact includes the direct effect of \$478.4 million for payroll and benefits received by the fort's military and civilian federal employees, as well as the \$864.6 million in contracts awarded by fort organizations to New Jersey companies or to companies of other states for work performed at Fort Monmouth.

Along with estimated spending by government travelers to Fort Monmouth, aid paid to local schools and estimated private sector pay received by family members of Fort Monmouth employees, direct expenditures from Fort Monmouth to New Jersey amounts to \$1.415 billion.

The total estimated economic impact of \$3.24 billion is obtained by multiplying the direct New Jersey expenditures by an economic revenue multiplier of 2.29.

The economic revenue multiplier is a tool that was used by economists in the 2002 report to calculate the additional spending resulting from the direct contributions of Fort Monmouth to the New Jersey economy.

The 5,856 government jobs\* at Fort Monmouth held by New Jersey residents in fiscal year 2004 yield an estimated total of 22,774 jobs in the state when the labor multiplier of 3.889 is applied. Approximately 200 Fort jobs are held by New York and Pennsylvania residents.

The employment multiplier is a tool that was used by economists in the 2002 report to calculate the additional jobs created by all New Jersey businesses supplying, servicing or benefiting from direct spending.

The economic impact for fiscal year 2004 is slightly higher than the \$3.16 billion for fiscal year 2003. Fort Monmouth was responsible for slightly fewer jobs in 2004 than the 5,900 jobs held by New Jersey residents in 2003.

Fort Monmouth is the home of many organizations, primarily including those responsible for research, development, acquisition, fielding and support of Command and Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance systems for the Joint Warfighter.

---

\* Note: The 5,856 government jobs at Fort Monmouth referred to above comprises all appropriated fund and nonappropriated fund jobs that were held by New Jersey residents at some time during fiscal year 2004.

This is Google's cache of <http://www.tworivertimes.net/lead.php> as retrieved on May 22, 2005 23:35:22 GMT.

Google's cache is the snapshot that we took of the page as we crawled the web.

The page may have changed since that time. Click here for the [current page](#) without highlighting.


This cached page may reference images which are no longer available. Click here for the [cached text](#) only.

To link to or bookmark this page, use the following url: <http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:1v0BDqw8A7QJ:www.tworivertimes.net/lead.php+fort+monmouth+brac&hl=en>

*Google is not affiliated with the authors of this page nor responsible for its content.*

These search terms have been highlighted: **fort monmouth brac**

FRED BANK • HIGHLANDS • FAIR HAVEN • RIVINGTON • HIGHLAND • SEA BRIGHT • MONMOUTH BEACH • ATLANTIC HIGHLANDS • OCEANPORT • MIDDLETOWN • SHREWSBURY • LITTLE SILVER • COLTS NECK



# THE TWO RIVER TIMES

The Week of May 20 - 27, 2005

[TRT the Book](#) [Home](#) [About Us](#) [Advertise](#) [Subscribe](#) [Contact Us](#)

## Fort Monmouth Takes Direct Hit From Pentagon

**Lisa Merlini**

Birthplace of U.S. Army Signal Corps on federal base closing list.

TINTON FALLS – "The way this country runs its foreign policy, they should be opening bases, not closing them," Tom Carver, Commissioner for the New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development, said last Friday at a public meeting organized by area legislators in response to the announcement that **Fort Monmouth** is among the military facilities slated for closure by the federal government.

Early last Friday morning, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) made public a list of major military installations that they recommended for realignment or closure to the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) commission. **Fort Monmouth**, along with 33 other bases around the country, was on the list.

The Pentagon said in its report that **Fort Monmouth** was of little use beyond its research and development capabilities, and the military would be better served by streamlining and reorganizing their efforts on a nationwide scale.

On Friday afternoon, Congressman Rush Holt (D-NJ), along with fellow panelists Senator Jon Corzine (D-NJ), Senator Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ), Congressman Frank Pallone (D-NJ) and Admiral Paul Gaffney, chairman of the Governor's Commission on Military Bases, convened at **Monmouth** Regional High School's auditorium to discuss the base's future.

**Monmouth** County freeholders, mayors, base engineers, base scientists and the general public filled the auditorium, expressing their communal sense of dismay that the base – which contributes \$2.5 billion to the economy, provides over 5000 civilian jobs on-site and contributes to more than 17,000 others – could one day cease to exist.

In a signed letter dated May 13, 2005, Holt called **Fort Monmouth** "the Army's premier center for research and development (R&D) in communications, electronics and network-centric warfare." The letter went on to say that "**Fort Monmouth** has developed and implemented technology that jams signals intended to detonate roadside bombs; triggers automatic defense measures when missiles are fired at helicopters; and locates the sources of enemy mortar fire within seconds of its launch, to name just a few."

According to Holt, the decision to close the base is far from final. So far, only the first step has taken place. From here on in, he said, the **BRAC** commission would be in charge, making for a more open process that would include a visit by the **BRAC** commission to the base, and lobbying on the part of both the senators and congressmen, the co-chairs of the Save Our **Fort** Committee.

Last Monday, Holt and Pallone sent a letter to Anthony J. Principi, the chairman of the **BRAC** commission, inviting him to see the base firsthand.

"We will make sure that they know that you can't buy research off the shelf," Holt said. "We will make sure that they understand that you can't just pick up a lab, move it elsewhere and say, ok, produce at the level you were producing at before even though none of the personnel are the same."

"I'm going to be honest with you," Rep. Pallone told the assemblage. "We have a hell of a fight on our hands here. The fact of the matter is that the Pentagon has made a wrong and painfully absurd decision."

In a heated statement, Pallone said that the purpose of **BRAC** was to save the government money, when in fact it would cost far more money to close the base and transfer operations elsewhere than it would to keep it open. The Pentagon's report said it would cost the federal government \$822 million to transfer the base from **Fort Monmouth** to the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland, but it could save the government \$134 million annually.

"The Pentagon has completely ignored the military value of **Fort Monmouth** and what we do here," Pallone said. "We're at war. Right now, every day, the soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan and commanders are calling **Fort Monmouth** and asking us to develop new technologies in the communications and electronics field."

The Pentagon, Pallone said, thinks it makes more sense to move to Aberdeen, Md. because they have the land available for testing. "We test the equipment at **Fort Dix**," Pallone said. "We don't need to have a place to test equipment. We need the knowledge, the science, the engineering and the expertise that goes into developing these new technologies, and that would be lost while the war is going on."

"The Pentagon has violated the **BRAC** criteria," Pallone said. "They're not looking at all at military value, they're not talking about how they can recreate these functions in Aberdeen, they're costing the federal government more, and at the same time they're paying no attention to the cross-servicing whatsoever."

The Congressmen plan on holding regional meetings over the summer and then continue to Washington to make their case against closing the base. "We can win this" Pallone said. "It's not going to be easy, but with your help we can do this, and I don't want you to lose faith. We are determined to fight this battle to the bitter end, because we know that we don't want that soldier in the field to be hurt by these Pentagon recommendations."

"This is an SOS. Save our soldiers" Senator Lautenberg said. "It's not just about protecting jobs. It's not just about protecting an intellectual infrastructure. We have to make sure they understand, yes, it's a local matter. It's a matter of local intellect and ability. But it's also a matter of saving our soldiers, as many as we can."

Eight days prior to the meeting, Senator Corzine was in Iraq, visiting the striker brigade in Mosul. "Their command post was practically built here at **Fort Monmouth**," Corzine said. "Why, if you're trying to develop a mobile, lethal, smart system, are you going to turn your back on **Fort Monmouth**?"

"This is a bad, bad decision, not only for **Monmouth** County, not only for New Jersey, but for this nation. It will be turned back because it does not relate to what it is we're trying to do in a national strategy for defense," Corzine said.

"New Jersey has the highest concentration of scientists and engineers in the Union," Admiral Gaffney said.

Joan Hardy, of Middletown, is one of them. She has been an electrical engineer at **Fort Monmouth** for 20 years, and still, she said, she's learning. "It took me two years to be fluent in the acronyms," she said, after she was initially hired at **Fort Monmouth**. "It took me five years to learn my job. When the first desert storm war started, we went back to engineers with 40 years of experience to find out what the problems were and what to expect. In this Gulf war, I still defer to engineers with 20 or 30 years more experience than I have when I have problems. They save months and years in costs and procurement to the Army. To disrupt the system of mentoring and engineering skills that we have at **Fort Monmouth**, the irretrievable loss of multi-disciplinary skills - which are not taught in schools - is immeasurable, and can spell disaster for many technical areas."

**Fort Monmouth** estimates that 75 to 80 percent of its personnel will make the move with them, but many employees say those numbers are unrealistic.

Kathy Burks, a systems analyst, and Joan Welch, a logistician, both base employees, are both helping to support their families on their incomes. When asked if, given the worst-case scenario - the base closing

and full operations moving elsewhere - neither said they would follow the job.

"I wouldn't go," Burks said. "My life is here. My husband has a job here, I have children in school and my family is here. I would take an early retirement, and maybe go back to work later to help support my family."

"I like my job," Welch said, "but I wouldn't move to keep it. I have too many ties here. I'd rather get another job here than move to where I have no support system. Besides, if I move to keep job, my husband will be the one to have to find another job. We're a two-income family."

The disadvantages to losing the site, many believe, does not just end with the loss of intellectual capital, as Corzine called it. It ends with the loss, for many, of not only a job and an income, but of a way of life.

"I lived through the closing of the Cullen Air Force Base in Sacramento," Mike Ryan, of Lake Como, said. "What you fail to realize is that the people in Washington are looking at bases and they're looking at numbers. What they don't see the is degradation of family life, the suicides, the alcoholism, the divorces, the loss of jobs, the desperate ways people are looking to keep their family above water. It will impact a lot of people. When you throw the rock in the pond, the ripples will go far."

[return home](#)

Entire contents copyright © 2005 The Two River Times. All rights reserved. May not be reproduced without permission. For more information on this website, send an email to the webmaster at [webmaster@tworivertimes.net](mailto:webmaster@tworivertimes.net).

[Designed & Developed by Red Design Group LLC.](#)

This is Google's cache of <http://www.bayshore-courier.com/> as retrieved on May 23, 2005 20:22:00 GMT. Google's cache is the snapshot that we took of the page as we crawled the web. The page may have changed since that time. Click here for the [current page](#) without highlighting. The cached page may reference images which are no longer available. Click here for the [cached text](#) only. To link to or bookmark this page, use the following url: <http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:sXmfgv9W1VsJ:www.bayshore-courier.com/+fort+monmouth+brac&hl=en>


*Google is not affiliated with the authors of this page nor responsible for its content.*

These search terms have been highlighted: **fort monmouth brac**



# THE COURIER

Monmouth's Greatest Media Source



## Pallone Battles Base Closures

Will the U.S. Army installation at **Fort Monmouth**, in Eatontown, close or not?

The Army says "yes," while Rep. Frank Pallone, D-NJ, and his Congressional colleague, Rep. Rush Holt, D-NJ, say "no."


On Friday, May 13, the U.S. Department of Defense recommended the closure of **Fort Monmouth** as part of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process.

The 1,126-acre facility houses over 5,000 civilian jobs and 467 military personnel positions.

"BRAC 2005 recommendations are part of the critical foundation of transforming the Department [of Defense]'s infrastructure to meet emerging missions and revised defense strategy," said Timothy Rider, a spokesperson for the base, in a press release issued shortly after the U.S. Department of Defense issued its recommendation.

"My reaction was first to sit back and reflect on what it is we wear the uniform for: to make this a more effective force to fight the war on terror. Second, I thought about what this means to the food service worker or the daycare center down the street," said Maj. Gen. Michael R. Mazzucchi during a press conference held Friday afternoon.

The Department of Defense at the Pentagon in Washington, DC,



Do  
You  
See  
This



- Home
- Contacts
- Sales
- Circulation
- Vendors
- Letters to the Editor
- Comics
- Horoscopes
- Public Notices
- Lynn Azzolina's Dining Guide
- Azzolina

Gordon Bishop
e Kenny
Bruce Koczman
Jim Purcell
Lynn Azzolina's Scene Around
Somdatta Sengupta

recommended that many of the positions and departments located at **Fort Monmouth** be transferred to other bases, such as the Communication-Electronics Research and the Development & Engineering Center elements be moved to the U.S. Proving Grounds in Aberdeen, Maryland. Headquarters and elements of Program Executive Offices (PEO) for Command, Control and Communications-Tactical and PEO Intelligence, Electronic Warfare and Sensor would also be relocated to Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland according to the department's recommendation. Additionally, the Logistics and Readiness Center would be moved to the Defense Supply Center, in Columbus, Ohio.

The base has experienced a steady drawdown for several years. Prominent units and activities, including the U.S. Chaplain Center and School have already been moved off of the **fort**. In addition, the new plan would send the United States Military Academy Preparatory School (USMAPS) to the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York.

"This recommendation is what the people at the Pentagon are saying, not the Army," Pallone said. "We have successfully kept the **fort** open before and we will do it again."

Mazzucchi said that he has not experienced a strong reaction by rank-and-file workers at the post to the potential closure. "These are some of the greatest patriots. They understand that their mission has to continue. They understand that it will be months before [the closure] becomes law and years before [the law] becomes implemented," he said.

"We are going to fight before the **BRAC**. Scientists and engineers aren't going to move. We think, ultimately, that [Congress] isn't going to go with the **BRAC's** [recommendations]," Pallone said.

He noted that, by his estimation, it would cost the Federal Government \$1 billion to move various components of the **fort** to other destinations throughout the military community. "How does that save any money?" he questioned.

According to a timeline distributed at **Fort Monmouth**, there will be a July 1 Government Accounting Office (GAO) analysis of **BRAC's** recommendations.

In addition, not later than September 23, President George Bush must approve or disapprove of the list in its entirety. If Bush disapproves of the list, then **BRAC** has to submit revised recommendations by October 20.

"This is a long way from over," said Pallone regarding the base closure recommendation.

## DeSevo, Borbely Battle to Save Fort



**When They**  
We offer weekly, bi  
time and seasona

- Family owned bus
- Fully insured
- Trained and unifo
- Clearly marked ve
- Environmentally r
- Year round servic

**732-495-P00**

When Door  
pet wa  
clean-up s



Middletown residents Alex DeSevo and Steve Borbely are coming out swinging on the issue of **Fort Monmouth**.

"It's time for someone at the grassroots level to start doing something to save Ft. **Monmouth** and its 5,000-plus jobs," DeSevo said.

He explained that there is "no way the closure of **Fort Monmouth** doesn't impact the economy of Middletown Township."

DeSevo and Borbely are both running for seats on the Middletown Township Committee this year, as Democrats.

"The issue of the base closure isn't Republican or Democrat, it's a **Monmouth** County issue. The fact that Middletown is the largest of the county's municipalities only means that a grassroots effort to save this fort should begin here," Borbely said.

Even though the two men are both contending for positions on the Middletown Township Committee against Republican counterparts this year, the two said they want to set partisanship aside.

Specifically, DeSevo and Borbely are discussing the formation of a committee to gather signatures on a petition to the Department of Defense.


"I really want to applaud the efforts being made by both congressmen Frank Pallone and Rush Holt when it comes to fighting the base closure," DeSevo said.

"I think it's time that residents start weighing in on this issue, though."

Borbely said the best place to start being heard is at the Army **BRAC** Division, in Virginia. "Maybe in the end, the Army will do what it wants to do with the base. But, I suggest that we do everything we can as citizens for the military to hear our request and hope that **Fort Monmouth** continues to serve our country here," Borbely said.

For more information about the committee to begin a petition drive, call Joe Caliendo at (732) 299-6470. To speak directly to someone at **BRAC**, call (888) 309-6359.

**Read More in this week's Courier.**



- Small Animal
- Reptiles
- Hand-Fed Bir
- Fancy Goldfi
- Tropical & M

**Wide vari  
Cat & Dog  
Including f**  
Airport Plaza • 13  
Hazlet • 732-



NANCE S. C  
PROPRIET  
68 First Ave  
Atlantic high land  
tel. 732.291  
www.atlanticar  
© S. Set of A

**TJK STAI**  
IRISH SPORTS BAR  
www.TJKstad  
(73

**SUBSCRIBE TODAY:**  
**FEDERALTIMES**

[Home](#) | [Subscribe](#) | [Customer Service](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Advertise](#) | [About Us](#)

May 28, 2005

Agency Management

HR Management

Pay & Benefits

Information Tech.

Procurement News

Homeland Security

Federal Traveler

Postal Report

Career Information

Commentary

Spotlight

Weekly Poll

Ask the Experts

Bookstore

Defense News Media Group:

- [DNMediaGroup.com](#)
- [DefenseNews.com](#)
- [SRJournal.com](#)

[Online.com](#)

Military Times Media Group:

- [MilitaryCity.com](#)
- [ArmyTimes.com](#)
- [NavyTimes.com](#)
- [AirForceTimes.com](#)
- [MarineCorpsTimes.com](#)

May 18, 2005

## Two BRAC commissioners question closing of Fort Monmouth, N.J.

By GORDON TROWBRIDGE

Members of the commission reviewing the Pentagon's base-closing proposals told Army officials May 18 that they question the service's justification for closing Fort Monmouth, N.J., a move that would cost New Jersey more than 5,200 jobs.

"I disagree with that decision," Commissioner James Bilbray, a former congressman from Nevada, told Army Secretary Francis Henry and Chief of Staff Gen. Peter Schoomaker during a hearing on the Army's base-closing recommendations.

The economic impact of closing Monmouth would be substantial — New Jersey would lose more than 4,000 civilian jobs, many of them well-paid research and technology positions. But Bilbray and Commissioner Philip Coyle, an expert on defense-related technology, questioned the move's effect on the Army's research base.

"Do you agree Fort Monmouth possesses a highly skilled, specialized work force, and are you concerned that skill will be eroded?" Coyle asked.

Harvey said that in similar moves in previous base-closing rounds, about one-fourth of Army technical workers had chosen to move to new locations.

"I won't sit here and tell you we expect all the people at Fort Monmouth to move to Aberdeen Proving Ground," Harvey said, referring to another prominent Army research facility in Maryland.

But he said that cost was offset by the need to create a center for command, control and communications research and development at Aberdeen. "We have to do everything we can structurally and process-wise to reduce our cycle time from idea to capability," he said.

That justification failed to persuade Bilbray, who became the first of the nine commissioners in nine days of hearings to voice outright opposition to a closing.

"I can see it's going to take years to re-create the capacity you've got at Fort Monmouth," Bilbray said.



Nobody goes through life alone.

 **BlueCross**  
**BlueShield**  
 Federal Employee Program

# Atlanticville

Long Branch, NJ  
70F

Marketplace: Real Estate Automotive Classifieds Special Sections Guides Media Kit

### News

- Front Page
- Bulletin Board
- Letters
- Editorials
- Obituaries
- Schools
- Sports
- Business

## Front Page

April 28, 2005

**Ft. Monmouth bracing for BRAC on May 16**  
 Fate of county's largest employer topic of concern for officials  
**BY SUE M. MORGAN**  
**Staff Writer**

**EATONTOWN** — Officials at all levels of government are bracing for next month's highly anticipated federal Department of Defense (DOD) announcement about the fate of Fort Monmouth.

The list of military installations affected by this year's Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process is due for release by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld on May 16, DOD officials have stated.

In Eatontown, however, the day of reckoning comes three days earlier on May 13, which is when Mayor Gerald Tarantolo and Business Administrator Michael Trotta expect to be notified by federal officials as to whether or not Fort Monmouth will be listed for closure or realignment.

"We will then be privy to what bases have been included on the BRAC list," Tarantolo said last Thursday night.

In anticipation of the notification and release of the BRAC list, members of the Save Our Fort Committee advocacy group will meet with area public officials to prepare for the announcement regardless of what it turns out to be on May 9 in Eatontown.

The Save Our Fort Committee is comprised of many private contractors who conduct business with the U.S. Army at Fort Monmouth.

"We're hoping to get an inkling of what bases will be on the BRAC list," Tarantolo said of the May 9 meeting.

Fort Monmouth is one of seven New Jersey military installations, along with bases across the country, now being looked at for closure or downsizing by the DOD as a cost-cutting measure.

Altogether, the DOD is expected to eliminate about 20 to 25 percent of

Click ads below for larger version

**Let's Talk Real Estate**  
 Presented by  
**Margdalena Lamb, Real Estate Broker**  
 GET YOUR GARAGE ORGANIZED  
 with a little help from  
 Margdalena Lamb, Real Estate Broker



Call for more information  
 732-530-8770  
 www.Let'sTalkRealEstate.com

**FAIR HAVEN**  
 NEW CONSTRUCTION  
 3,000 sq. ft. 4 bedrooms, 3.5 bathrooms, granite countertops, hardwood floors, stainless steel appliances, central air conditioning, finished basement, large deck, close to schools and shopping.  
 Call for more information  
 732-530-8770  
 www.Let'sTalkRealEstate.com



**RUMSON**  
 NEW CONSTRUCTION  
 2,500 sq. ft. 3 bedrooms, 2.5 bathrooms, granite countertops, hardwood floors, stainless steel appliances, central air conditioning, finished basement, large deck, close to schools and shopping.  
 Call for more information  
 732-530-8770  
 www.Let'sTalkRealEstate.com



**Gloria Nilson** **GMAC**  
 Real Estate  
 Rumson Office • 110 Avenue of the Rivers • 732-530-2800

**#1 Source**  
**FOR GREAT LOANS**

**American Mortgage**  
 SOURCE  
 Your American Mortgage Solution Today

- 30 Year, 15 Year, 5/1 ARM
- 1st, 2nd, 3rd Mortgages
- Reverse Mortgages
- Home Equity Loans
- Construction Loans
- Business Mortgages

**LOW RATES**  
**GREAT SERVICE**  
**SAME DAY APPROVAL**


Call for more information  
 732-530-8770  
 www.AmericanMortgage.com




1000 New York Turnpike, Suite 100  
 Rumson, NJ 07070  
**732-530-8770**

Featured Special Section Home

That's the difference that's in a house and a home.



About Us


- Archive
- All Greater Media News
- Contact Us
- Services
- Search Archive

Search  
 Copyright © 2001 - 2005 GMN  
 All Rights Reserved



Newspaper web site content management system and services





military bases in the country via the BRAC process.

System and Method for Display  
Ads have a Patent Pending.  
Click Here for More Information

The federal government will then review the BRAC list in the four months following its release, with President George W. Bush to receive it in early September, Tarantolo explained. Bush is then to approve or disapprove the list by later that month.

BRAC commissioners, who were named by Bush in March, will then review any of the president's objections and consider any changes he proposes. A final BRAC report is then returned to Bush for his acceptance or rejection before the president forwards the list to Congress.

Congress then has 45 days to approve or disapprove the entire list as a whole.

No single base would be removed from the BRAC listing once it is in the hands of Congress, Tarantolo noted.

Located mainly in Eatontown and Tinton Falls, but also bordering Shrewsbury, Little Silver and Oceanport, Fort Monmouth has been described by numerous officials as the largest employer of Monmouth County residents.

Since the coming BRAC was first announced last fall, Tarantolo and the mayors of the other four most-affected municipalities have been meeting with higher-level government officials who might have some influence on the final listing.

Earlier this month, Virginia S. "Ginny" Bauer, CEO and secretary of the New Jersey Commerce, Economic Growth and Tourism Commission, pledged to work at the state level for Fort Monmouth's well-being.

"Ginny expressed support for Save the Fort, and is actively pursuing support for Fort Monmouth and the economic pluses that it offers this area and all of Monmouth County," Tarantolo said.

Bauer was accompanied by U.S. Representatives Frank Pallone and Rush Holt (D-N.J.) at this month's meeting with Tarantolo and other local officials. Both congressmen, who represent portions of Monmouth County, have promised to lobby for keeping Fort Monmouth off the BRAC list.

U.S. Senator Jon Corzine (D-NJ), who is also running in this year's gubernatorial race, has previously pledged his own support for the fort and met with Holt, Pallone and other officials.

Programs for command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance — known collectively as

(C4ISR) — are developed at the fort and later used on the battlefields, particularly in the Middle East according to Pallone. The base is known as the manufacturing center of the Army's military communications equipment.

phillyBurbs.com  
Your Internet Starts Here.

Login | Standard Edition | Edit

5/28/2005 • LIGHT RAIN 61° | Forecast

<b>AdSearch</b> Newspaper ads and Classifieds	<b>BizSearch</b> Find Stores & Businesses	<b>CarSearch</b> Search 15,000 LOCAL cars	<b>JobSearch</b> Search jobs Post a resume	<b>HomeSearch</b> Search 6,000 LOCAL Homes	› Shop Online	› Subscribe
					› Shop Local	› Advertise
					› Coupons	› Contact Us

**Courier Times**

News Sports Money Entertainment Guides Interact Search ? Shopping

Extend the reach of your advertising with banners on PhillyBurbs.com!  
Call Mel Taylor today at 866-779-1210



**NEWS**

- Local
- Bucks County  
Courier Times
- Burlington  
County Times
- The Intelligencer
- Hometown  
Pennsylvania
- New Jersey  
National  
World
- Health  
Washington  
Elections
- Columnists  
aries  
ies  
Weather

Home / New Jersey News

**BRAC commissioner to visit Fort Monmouth in June**

By **DONNA DE LA CRUZ**  
The Associated Press

WASHINGTON - One of the commissioners appointed by President Bush to oversee this year's military base closings will visit Fort Monmouth on June 9, but the New Jersey congressional delegation said Thursday they are pressing for more of the commissioners to come to the post.

The New Jersey Army base was among the installations the Pentagon recommended be closed when it announced sweeping changes to the nation's military bases last week although it was ranked 50th out of 97 installations in terms of military value, according to an Army report made public Thursday. New Jersey's Picatinny Arsenal is ranked 47th and is gaining jobs. Fort Hamilton in New York is ranked 73rd and was not targeted for closure.

Lloyd Warren Newton, a retired Air Force general, will tour Fort Monmouth, most likely with several members of New Jersey's congressional delegation, said Democratic Reps. Rush Holt and Frank Pallone. All 15 members of the delegation are working together to get Fort Monmouth off the list.

For that to happen, a majority of the nine members of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission would have to agree to take it off the list they will send to President Bush in September.


On July 8, three commissioners - Newton, Philip Coyle and Chairman Anthony Principi - are to hold a regional hearing in Baltimore that will include proposals for New Jersey. Coyle is a defense consultant and served in the Clinton administration. Principi was secretary of Veterans Affairs in President Bush's first term.

Principi said the regional hearing will provide "the primary means for communities to educate the commissioners and their staff on their disagreements with the Department of Defense base recommendations."

The New Jersey delegation has written to Principi and personally asked

You could win a **\$100,000** backyard makeover when you use your MasterCard at The Home Depot.

[click here](#)



**BizSearch**  
Find businesses & stores near you

Keyword(s) or  
Business Name

him to visit Fort Monmouth, said Republican Rep. Chris Smith after the majority of the lawmakers gathered for about an hour in the Capitol to discuss strategies for keeping the post open.

Town  ST   
Search

**BUCKS COUNTY Courier Times** **SUBSCRIBE**  
**DATE TIME** **SIGN IN**

**Frankford Hospital – Bucks County**  
**Jefferson Health System**



**1-800-JEFF-NOW**

They agreed they need to demonstrate Fort Monmouth's military value and will do so by highlighting the post's many contributions to the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Fort Monmouth employees have developed many weapons systems and technological devices currently being used by U.S. forces.

**Events, Contests and Promotions**

- Area Congregations
- NIE Online Auction
- BCT Photo Gallery

The congressmen also plan a survey of the post's 5,272 employees to see if they would move to Aberdeen, Md., where much of the research and development work now done at Monmouth would be transferred. Secretary of the Army Francis J. Harvey told the commissioners on Wednesday that the Army was concerned that many of the employees - who are mainly civilian engineers and scientists - would not move.

"That brain drain is very real," Smith said. "You just don't put an ad in the paper and get the people you need."

The lawmakers also plan to show that moving Fort Monmouth's mission to Aberdeen will be more costly in the long run. The Pentagon has said the move would cost \$822 million.

The Pentagon tried to close Fort Monmouth in 1988 and 1993, but an intense lobbying effort by congressional, state and local officials kept the post open.

By law, Bush can only accept or deny the entire package submitted by BRAC. If Bush accepts the recommendations, the list becomes final within 45 legislative days, unless Congress passes a joint resolution to block the entire package.

If Bush rejects the recommendations, the commission has until Oct. 20 to submit a revised list. In November, Bush would have to approve or disapprove of the revised recommendations.

May 19, 2005 4:54 PM

**Story Options:** [Print this story](#) [Email a friend](#)

- › [Shop Online](#)
- › [Find Deals](#)
- › [Buy a Car](#)
- › [Find a Job](#)
- › [Buy a House](#)
- › [Plan a Trip](#)
- › [Go Out to Eat](#)

**phillyBurbs highlights**

**15,000 cars near you**

Find the one you like

**Burbs Blogs: Join in the conversation!**

**Online-only deals**  
Save time and money

**Degrees to jumpstart your career**

**Listen up**  
The music you need

phillyburbs nav



Marketplace: Real Estate Automotive Classifieds Special Sections Guides Media Kit

News Front Page Bulletin Board Editorials Obituaries Sports Business

Featured Special Section Home



About Us Archive All Greater Media News Contact us Services News Archive

Search

Copyright© 2000 - 2005 GMN All Rights Reserved



Front Page

May 19, 2005

Click ads below for larger version

Officials pledge to fight for Fort Monmouth Federal, state, county, local legislators react to closing of fort BY SUE M. MORGAN Staff Writer



Tinton Falls

TINTON FALLS — Joan Hardy, a civilian electrical engineer at Fort Monmouth, insists that the technological expertise that she has drawn upon during her 20-year tenure at the local military base can never be duplicated elsewhere.

Addressing a group of area legislators during Friday afternoon's town hall meeting at Monmouth Regional High School's auditorium, Hardy, of Marlboro, stressed that the Pentagon's plan to shutter Fort Monmouth under its Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) program would disrupt the ongoing "system of mentoring" where engineers teach each other how to produce state-of-the-art instruments to protect soldiers in the field.

Hardy is just one of more than 5,000 area residents facing possible job relocation or even loss of long-term employment if Fort Monmouth does cease operations in New Jersey as recommended by the federal BRAC commission on Friday morning.


Addressing more than 200 people inside the auditorium, U.S. Representatives Rush Holt (D-6) and Frank Pallone (D-12), co-hosts of the post-BRAC announcement forum, told an assortment of base employees, subcontractors and interested residents that the Pentagon simply "got it wrong."

The federal Department of Defense has exercised "flawed logic that has led to a bad decision" to relocate the fort's research and development functions, along with an expected 80 percent of civilian employees, to the smaller Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG) in Aberdeen, Md., Holt said.

Though still quite obviously reeling from the Pentagon's release of the BRAC list earlier that morning, both Holt and Pallone expressed

Real estate ads for FAIR HAVEN and RUMSON properties with photos and prices.

Advertisement for American Mortgage Source, #1 Source for Great Loans, with contact information.



confidence that the decision to close Fort Monmouth could be reversed by Sept. 8, when a finalized list of targeted installations is sent to President George W. Bush for his approval or disapproval.

How the Department of Defense could consider closing or restructuring any bases with the war on terror raging in Iraq and Afghanistan is unfathomable, said Holt, who co-chairs the Save Our Fort Committee advocacy group with Pallone.

"We will make sure that [the BRAC commission] understands that this is an odd time, a foolish time, to be redesigning the base structure in the United States," he said.

"I think we will end up with Fort Monmouth off the list ultimately," Holt said to applause.

"The Pentagon has made a very wrong and a patently absurd decision," Pallone said.

The Save Our Fort Committee, which is composed of several local elected officials as well, will meet throughout the summer to prepare its case before going to Washington, D.C., to present its arguments for keeping Fort Monmouth open, Pallone announced.

"I believe we can win this battle but we need your help," he said. "We will make the case to BRAC and we can win."

The Pentagon has argued that moving Fort Monmouth's personnel and operations to the APG at a one-time cost of \$822 million will save \$143 million annually over six years, according to Pallone, who contends that the proposed relocation will cost the federal government more in the long run.

"The Pentagon has completely ignored the military value of Fort Monmouth," Pallone said. "You can't say that, over the next five years, we're going to transfer that to Aberdeen and think that is going to work."

U.S. Sens. Jon Corzine and Frank Lautenberg, and retired Rear Vice Adm. Paul G. Gaffney II, now president of Monmouth University, pledged to aid the congressmen in their quest.

The Pentagon's idea that the communications and electronics technology could be replicated by private sector firms more efficiently and at a cost savings is unfounded, said Lautenberg, who served in the U.S. Army at Fort Monmouth over 60 years ago.

Citing the state's Motor Vehicle Commission as an example of the inefficiency that could result when the private sector takes over a

Not 1%.  
Not 2%.  
Not even 98%  
**100%**  
Real Estate  
Satisfaction.

**SOLD**

**COLDWELL  
BANKER**

Riviera Realty, Inc.  
**732-364-0099**

[www.rivierarealty.com](http://www.rivierarealty.com)

System and Method for Display  
Ads have a Patent Pending.  
Click Here for More Information

government-run function, Lautenberg recalled the well-publicized breakdown of the inspection operation.

Moreover, it is the American soldier who would suffer if the nine-member BRAC commission agrees with the Pentagon's decision to relocate Fort Monmouth's technology, Lautenberg said.

"This is an S.O.S. — save our soldiers," Lautenberg said. "We have a war where the enemy doesn't care if they die, but we care if our guys die. The one way to keep them alive is through technology.

"If we save 50 because we have the right equipment, it's worth the fight," he added.

Corzine, who had actually visited Iraq just eight days prior to Friday's announcement and who observed soldiers using the instruments produced at Fort Monmouth, criticized the federal government as a whole.

"This is about as outrageous a decision as I've seen this government make," said Corzine, a Democratic candidate for New Jersey governor.

"This is a bad, bad decision," he continued. "Not only for Monmouth County, not only for New Jersey, but for this nation. It will be turned back because it does not relate to what we want to do in national defense."

Drawing upon his own experience as a private businessman, Corzine expressed doubt that 75 to 80 percent of the fort's more than 5,300 employees would actually relocate to Maryland or other selected bases, as has been suggested by the Pentagon.

Though Pallone, in response to one questioner, dismissed any idea that the Pentagon's choice of the 33 installations listed for closure throughout the nation reflected the country's current political climate, Corzine promised to analyze "red states and blue states" for any patterns of favoritism by the Bush administration.

However, Freeholder William C. Barham, a Republican, addressed the legislators and urged them to see beyond party politics.

The all-GOP county freeholder board will stand behind the legislator's fight, Barham said.

"We must do the right thing for over 600,000 Monmouth County residents," Barham said on behalf of the board. "We stand ready to do whatever we need to do."

Gaffney, who also chairs a state commission designed to protect New

Jersey's seven military installations from federal closure, told those assembled that he is "buoyed by some of the decisions" rendered by the Pentagon.

The designation of Lakehurst Naval Air Station, McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix, all contiguous to each other in Burlington and Ocean counties, as a joint predeployment mobilization site is particularly encouraging, Gaffney said.

However, echoing Holt, Gaffney stressed that Fort Monmouth's location in New Jersey provides it with access to "the highest concentration of scientists and engineers of any state in the nation."

Though the Pentagon has described Fort Monmouth as a base lacking capacity for weapons testing, those functions could be executed at Fort Dix and Lakehurst, Gaffney said.

On a more localized level, Assemblyman Michael Panter noted that the municipalities that host and surround Fort Monmouth depend on it for mutual aid in the event of disasters.

Recalling March's explosion and building collapse at the Petco store in Eatontown, Panter recounted how rescue units from the fort "were among the first on the scene."

Mayors Ann Y. McNamara and Gerald Tarantolo, who lead the host communities of Tinton Falls and Eatontown, respectively, expressed confidence in the federal legislators to successfully press Fort Monmouth's case.

More than the local impact, McNamara, too, believes the fight is for the service personnel.

"I frankly think this move will jeopardize our armed forces in Iraq and Afghanistan."

Like Corzine and the others, McNamara disagreed that the fort's civilian workforce would uproot themselves to Maryland and other places.

About 650 Eatontown residents are employed at the fort, Tarantolo stated.

"I feel confident that we will be able to present our case and get this reversed," Tarantolo said. "I don't think [closure] will happen. I think logic will prevail."

Final hearings to determine any additions or subtractions to the Pentagon's list will take place in July, Pallone has said.



Marketplace: Real Estate Automotive Classifieds Special Sections Guides Media Kit

News Front Page Bulletin Board Editorials Obituaries Sports Business

Featured Special Section Home



About Us Archive All Greater Media News Contact us Services News Archive

Search

Copyright© 2000 - 2005 GMN All Rights Reserved



Newspaper web site content management software and services

Editorials

May 19, 2005

Public officials comment on closing of Fort Monmouth Fort Monmouth jobs not transferable



CHRIS KELLY staff Reps. Frank Pallone and Rush Holt (both D-N.J.) held a town hall meeting May 13 to discuss the Pentagon's recommendation to close Fort Monmouth.

It makes absolutely no sense that Fort Monmouth is on the list of base closings released by the Pentagon.

The fort serves as a key and strategic part of the war on terror. Fort Monmouth leads the way in expanding communication among our forces, which leads to greater success in the battlefield. Furthermore, Fort Monmouth provides an economic boost to the county and the state. The jobs lost would not easily be transferable either to other army bases or another sector.

above I hope the fort will be one of the 15 percent or so of bases that are on the list, but don't eventually get closed.

Steven M. Clayton committeeman Monmouth County Democratic Committee Ocean Township

We were disappointed to hear that the Department of Defense has included Fort Monmouth in its list of base closures.

The inclusion of Fort Monmouth on this list is a terrible mistake. The

Click ads below for larger version

#1 Source FOR GREAT LOANS American Mortgage Source... LAW BASES GREAT SERVICE SAME DAY APPROVAL... 732-530-8770

Not 1%. Not 2%. Not even 98%. 100% Real Estate Satisfaction.

SOLD COLDWELL BANKER RIVIERA REALTY, INC. 732-364-0099 www.rivierarealty.com

**+ MY Y!**  
Add to My Yahoo!

work civilian and military personnel do there is critical to the missions and safety of our soldiers overseas. For decades, Fort Monmouth has been a primary source of technology innovations that we have used to protect our troops. It would be foolish to relocate while we are in the midst of a war in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We have reason to believe that the criteria used by the Pentagon to make this decision were flawed. Their process did not sufficiently consider the importance of the research, development and evaluation that is accomplished at Fort Monmouth.

We further disagree with the cost savings report that the Pentagon used to justify the closure of Fort Monmouth.

The cost of doing business is certainly greater in New Jersey than in other states, but New Jersey has more scientists per square mile than any state in the union. What we can provide here simply does not exist elsewhere. Fort Monmouth is the ideal location for a high-tech arm of the military.

The base is also important to homeland security. We hope that fact is a major consideration as the BRAC committee and Congress review the Pentagon's recommendations.

Representing four of the five municipalities bordering Fort Monmouth, we know how important the base is to our business community. A Rutgers University study indicates that the base injects more than \$2 billion into the economies of Monmouth County and New Jersey.

Approximately 22,000 people depend on Fort Monmouth for their livelihood. Fort Monmouth draws from a strong network of local contractors who provide unique services to research and development teams there.

A significant number of companies have developed out of niches created specifically by Fort Monmouth and CECOM. Their long-standing partnerships with the base can not be recreated elsewhere without causing a serious delay for projects. Our soldiers should not have to wait for new technology until a new base gets accustomed to CECOM's mission.

This week, we sponsored a resolution in the General Assembly condemning the inclusion of Fort Monmouth on this list. It was not only fast-tracked for an immediate vote, but also unanimously approved. This issue is a priority to our state because of the incredible impact it could have on our safety, our economy, and the workers at the fort.

This week, we are working with Acting Governor Codey to identify state funding to assist in the effort to defend Fort Monmouth from closure. We are hopeful that by joining our state and federal leaders, we

**GOLDWELL BANKER**  
RIVERA REALTY, INC.

**732-477-2000**  
www.RivieraRealty.com

**Whichert Realty**

*Exceptional Value in Trenton Falls*

Thinking of buying or selling?  
Call Bob for a Free Market Analysis

System and Method for Display Ads have a Patent Pending.  
[Click Here for More Information](#)

can show the BRAC Commission that Fort Monmouth does not belong on this list.

We hope our constituents and residents from all over the state will join us in what we expect will be a very public fight to keep Fort Monmouth open.

Michael J. Panter and Dr. Robert L. Morgan

assemblymen

D-Monmouth/Mercer

Fort Monmouth has been a vital part of the area's economy since World War II and is Monmouth County's largest employer.

Closing the fort would have a tremendous impact — not only for the 5,300 employees who would lose their jobs or be forced to relocate, but for the thousands of other contract workers and local businesses who depend on the fort for their livelihood.

The Board of Chosen Freeholders is committed to doing whatever is necessary to reverse the decision, and joins the Save the Fort Committee and other advocates in the battle to keep Fort Monmouth open.

The Pentagon had recommended closing Fort Monmouth twice previously, but it remained open after a successful lobbying effort by local and county officials and New Jersey's congressional delegation.

The fort is home to the Army's Communications Electronics Command and the Communications and Electronics Research and Development Center. It serves as research and development center for communications, surveillance and reconnaissance systems that U.S. soldiers are using in Iraq and Afghanistan. It also is home to the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School, which trains cadet candidates for admission into West Point.

Fort Monmouth officials estimate that its closure would affect some 22,000 jobs once businesses that provide goods and services to the base are counted.

This would be devastating to the residents and businesses of Monmouth County, particularly to the five towns surrounding the fort. The Monmouth County Board of Freeholders will be a strong advocate for saving the fort at the upcoming Base Closure and Realignment Commission hearings, which will take testimony during the summer before making a final recommendation to President Bush on Sept. 8.

Thomas J. Powers

Amy H. Handlin

Theodore J. Narozanick

William C. Barham

Robert D. Clifton

Monmouth County Board

of Chosen Freeholders

I am extremely disappointed to see that Fort Monmouth was on the BRAC Commission's recommendation list. The closing of this facility would have widespread detrimental effects that will be felt for years to come in the 12th legislative district and surrounding communities.

Fort Monmouth is a driving force in our regional economy. Its closure would not just impact its 5,000 employees, but would also adversely affect over 23,000 people who have jobs related to Fort Operations. Moreover, hundreds of area businesses depend on the commerce generated by Fort employees for their economic well-being.

The BRAC Commission seems to make their closure recommendations based on a narrow set of criteria that doesn't take into account the quality of work coming out of a facility.

Fort Monmouth has a proven track record of excellence in battlefield communications and troop safety, and has most recently developed technology to detect and disarm roadside bombs in Iraq.

The Fort has shown its worth time and time again and is an invaluable asset to the U.S. Armed Forces.

Fort Monmouth has been targeted for closure twice before, and in both instances it has made a solid case to remain open.

Friday's announcement is discouraging, but is only the start of a long appeals process, and I am hopeful that the leadership in the Department of Defense comes to their senses and allows Fort Monmouth to continue its mission and support our troops."

Ellen Karcher

N.J. state senator

D-Monmouth and Mercer

The decision to close Fort Monmouth is wrong for the military, wrong

for national security and wrong for New Jersey.

It underscores the administration in Washington's insensitivity to New Jersey as a security target.

We will fight this decision. We will fight for our hard-working families. And we will fight to save Fort Monmouth.

I have called upon Vice Admiral (Ret.) Paul Gaffney, chairman of the Governor's Commission to Support and Enhance New Jersey's Military and Coast Guard Installations, to help lead the state's efforts to save Fort Monmouth.

I will continue to work aggressively with our congressional delegation to convince the members of the BRAC Commission that the base's military value far exceeds any perceived cost savings from its closure.

*Richard J. Codey*

*acting governor of New Jersey*

We sincerely hope the Pentagon will thoroughly review this decision. Fort Monmouth is an essential member of the Monmouth County community and its closure would be a detriment to the entire area. We look forward to working with the president and our congressional delegation to protect jobs and the economy of Monmouth County.

Steve Corodemus,

assemblyman, R-11

As one of the military's top research centers in the field of communications, computers and intelligence Fort Monmouth has contributed a great deal to the protection of our country. Since 1925 Fort Monmouth has been one of the regions top employers. Today, the base employs nearly 5,000 civilian workers.

It is essential that we do everything in our power to protect those jobs and keep this vital asset in our county. A closure of this magnitude could have serious, long-term repercussions on the entire region.

Sean Kean,

assemblyman, R-11

We live in dangerous times and the importance of our Armed Forces have never been more apparent. The jobs our uniformed men and women fill have guaranteed all of us our safety and freedom.

We want to work alongside our federal counterparts to make certain that any decision made is the best one for the safety of our county, state and nation.

Joseph Azzolina

assemblyman, R-13

This is not a decision taken lightly and we know that over the coming months our constituents will become actively engaged in the possible closing of this vital land mark.

I hope that all the people of Monmouth County understand the significance of this base and its history of service to our nation, and will join our efforts to reverse this decision.

Sam Thompson

assemblyman, R-13



Marketplace: Real Estate Automotive Classifieds Special Sections Guides Media Kit

- News
- Front Page
- Bulletin Board
- Editorials
- Obituaries
- Sports
- Business

### Front Page

May 19, 2005

## Ft. Monmouth targeted for closure by Pentagon

Operations, personnel would be transferred to other bases

**BY SUE M. MORGAN**  
Staff Writer

TINTON FALLS — More than 5,300 military and civilian employees at Fort Monmouth are facing uncertainty regarding their jobs following Friday morning's announcement that the Pentagon has targeted the U.S. Army base for possible closure.

The proposed closing of the fort, which last year generated \$3.24 billion in payroll and income for New Jersey residents, could adversely impact close to 23,000 military, civilian, and contractor jobs throughout New Jersey.

Another 23,000 military retirees who use its extensive facilities spread over 1,126 acres in Eatontown, Tinton Falls, and Oceanport could also be inconvenienced if the Pentagon's suggestion, rendered under its Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) program, moves forward if it is approved by President George W. Bush and Congress later this year.

Fort Monmouth was one of 33 installations nationwide recommended for future closing by the Department of Defense upon release of the long-awaited BRAC list on Friday inside the Pentagon.

Several hours later, at a late afternoon press conference, two Fort Monmouth officers attempted to reassure base employees, both civilian and military, and all the affected parties, that the situation could change by this fall when Congress is expected to vote on the final BRAC listing.

The news that Fort Monmouth could be closing and its technical operations shifted to military installations in other states was not welcome to many employees, nor to the host and neighboring communities, said Maj. Gen. Michael R. Mazzucchi, commanding officer of the U.S. Army Communications Electronics Life Cycle Management Command.

Flanked by Col. Ricki L. Sullivan, the fort's garrison commander,

Click ads below for larger version

Not 1%.  
Not 2%.  
Not even 98%  
**100%**  
Real Estate Satisfaction.

**SOLD**

Riviera Realty, Inc.  
**732-364-0099**

[www.rivierarealty.com](http://www.rivierarealty.com)

**COLDWELL BANKER**  
RIVIERA REALTY, INC.

**732-477-2000**  
Real Estate Division, Bank NJ 08720  
[www.RivieraRealty.com](http://www.RivieraRealty.com)

Exceptional Value In Tinton Falls

**Robert "Bob" Lovatone**

**Weichert Realtors**

Featured Special Section

### Home



About Us

- Archive
- All Greater Media News
- Contact us


Services News Archive

Search

Copyright© 2000 - 2005 GMN All Rights Reserved



Newspaper web site content management software and services



Mazzucchi asked those affected to maintain the news in perspective.

"We remind everyone that these BRAC recommendations are just that — recommendations. They are not final," Mazzucchi said.

Before the recommendations become binding, the nine-member BRAC committee, appointed by the Bush Administration and Congress, will review the existing list and change it before forwarding it to the White House by Sept. 8, Mazzucchi explained.

The president has until Sept. 23 to accept or reject the BRAC list in its entirety, Mazzucchi went on. If Bush accepts the list, Congress has 45 legislative days to reject the entire BRAC list as a whole before it becomes law, he said.

Even if the BRAC list does become law, it would take another six years for the transition of the fort to be completed, Mazzucchi pointed out.

Even if the Army chooses to act on the final BRAC decisions as soon as they become effective, "for the next few years, our Fort Monmouth personnel expect that they will continue their normal duties," the commanding general said.

The Pentagon has proposed locating the majority of the civilian and military workforce to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG) in Aberdeen, Md., according to a release issued by Fort Monmouth's public affairs office. Other commands, depending upon function, would be transferred to other locations in Columbus, Ohio, Fort Meade, Md., Fort Belvoir, Va., and West Point, N.Y., the press release states.

No specific numbers are available yet as to how many fort employees would be re-assigned to each location, said Sullivan.

Other workers might choose to retire, if eligible to do so, he added.

"Some people will relocate; some people will decline to relocate," Sullivan said.

The targeting of Fort Monmouth is not a reflection of the quality of personnel there, Mazzucchi stressed.

Instead, the BRAC process is part of what the defense department does on a regular basis to streamline the nation's defense, he noted.

"As I walk through the base and talk to people, certainly there is anxiety," Mazzucchi said. "These are some of the greatest patriots in the country. They understand that the mission must continue."

Military retirees who use the fort's services might instead be able to use



System and Method for Display Ads have a Patent Pending.  
Click Here for More Information

the Veteran's Administration hospital and other facilities at Fort Dix, McGuire Air Force Base and Earle Naval Weapons Station, Sullivan suggested.

"Those concerns will be addressed," he said.

The commissary, Army and Air Force Exchange Services, and garrison activities would be eliminated if the fort closes, the release stated.

The intent of the BRAC program is to maximize the defense department and make it as "efficient and effective" as we can, Mazzucchi said.

Fort Monmouth has been the central base of the Army's Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance program, known collectively as C4ISR.

The Pentagon's recommendation appears to have come out of a desire to "consolidate C4ISR in a single location," Mazzucchi acknowledged.

Part of the base closure process is the disposal of land upon which it sits, Sullivan explained.

In following Army policy, the department of defense must inventory that land and address any unresolved environmental concerns before turning it over to the host communities, he said.

Because the land on which Fort Monmouth sits is federally owned, the federal government would be consulted first for future uses of the land, Eatontown Mayor Gerald Tarantolo said on Monday.

Should the federal government choose to dispose of its land, the host municipality would then be allowed to use it for public purposes, Tarantolo explained.

If the host community has no interest in the land, the acreage could then be offered to the private sector.

Tarantolo acknowledged that private developers might be interested in the land.

"If I were a developer and I heard the news, I'd be [chomping] at the bit at over 600 acres that I could potentially develop," he said.

In an effort, to save Fort Monmouth from closing, local congressmen have invited Anthony J. Principi, the head of the BRAC commission, to tour the installation and observe the base's functions for himself.

BRAC commissioners are required to visit all of the bases targeted for closure prior to compiling the final list for submission to the president.

Besides C4ISR, and numerous research and development functions, Fort Monmouth houses a campus of the U.S. Military Academy Preparatory School and an office of the FBI Information Technology Center.



Marketplace: Real Estate Automotive Classifieds Special Sections Guides Media Kit

News Front Page Bulletin Board Editorials Obituaries Sports Business Featured Special Section Home

Front Page

May 19, 2005

BRAC head invited to check out fort's mission

Congressmen: Pentagon number-crunchers don't understand fort's mission

BY SUE M. MORGAN Staff Writer



CHRIS KELLY staff Maj. Gen. Michael R. Mazzucchi (l), commanding general of the Communications Electronics Life Cycle Management Command at Fort Monmouth, and Col. Ricki L. Sullivan, Fort Monmouth Garrison commander, field questions from media representatives at a press conference at Gibbs Hall on May 13.

Two area congressmen are inviting the head of a federal commission created to determine the fate of military bases throughout the nation to look closer at Fort Monmouth's service to soldiers in the field, before choosing to shut it down.

Three days after the U.S. Department of Defense announced that Fort Monmouth, Eatontown, is one of 33 military installations nationwide recommended for shutting, U.S. Representatives Rush Holt (D-12th District) and Frank Pallone Jr. (D-6th

District) are appealing to Anthony J. Principi, chairman of the Pentagon's Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission, to visit the threatened base and experience its mission firsthand.

The Defense Department has made a "terrible error in recommending the closure" of Fort Monmouth, described as a "critical military installation" during wartime, Holt and Pallone wrote in the letter distributed following Monday morning's meeting of the Save Our Fort Committee, an advocacy group co-chaired by both congressmen.

Because the nine BRAC commissioners, none of whom are from New Jersey, are now entrusted by the Defense Department to choose which if any of the 33 targeted bases are removed from the Pentagon's list of

Click ads below for larger version

Real estate advertisement for Coldwell Banker, featuring property photos and contact information: 732-477-2000, www.RivieraRealty.com

Real estate advertisement for Robert "Bob" Lombardi, featuring a photo and text: "Exceptional Value in Raritan Falls", "Call Bob for a Free Market Analysis"

Real estate advertisement for "Meet Team Assist-2-Sell", featuring a grid of agent photos and text: "CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR 2004 RAMP CIRCLE OF EXCELLENCE MEMBERS"

Real estate advertisement for "Countrywide Home Loans", featuring property photos and text: "U List 4Sale.com"




About Us Archive All Greater Media News Contact us Services News Archive

Search

Copyright© 2000 - 2005 GMN All Rights Reserved





recommendations, public officials must now grab their attention, Holt explained.

Unlike the "specific, limited criteria" used by the Pentagon in recommending that Fort Monmouth be shut down and its operations relocated mainly to the Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG) in Aberdeen, Maryland, the BRAC commission looks at each targeted installation in the context of "national security [and] homeland security," he said.

Contingents of BRAC commissioners are required to visit all of the bases suggested for closing this summer, prior to Sept. 8 when the commissioners' final listing of recommended base closings and realignments is submitted to President George W. Bush, Pallone noted.

"We will spend the next three months fighting this battle," he said.

In their correspondence to Principi, a California resident, both congressmen offered to show him the U.S. Army's Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems created by Fort Monmouth scientists and engineers.

"Several of the most technologically advanced systems currently being used today in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom and Homeland Defense were developed at Fort Monmouth, and are playing a direct and major role in helping our troops in the global war on terror," Holt and Pallone wrote.

"We would be honored to show these to you personally at Fort Monmouth," the congressmen added.

Soldiers in both Iraq and Afghanistan are "relying on Fort Monmouth for ground-breaking and timely innovations to keep them safe and effective," Holt and Pallone wrote.

If Fort Monmouth is closed, the safety and effectiveness of those soldiers and the nation would be compromised, they added.

Joined by Mayors Gerald Tarantolo, Ann Y. McNamara, and Maria Gatta, who lead the fort's three host communities, Eatontown, Tinton Falls and Oceanport respectively, three of the fort's host communities, Holt and Pallone contended that the Pentagon had ignored the fort's "military value" and its ability to "cross-service" other branches of the military besides the U.S. Army.

Frank Muzzi, a fort contractor who also co-chairs the Patriot's Alliance, another advocacy group, also joined in to back up the congressmen as they moved ahead with their battle to save the base from closure.

WENDY SMITH  
4145 Route 3 North  
New Jersey  
732-364-0300 x108

**Century 21 ACTION PLUS REALTY**  
33 North County Line Road, Jackson  
JACKSON \$619,000  
CALL BILLIE POWERS Office - 732-905-1495 or Cell - 732-779-0190

System and Method for Display  
Ads have a Patent Pending.  
Click Here for More Information

Regardless of party affiliation, public officials from the federal, state, county and municipal levels must endeavor to demonstrate Fort Monmouth's research and development capabilities to Principi and other BRAC commissioners, Pallone said.

"Numbers crunchers" inside the Pentagon who have determined that the Defense Department can save \$143 million per year over six years by moving Fort Monmouth's operations to APG at a cost of \$822 million do not understand the local base's mission, he continued.

"The nature of what is done here is a little more esoteric and not as well known at the Pentagon," Pallone said, noting that the U.S. Army has recommended that Fort Monmouth remain open.

The Defense Department has "overestimated the savings to be garnered by moving the facility," Holt and Pallone wrote to Principi.

The Defense Department has argued that the cost of living, health insurance and utilities will be significantly less in Aberdeen, located about an hour outside of Baltimore, than they would be in Monmouth County, Muzzi noted.

Yet it is unlikely that the cost of living would be that much lower in Aberdeen, which is also located in the northeastern corridor between Washington, D.C., and Boston, Pallone pointed out.

"That's not exactly a low-cost area," he said.

By predicting that 75 to 80 percent of the more than 5,000 civilians now employed at Fort Monmouth would relocate to Maryland, the Pentagon has already shown "that they don't understand the nature of their workforce," Holt said.

Public officials and other Fort Monmouth supporters need to impress upon Principi and the BRAC commissioners that the majority of the civilian workforce will refuse to relocate and uproot their families, he continued.

As a result, new civilian scientists and engineers possessing the knowledge now available at Fort Monmouth would have to be recruited for APG, Holt said.

By the time those workers were up to speed on the advanced technologies, soldiers in the field could be put at risk, he continued.

"[Fort Monmouth] has been the center of electronics, telecommunications, signals, the kind of thing that has provided a level of support and a level of expertise that would be very hard to duplicate elsewhere," Holt said.

The Pentagon has also "failed to calculate the jointness Fort Monmouth has achieved with nearby military facilities at Fort Dix, Lakehurst, McGuire and Earle," both congressmen wrote to Principi.

The first three military installations, located contiguously in Burlington and Ocean counties, have been recommended for realignment into a central operation to serve all branches of the service, Pallone pointed out.

However, the Pentagon has ignored Fort Monmouth's attempts at "cross-servicing" all branches of the military, he added.

"[The Pentagon] is looking at Fort Dix and Lakehurst and saying they want cross-servicing there," Pallone said. "We're doing cross-servicing here."

Although economic impact on the host communities is lower on the list of criteria used by the Pentagon to evaluate bases for closure or restructuring, all three mayors emphasized that they will rally residents to save the installation.

"Fort Monmouth is a beloved institution in Tinton Falls," said McNamara, who noted that "every single [resident] feels it would be a loss to see the fort close."

The results of a study, funded by the state Department of Community Affairs, on the impact of a possible fort closing on the three host communities as well as upon neighboring Little Silver and Shrewsbury are expected to be released by the end of the month, Tarantolo said.

About 25 percent of Fort Monmouth is physically located in Oceanport, a scenario that has residents there showing "tremendous support" to keep the base open, Gatta said.

"Everyone is looking to help. Everyone is doing their part," she said.

No date is set yet for Principi, who is vice president of Pfizer Inc., to visit Fort Monmouth, which if closed, would take about two to six years to dismantle, both congressmen said.



Marketplace: Real Estate Automotive Classifieds Special Sections Guides Media Kit

- News
- Front Page
- Bulletin Board
- Editorials
- Obituaries
- Sports
- Business

# Front Page

May 19, 2005

Click ads below for larger version

## Area mayors close ranks, will fight fort closure

### Tarantolo: 20 percent of work force is from five neighboring towns

**BY LAYLI WHYTE**  
Staff Writer



Little Silver

LITTLE SILVER — On the heels of the announcement that Fort Monmouth is on the list of federal installations slated for closure, the Two River Council of Mayors consulted with fort officials at its regular meeting Saturday.

The main topic of discussion with Fort Monmouth Garrison Cmdr. Col. Ricki Sullivan was how the fort closing will affect the people who live in the communities directly adjacent to the fort — Oceanport, Eatontown, Tinton Falls, Shrewsbury and Little Silver.

Eatontown Mayor Gerald J. Tarantolo said there are over 1,300 people employed at the fort from those five towns alone.

“That’s a little over 20 percent of the work force,” he said. “You can see the direct impact on residents by the potential of this fort closure.”

Tarantolo said that he has made arrangements to get input from other municipalities that have been through similar closures.

Tim Rider, of the community relations department at Fort Monmouth, said that in fiscal year 2004, \$478.4 million was paid out in salaries at the fort, and \$864.6 million in contracts were awarded for work done at the fort and related facilities.

He added that \$1.415 billion is estimated to have been spent in fiscal year 2004 as the result of direct expenditures from fort employees to the state and the local area.

“I think it will be a significant blow to our area,” said Red Bank Mayor Edward J. McKenna Jr. “I am particularly concerned for Eatontown,

*Exceptional Value In Tinton Falls*



**Robert 'Bob' Weinstein**  
Real Estate



**Weinstein Realtors**  
Call Ed for a Free Market Analysis

**Meet Team Assist-2-Sell**  
CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR 2004 TEAM CIRCLE OF EXCELLENCE MEMBERS




**Assist2Sell**

Call Ed for a Free Market Analysis

**Countryside Home Loans**

**U List/Sale.com**

*Just Your Average Neighbor, LLC*




**WENDY SMITH**  
RE/MAX REALTY 9  
4842 Route 9 North  
Horseneck, New Jersey  
732-364-0300 x108

Featured Special Section Home




About Us  
Archive  
All Greater Media News  
Contact us  
Services  
News Archive

Search  
Copyright© 2000 - 2005  
GMN  
All Rights Reserved



Newspaper web site content management software and services





Oceanport, Tinton Falls and Shrewsbury, but really our entire area.”

Mayor Ann McNamara, of Tinton Falls, said that she has seen presentations of new technologies at the fort that are now being used by U.S. soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan.

“What happens to them if Fort Monmouth shifts gears,” she asked. “Did the Pentagon even consider that?”

Sullivan said that this will be a long and involved process.

“This requires a lot of planning and a lot of hard work,” he said.

McNamara also said she suspected that morale at the fort must be low after the news of its impending closure.

“They understood this is a recommendation,” Sullivan said. “They are taking it fairly well. Some certainly took it harder than others, but I am pretty impressed with how well the work force did take it yesterday.”

“I don’t think they’ve gone into panic mode yet,” Ocean Township Mayor William Larkin said.

Tarantolo reminded the council that in 1995, the fort had been scheduled for closure, but the local municipalities, as well as fort officials did what they could and were able to get Fort Monmouth moved to the list for realignment instead.

That meant that some moving around of facilities was done, but that the fort remained, for the most part, untouched.

He said they would like to try to do that again, but they are also preparing for the worst.

“I’m hoping that by the time the final decision is made,” McKenna said, “the federal government will change its mind. I would support an appeal. My first job ever was at Fort Monmouth, and in college I worked on the golf course there.”

**Century 21 ACTION PLUS REALTY**  
 91 North County Line Road, Jackson



FOR FURTHER DETAILS TO SCHEDULE AN APPOINTMENT  
**CALL BILLIE POWERS Office - 732-905-1495**  
 or cell 732-909-0190

**THEANO MEYERS**  
 Certified Luxury Home Marketing Specialist  
 Honesty, Integrity & Service



**RE/MAX Central**

[System and Method for Display Ads have a Patent Pending.](#)  
[Click Here for More Information](#)



Marketplace: Real Estate Automotive Classifieds Special Sections Guides Media Kit

News Front Page Bulletin Board Editorials Obituaries Sports Business

Business

May 19, 2005

Click ads below for larger version

Businesses that depend on fort brace for change

BY GLORIA STRAVELLI Staff Writer



Evelyn Malick has operated Reliable Cleaners and Tailoring on Broadway in West Long Branch for more than 35 years. If the federal government goes ahead and closes Fort Monmouth as per the recommendation of its Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC), it will cut her dry-cleaning and laundry business by 50 percent.

"Half of my business is with Fort Monmouth, not just military personnel, but the uniforms for the prep school and civilian employees, too," she said last week. "The workers at the fort deal with me, too, because I deliver to the fort.

"It's going to affect everybody — businesses and the real estate market. A lot of families will be forced to move to keep their government jobs," she said. One of those is her son-in-law, who is seven years away from retirement.

GLORIA STRAVELLI Reliable Cleaners and Tailoring, Broadway, WestLong Branch, is one of the many local businesses facing a dramatic drop-off in revenues if Fort Monmouth is closed.

"He'll have to move to keep his retirement," she said.

Fort Monmouth is where Leonard Penta started out as a barber when he first came to America.

"I worked in Fort Monmouth for 13 years when I first came to the [United States] from Italy," Penta said with a heavy accent.

Penta has snipped and trimmed the coils of thousands of military and civilian personnel who worked at the fort during the 30 years he has operated the Village Barbershop in Oceanport.

Meet Team Assist-2-Sell advertisement with photos of team members and contact information.

Countrywide Home Loans advertisement with website URL and contact details.

RE/MAX REALTY 9 advertisement for Wendy Smith with contact number 732-364-0300 x108.

Century 21 ACTION PLUS REALTY advertisement for Jackson with contact information for Billie Powers.


Featured Special Section Home



About Us Archive All Greater Media News Contact us Services News Archive

Search Copyright© 2000 - 2005 GMN All Rights Reserved

Newspaper web site content management software and services

 MY Y!  
Add to My Yahoo!

He was livid last week as he spoke animatedly about the BRAC recommendation and had harsh words for the administration's priorities.

"I do a lot of business with the soldiers and workers at the fort. Half of my business is with the fort.

"Sure I'm angry. I don't want to see it close. It's a shame; everyone's mad. It's going to hurt everybody, all over the county," Penta said. "They've been saying they're going to close it for 40 years; now they're going to do it. We give money all over the world, and we can't support Fort Monmouth?"

"It's going to be a problem," admitted Al Patel, proprietor of Luigi's Pizza on Oceanport Avenue in Little Silver. "We do a lot of lunch business with the fort. It will have a big impact on our lunch business."

Patel said the fort accounts for half of the pizzeria's lunch business.

Things changed only slightly after 9/11, he said. With heightened security, deliveries are now made to the gate. But business continued to be good.

"We sometimes deliver 15-20 pies when there's a party or something special going on," Patel said.

"I hope something else comes in," he added. "We're going to be hurt for sure."

In fact, according to economic impact statistics compiled by the Save Our Fort committee, Fort Monmouth generates \$600 million worth of revenues for businesses like Malick's, Penta's and Patel's in the surrounding communities.

"There's certainly going to be a domino effect on all the businesses in the area," said Bea Duffy, director of the county's Office of Economic Development and Tourism. "It's going to hit the small businesses very, very hard. I feel really bad for them. We know what happened to other towns where bases closed — they're like ghost towns.

"It's certainly an economic boondoggle for the county," Duffy continued. "We've had a very healthy economy. The impact on the county, I would say, will be in the multimillions in retail sales. Needless to say, we're going to fight our darnedest."

"From a tourism perspective a lot of businesses will be affected," said Jeanne DeYoung, tourism representative with the office.

"When people come to visit families at the fort, they are tourists. They stay at local hotels, eat at restaurants, go to the mall, the track and the



**THEANO MEYERS**  
Certified Luxury Home Marketing Specialist  
Honesty, Integrity & Service

THEANO MEYERS  
REAL ESTATE  
Serving the Fort Monmouth Area

RE/MAX Central

System and Method for Display  
Ads have a Patent Pending.  
Click Here for More Information

beach and they sometimes bring their families,” DeYoung said. “Tourism is far-reaching, and the effect that the closing of the fort is going to have is far-reaching. This will definitely affect all aspects of economics in Monmouth County, and it is compounded by what happened at AT&T and Lucent.”

## News From NJ Senate Democrats

Released on: May 13, 2005

For information, contact:

**Kara Grieco**

**Senator Karcher's Office**

Tel: (732) 462-8883

### KARCHER STATEMENT ON FORT MONMOUTH POTENTIAL BASE CLOSING

FORT MONMOUTH - Senator Ellen Karcher, D-Monmouth and Mercer, the prime sponsor of three new laws designed to improve conditions for New Jersey's military bases in an effort to avoid consideration by the Base Relocation and Closure (BRAC) Commission, issued the following statement concerning reports that Fort Monmouth was listed on the BRAC Commission's recommendation list for closure:

*"I am extremely disappointed to see that Fort Monmouth was on the BRAC Commission's recommendation list. The closing of this facility would have widespread detrimental effects that will be felt for years to come in the 12th legislative district and surrounding communities.*

*"Fort Monmouth is a driving force in our regional economy. Its closure would not just impact its 5,000 employees, but would also adversely affect over 23,000 people who have jobs tied into the Fort, and the hundreds of area businesses that depend on the commerce generated by Fort employees for their good.*

*"The BRAC Commission seems to make their closure recommendations based on a narrow set of criteria that doesn't take into account the quality of work coming out of a facility. Fort Monmouth has a proven track record of excellence in battlefield communications and troop safety, and has most recently developed technology to detect and disarm roadside bombs in Iraq. The Fort has shown its worth time and time again and is an invaluable asset to the United States Armed Forces.*

*"Fort Monmouth has been targetted for closure twice before, and in both instances it has made a solid case to remain open. Today's announcement is discouraging, but is only the start of a long appeals process, and I am hopeful that the leadership in the Department of Defense comes to their senses and allows Fort Monmouth to continue its mission and support our troops."*

**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
**Washington, DC 20515**

May 13, 2005

Dear Friend:

As you may know, our community and the State of New Jersey recently received disheartening news regarding Fort Monmouth. Specifically, the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) included Fort Monmouth on its preliminary list of military facilities that it is recommending be reduced in size, consolidated with other facilities, or closed completely. This list has been submitted to the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission, which will review the list and make a final recommendation to President Bush in September, 2005.

I believe that the Defense Department has made a terrible error, and I intend to fight it. I want to emphasize that the BRAC list of bases is preliminary. The process now shifts from the Pentagon to the nine-member Commission. Bases can still be removed or added to the list.

Fort Monmouth is the Army's premier center for research and development (R&D) in communications, electronics, and network-centric warfare. The work done at Fort Monmouth helps make our soldiers safer and more effective. For example, Fort Monmouth has developed and implemented technology that jams signals intended to detonate roadside bombs; triggers automatic defense measures when missiles are fired at helicopters; and locates the sources of enemy mortar fire within seconds of its launch, to name just a few. Day in and day out, the people working at Fort Monmouth are delivering meaningful military value to the men and women risking their lives in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere.

Unfortunately, the criteria used by the Pentagon to measure military value were flawed from the start. Despite several attempts on my part to amend them, the criteria did not weigh the unique and critical value that R&D facilities bring to the battlefield. This is a gaping hole in the Pentagon's assessment – one that will weaken our military's ability to engage and win battles in the battlefield of the future. Another flaw in the Pentagon's assessment of Fort Monmouth is that, in contravention of the statute that created the BRAC process, it neglects the fact that Fort Monmouth has been a leader in integrating the four branches of the military in joint operations. And lastly, closing Fort Monmouth would cost the Defense Department much more than it would save. The highly-educated, highly-skilled people who work at the Fort have unique, proven expertise that cannot be replaced by transferring their work elsewhere or by contracting out to private laboratories. Attempting to do so would inure the Army's ability to conduct cutting-edge R&D and take years to recover.

I will make these and other arguments to the BRAC Commission as it reviews the list and considers whether to include Fort Monmouth in its final recommendation for closure or realignment. Closing bases in the middle of a military action is foolhardy, and doing so in a way that compromises our military's strength is inexcusable. Of additional concern to me is the fact that Fort Monmouth is uniquely suited to assist out state and the entire region should a terrorist attack occur in New York or Washington, D.C. Although the Pentagon's criteria did not allow for consideration of domestic homeland security contributions by facilities like Ft. Monmouth, the Defense Department should not forget that Fort Monmouth, due to its proximity, was integral to the response and recovery efforts following the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks of 2001. I will make sure that the Commission has the benefit of that argument.

The coming weeks and months will require a great deal of work from all of us. To be clear, this initial recommendation to the BRAC Commission does not mean that the Fort will be closed for certain. Bases in New Jersey, including Fort Monmouth, have appeared on such lists in previous BRAC cycles, and through community efforts, have avoided closure. Similarly, even if it were to close eventually, there is no danger of the Fort being padlocked immediately and its employees let go.

Following is the timeline for the remainder of this BRAC Round:

- July 1, 2005 – The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) must file a report with the House and Senate Armed Services Committees analyzing the Defense Secretary's recommendations to the BRAC Commission.
- September 8, 2005 – The BRAC Commission must submit its report and recommendations to President Bush.
- September 23, 2005 – The President must approve or disapprove the BRAC Commission's recommendations.
- October 20, 2005 -- If the President disapproves the BRAC Commission's initial recommendations, the BRAC Commission must submit its revised list of recommendations to the President.
- November 7, 2005 – The President must approve the revised BRAC recommendations and send them to Congress for an up-or-down vote without any amendments within 45 legislative days, or the BRAC Commission's list becomes law.
- April 15, 2006 – BRAC Commission goes out of existence.

As you can see, our best window of time for changing the BRAC list is from now until mid-September, 2005.

Saving the Fort and planning for any contingency is a community effort. For my part, I will continue to work with the Save Our Fort Committee, Congressional leaders, and opinion leaders in the Pentagon to secure the five of nine votes on the BRAC Commission to remove Fort Monmouth from the list. I will also be holding town hall meetings to discuss this process and solicit your input. Please visit my website at

[www.holt.house.gov](http://www.holt.house.gov) to learn more about upcoming meetings and the BRAC process generally. I have dedicated a special section of my website to this topic so I can provide you with information.

Though I am disappointed that Fort Monmouth is on the initial BRAC list, I am determined to fight this with every ounce of effort. Please feel free to contact me by calling 1-87-RUSH-HOLT (877-874-4658) or e-mailing me through [www.holt.house.gov](http://www.holt.house.gov).

Sincerely,

RUSH HOLT  
Member of Congress

## Frequently Asked Questions About BRAC

**Question: *What is BRAC?***

**Answer:** "BRAC" is an acronym which stands for Base Realignment and Closure. The 2005 BRAC round is the fifth since 1988 and it is expected to be the last for the foreseeable future. Ostensibly, the BRAC process is used by the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) to reorganize its installation infrastructure so that it can support its forces more effectively and efficiently, increase operational readiness, and facilitate new ways of doing business. However, no such massive base realignment or downsizing has occurred during an open-ended war, which is one of several reasons why the current BRAC round is highly controversial.

**Question: *Who are the BRAC Commissioners?***

**Answer:** The law governing the BRAC process requires that the President and Congress appoint a nine-member BRAC Commission to review the Pentagon's proposed BRAC list and make recommendations to President. The President can accept, modify, or reject the list of recommendations developed by the BRAC Commission. The nine members of the 2005 BRAC Commission are:

- **Anthony Joseph Principi**, of California (Chairman). Mr. Principi currently serves as Vice President of the Pfizer Corporation. He recently served as Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Prior to joining the Administration, he was president of QTC Medical Services, Inc. Earlier in his career, Mr. Principi served in the United States Senate as Republican chief counsel and staff director of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and as counsel to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. A combat-decorated Vietnam veteran, he first saw active duty aboard the destroyer USS Joseph P. Kennedy, and later served with the River Patrol Force on the Mekong Delta. Mr. Principi graduated from the United States Naval Academy and later received his J.D. from Seton Hall University.
- **James H. Bilbray** of Nevada. Former Congressman Bilbray was a member of the Foreign Affairs, Armed Services and Intelligence Committees. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1955 to 1963.
- **Philip Coyle** of California. Mr. Coyle is a Senior Advisor to the Center for Defense Information. He served as Assistant Secretary of Defense and Director of Operational Test and Evaluation at the Department of Defense.
- **Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr.**, USN (Ret.) of Virginia. Admiral Gehman served on active duty in the U.S. Navy for over 35 years. His last assignment was as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic and as the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Joint Forces Command.

- **James V. Hansen** of Utah. Former Congressman Hansen was a member of the Armed Services Committee. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955.
- **General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)** of Florida. General Hill served in the U.S. Army for 36 years. His last assignment was as Combatant Commander of the U.S. Southern Command.
- **Lieutenant General Claude M. Kicklighter, USA (Ret.)** of Georgia. Mr. Kicklighter is the Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning at the Department of Veterans Affairs. He served in the U.S. Army for nearly 36 years.
- **Samuel Knox Skinner** of Illinois. Mr. Skinner served as Chief of Staff and as Secretary of Transportation for President George H. W. Bush. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1960 to 1968.
- **Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)** of Texas. General Turner is a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission. She served in the U.S. Air Force for 30 years, most recently as the director of nursing services in the Office of the Air Force Surgeon General at Bolling Air Force Base.

**Question: Why did the Pentagon recommend closing Fort Monmouth?**

**Answer:** Quite simply, the Pentagon made a serious error. The criteria it applied were flawed, which caused Fort Monmouth's military value to be undervalued from the start. Further, the Pentagon has failed to appreciate the loss of military

**Question: What is the timeline for this BRAC round?**

**Answer:** Several entities will play a role during this BRAC round, including the Department of Defense (DoD), the Government Accountability Office, the President, and the Congress. Below is the timeline for this BRAC round, along with a brief description of what each entity's role is at the various stages of the process:

Action	Due Date	Status
DoD must publish initial selection criteria in the <i>Federal Register</i>	12/31/03	Completed
GAO must complete review of DoD criteria	1/28/03	Completed
DoD must publish final selection criteria in the <i>Federal Register</i>	2/16/04	Completed
DoD final criteria becomes effective (unless disapproved by Act of Congress)	3/15/04	Completed
President must nominate Commission members (or BRAC process is terminated)	3/15/05	Completed
DoD must send closure list to Commission and Congress	5/16/05	Completed
GAO must complete review of DoD list	7/1/05	
Commission must send closure list to President	9/8/05	

President must approve/disapprove	9/23/05	
Commission may submit final revisions	10/20/05*	
President must certify Commission list (or BRAC process is terminated)	11/7/05*	
Congress has 45 legislative days to pass motion of disapproval (or the Commission's list becomes law)	Variable*	
Termination of base closure Commission authority	4/15/06	

\* These dates are the last legally authorized date by which either the Commission or the President can act at this particular stage of the process. If the Commission has no additional actions to recommend to the President after September 23 and the President subsequently approves the final BRAC list, it is possible he could submit the final list before November 7, 2005.

**Question: *If Ft. Monmouth is on the list, is it guaranteed to close?***

**Answer:** Removing a facility from the preliminary BRAC list is very difficult, but it is not impossible. Many factors are considered by the Commission when making its recommendation to the President. Ft. Monmouth has been on previous BRAC lists, for example, and has avoided closure.

**Question: *What if Ft. Monmouth is on the final BRAC list the President submits to Congress?***

**Answer:** When the President submits his list of proposed base closures to Congress, Congress has 45 legislative days to either approve or disapprove the entire list. Congress is not allowed to amend the list in any way. A majority vote is required for passage.

**Question: *If Fort Monmouth remains of the list and the BRAC Commission decides to close it how quickly will it happen?***

**Answer:** The fort would not close immediately and the entire process would likely stretch out over several years and would be influenced by several factors, including the amount of time required to get the potential receiving base in order to receive Ft. Monmouth's units, which will take some time. The precise timeline will only become clear after final Congressional action on the BRAC list and DoD has begun action to implement the final BRAC list. Regular updates on the process will be provided to the community.

**Question: *What will happen to New Jersey's economy if Ft. Monmouth closes? How many jobs will we lose?***

**Answer:** The full impact on New Jersey's economy will not become apparent for some time and will depend on several factors, including how the land

encompassing Ft. Monmouth is ultimately redeveloped, and whether Ft. Monmouth's units and activities are moved elsewhere in New Jersey or out of the state entirely. We will not know the full impact until the fort's final status has been determined. However, the Fort currently employs 5,555 people: 5,088 civilians and 467 military personnel. According to the New Jersey Commerce and Economic Growth Commission, Ft. Monmouth contributes an estimated \$2.5 billion annually to the state economy. The \$2.5 billion in economic activity supports more than 22,000 jobs throughout New Jersey's economy.

**Question: *Will there be opportunities for public input?***

**Answer:** Yes. Later this year, the BRAC Commission will hold regional hearings at which it will take testimony from the public. Once the date, time, and location of the nearest regional hearing are available, we will notify district residents. Also, members of the public can send their comments to the BRAC Commission and the President.

Base Closure & Realignment Commission  
2521 South Clark Street  
Suite 600  
Arlington, VA 22202

President George W. Bush  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20500



Print

## The Closing of Monmouth Base in New Jersey Means Job Losses to The Surrounding Communities

By Maura Jane Farrelly  
New York  
22 May 2005

[Maura Farrelly Report-Download\(MP3\)2280KB](#)

[Maura Farrelly Report-Download \(Real Audio\)777KB](#)



Ever since it unveiled its proposal to save nearly \$50 billion over the next 20 years by closing dozens of U.S. military facilities, the Pentagon has been busy defending its list of targeted bases. The closing of a military base is hardly ever a seamless affair, since it means job losses and a decline in revenue for the communities that surround the base. Local leaders in the 22 states that could see major base closures are therefore scrambling to get the Pentagon to revise its list.

In Monmouth County, New Jersey, the mayors of 5 different communities that surround Fort Monmouth Army Base recently gathered to formulate a strategy for saving the facility. They have hired a consultant to study the economic impact Fort Monmouth has on the area, and before the meeting even began, Oceanport mayor Maria Gatta made it clear that she was not


happy with the Pentagon's decision.

Ms. Gatta passed around a political cartoon that she had cut out from her local newspaper that morning. It featured a drawing of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, recommending that *all* of America's military bases be relocated to Iraq. The commentary got a laugh out of Shrewsbury mayor Emi Siciliano, who ran as a Republican.

Republican or Democrat, none of the mayors in Monmouth County, New Jersey, is happy about the prospect of losing the area's biggest employer. "Fort Monmouth contributes to the local, county, (and) state economy on the order of \$3 billion a year," says Gerry Tarantolo, mayor of Eatontown. "We have 5,300 jobs directly impacted by this. Possibly another 22,000 jobs that are affiliated with some function at Fort Monmouth. So when you start putting the numbers together, you're starting to approach 30,000 jobs being lost in this area. That's a concern."

Another concern is all the business revenue generated by Fort Monmouth's 500 military families. Oceanport Mayor Maria Gatta says 2 years ago, when a bridge closure cut Fort Monmouth off from her town's business district, local storeowners saw their revenue drop by 20-60%. "So your little 'mom and pop' stores (i.e. small, non-franchised stores) are not going to be able to survive that," she says. "They rely, especially in Oceanport, on a lot of trade and business from Fort Monmouth personnel."

The Pentagon is required by law to consider the economic impact a base has on the surrounding community before recommending its closure. But because *every* town that stands to lose a base is going to take an economic hit, officials in Monmouth County do not plan to focus just on the economy when making their appeal to the Defense Department. Fort Monmouth, they



Monmouth Base in New Jersey

point out, is located just 95 kilometers south of New York City. "Ground zero... a lot of Fort Monmouth personnel and expertise was deployed there," says Gerry Tarantolo. "We're talking about national security. We're right in the center of all of this activity. The 'soft zone' as (some people) put it. And to remove Fort Monmouth from this area is, I think, a big mistake," he says.


It is an argument that is echoed by members of the region's congressional delegation. U.S. Representative Rush Holt has already begun working on an appeal to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. "I expect the BRAC commission, like the Pentagon, will not be swayed by local economic arguments," Congressman Holt says. "So as much as we care about the jobs that are at stake here, most of our arguments will deal with the military value of Fort Monmouth," he adds.

New Jersey's leaders say they believe they *will* be able to save Fort Monmouth. The state's predominantly Democratic identity, though, *is* a source of concern for some of them. Noting the way the country has been divided since the 2004 presidential election into Republican-dominated "red" states and Democrat-dominated "blue" states, Mayor Gerry Tarantolo, a Democrat, and Mayor Emi Siciliano, a Republican, both suggest the base closings are political. "It just so happens that Fort Monmouth appears in a blue state," Mr. Tarantolo notes. "And (it's) a tag-on," Ms. Siciliano quickly adds. "I mean, it was added at the last minute. So to me, that indicates it's a political move," she says.


The Pentagon denies that partisan politics played any role in the base-closure recommendations--and in fact, President Bush's home state of Texas stands to lose more than 3,100 civilian jobs should those recommendations be implemented. Texas will also gain nearly 10,000 military jobs, though, while New Jersey will take a hit in both the civilian and the military sectors.

A 9-member BRAC commission will review the Pentagon's recommendations--make any changes it deems necessary--and then forward the base-closure list to President Bush by September 8th.

Print



CLOSE FORT MONMOUTH, NJ



## **FORT MONMOUTH, NJ**

### **Demographics**

The following tables provide a short description of the area near the installation/activity. FORT MONMOUTH is 35.3 miles from New York, NY, the nearest city with a population of 100,000 or more. The nearest metropolitan statistical area (MSA) is

MSA	Population
Monmouth-Ocean MSA	11,262,127

The following entities comprise the military housing area (MHA):

County/City	Population
Monmouth	615301
Ocean	510916
Total	1,126,217

### **Child Care**

This attribute captures the number of nationally accredited child-care centers within the local community: 54

### **Cost of Living**

Cost of Living provides a relative measure of cost of living in the local community. General Schedule (GS) Locality Pay provides a relative scale to compare local salaries with government salaries and Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) is an indicator of the local rental market. In-state tuition is an indicator of the support provided by the state for active duty family members to participate in higher-level education opportunities.

Median Household Income	(US Avg \$41,994)	\$54,865	Basis: MSA
Median House Value	(US Avg \$119,600)	\$160,700	
GS Locality Pay	("Rest of US" 10.9%)	19.3%	
O-3 with Dependents BAH Rate		\$2,098	
In-state Tuition for Family Member		Yes	
In-state Tuition Continues if Member PCSs Out of State		Yes	

### **Education**

This attribute defines the population in local school districts and identifies capacity. The pupil/teacher ratio, graduation rate, percentage of certified teachers and composite SAT I/ACT scores provide a relative quality indicator of education. This attribute also attempts to give communities credit for the potential intellectual capital they provide.

NOTE: "MFR" means a Memorandum For Record is on file at the installation/activity/agency to document problems in obtaining the required information. Reasons for not being able to obtain information may be that the school district refused to provide the information or the school district does not use or track the information.

If the installation/activity/agency has incomplete information from the local school system in order to accurately compute a score in this area, the number of school districts reporting information will be captured in addition to the computed answer.

		Basis
School District(s) Capacity	163,099	60 of 60 districts
Students Enrolled	150,368	60 of 60 districts
Average Pupil/Teacher Ratio	11.9:1	60 of 60 districts
High School Students Enrolled	41,901	26 of 26 districts
Average High School Graduation Rate (US Avg 67.3%)	92.4%	26 of 26 districts
Average Composite SAT I Score (US Avg 1026)	1023	26 of 26 districts
Average ACT Score (US Avg 20.8)		
Available Graduate/PhD Programs	6	
Available Colleges and/or Universities	9	
Available Vocational and/or Technical Schools	2	

## Employment

Unemployment and job growth rates provide a relative merit of job availability in the local community. National rates from the Bureau of Labor Statistics are also provided.

The unemployment rates for the last five-years:

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Local Data	4.2%	3.5%	3.8%	5.3%	5.4%
National	4.2%	4.0%	4.7%	5.8%	6.0%
Basis:	MSA	MSA	MSA	MSA	MSA

The annual job growth rate for the last five-years:

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Local Data	2.1%	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%	1.9%
National	1.5%	2.4%	.03%	-.31%	.86%
Basis:	MSA	MSA	MSA	MSA	MSA

## Housing

This attribute provides an indication of availability of housing, both sales and rental, in the local community. Note: according to the 2000 Census, Vacant Sale and Vacant Rental Units do not equal Total Vacant Housing Units; Total Vacant Housing Units may also include units that are vacant but not on the market for sale or rent.

Total Vacant Housing Units	64,957	Basis: MSA
Vacant Sale Units	5,399	
Vacant Rental Units	7,304	

## Medical Providers

This attribute provides an indicator of availability of medical care for military and DoD civilians in the local community. The table reflects the raw number of physicians/beds and ratio of physicians/beds to population.

	# Physicians	# Beds	Population	Basis: MSA
Local Community	2,705	2,770	11,262,127	
Ratio	1:4,163	1:4,066		
National Ratio (2003)	1:421.2	1:373.7		

## Safety/Crime

The local community's Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) Index for 2002 per 100,000 people and the national UCR based on information from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for 2002:

Local UCR	2,296.0	Basis: MSA
National UCR	4,118.8	

## Transportation

Distance to an airport shows convenience and availability of airline transportation. Public transportation shows potential for members and DoD civilians to use it to commute to/from work under normal circumstances and for leisure.

Distance from FORT MONMOUTH to nearest commercial airport: 47.0 miles

Is FORT MONMOUTH served by regularly scheduled public transportation? Yes

## Utilities

This attribute identifies a local community's water and sewer systems' ability to receive 1,000 additional people.

Does the local community's water system have the ability to meet an expanded need of an additional 1,000 people moving in the local community? Yes

Does the local community's sewer system have the ability to meet an expanded need of an additional 1,000 people moving in the local community? Yes

## Economic Impact Report

This report depicts the economic impact of the following Scenarios:

USA-0223v5: ARMY Land C4ISR RDA Center - Close Monmouth

The data in this report is rolled up by Action


ECONOMIC IMPACT DATA

Scenario: ARMY Land C4ISR RDA Center - Close Monmouth  
 Economic Region of Influence(ROI): Edison, NJ Metropolitan Division  
 Base: MONMOUTH  
 Action: Monmouth

**Overall Economic Impact of Proposed BRAC-05 Action:**


ROI Population (2002):	2,244,569
ROI Employment (2002):	1,220,335
Authorized Manpower (2005):	5,271
Authorized Manpower(2005) / ROI Employment(2002):	0.43%
Total Estimated Job Change:	-9,737
Total Estimated Job Change / ROI Employment(2002):	-0.8%

**Cumulative Job Change (Gain/Loss) Over Time:**




Edison, NJ Metropolitan Division Trend Data


**Employment Trend (1988-2002)**



**Unemployment Percentage Trend (1990-2003)**



**Per Capita Income x \$1,000 (1988-2002)**



**SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS [TABS FINAL VERSION]****SCENARIO # USA-0223v5****TITLE: CLOSE FT MONMOUTH C4ISR****GENERAL DESCRIPTION:** Close Ft. Monmouth, NJ.

Relocate Information Systems, Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research and Development & Acquisition (RDA) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Repairables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, Inventory Control Point functions; and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions 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. Relocate the Joint Network Management System Program Office to Fort Meade, MD. Relocate the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY. Realign Ft. Belvoir, VA by relocating and consolidating Sensors, Electronic Warfare & Electronics Research and elements of Research and Development and Acquisition 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.

Proposal affects the following Army installations:

1. Ft Monmouth closes.
2. Aberdeen Proving Ground gains approximately 5,000 personnel and approximately 1,325,000 SF of new MILCON
3. West Point gains approximately 300 personnel and 82,000 sq ft of new MILCON
4. DSCC Columbus gains approximately 50 personnel and requires no new MILCON. This is not an Army-owned facility – impacts assessed on "Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts Scenario #USA-223 (DLA only)"
5. Fort Belvoir has a net loss of personnel (more personnel moving to Aberdeen than arriving from Momnouth) but approximately 50,000 SF of new construction will still be necessary.
6. Fort Meade gains approximately 2 people
7. Fort Knox, Crystal City Lease, and Redstone are all losing personnel.

**ANALYST:** \_\_\_\_\_**LAST UPDATE: 05/09/05**

16

**SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF SCENARIO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (CONTINUED);**  
**SCENARIO USA-0223V5**

Env Resource Area	#2 <i>Losing</i> Installation Assessment Inst Name: Ft. Monmouth	Analyst Comments (& data source(s) that drive assessment)
Air Quality	No impact	#213 – In non-attainment for Ozone (EPA website confirms non-attainment for Ozone 8-hour); unclassifiable data for 4 other criteria pollutants
Cultural/Archeological/Tribal Resources	Survey and consultation with SHPO will be required to ensure protection of cultural resources at the installation.	#235 – 108 historic prop identified #230 – 9 archeological resources identified on installation, no restrictions reported #231 – Native People sites identified on or contiguous to the installation #232 – Areas with high archaeological potential identified.
Dredging	No impact	
Land Use Constraints/Sensitive Resource Areas	Environmental media contamination issues include DERA IRP sites, and operational ranges potentially contaminated with UXO and munitions constituents. Restoration and/or monitoring of contaminated media will likely be required after closure in order to prevent significant long-term impacts to the environment.	# 240 DERA CTC = \$2.9M; with \$11M spent through FY03, No MMRP 11 operational ranges \$15.3-\$110M  #273 - No MMRA's
Marine Mammals/Marine Resources / Marine Sanctuaries	No impact	
Noise	No impact	
Threatened & Endangered Species/Critical Habitats	No impact	#259 – No TES listed #260 – No critical habitat identified #263, #264 – No candidate species/habitat reported
Waste Management	No Impact	#269 –No RCRA Subpart X OB/OD Permit #265- No RCRA TSD facility #272 – No permitted solid waste disposal facility

16

Water Resources	Environmental media issues at the installation include Benzene, Chlorobenzene, Vinyl Chloride, Trichloroethene, Tetrachloroethene, Arsenic, Lead, Gasoline (Benzene, Ethyl Benzene, Toluene, Total Xylene), and MTBE in ground water, and cis-1,2-Dichloroethene; vinyl chloride; trichloroethene; tetrachloroethene; gasoline constituents including BTEX and MTBE in surface water. Restoration and monitoring of contaminated sites will likely be required after closure to prevent significant long-term impacts to the environment.	#275 -Groundwater contaminated with Benzene, Chlorobenzene, Vinyl Chloride, Trichloroethene, Tetrachloroethene, Arsenic, Lead, Gasoline (Benzene, Ethyl Benzene, Toluene, Total Xylene), and MTBE #281 – Surface water contaminated with Chlorinated compounds including cis-1,2-Dichloroethene; vinyl chloride; trichloroethene; tetrachloroethene; Gasoline constituents including BTEX and MTBE #297/#822- Installation has 2 domestic wastewater treatment plants
Wetlands	No impact	

Department : Army  
 Scenario File : J:\Technical SDC\Results\USA 0223\Close Monmouth less Adelphi\_2May05 v4.1.CBR\Close Monmouth less Adelphi\_4May05 v4.2\Close Monmouth Less Adelphi\_4May05 v4.2.CBR  
 Option Pkg Name: Close Monmouth C4ISR (less Adelphi) at APG  
 Std Fctrs File : J:\Technical SDC\Tools\Army COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

Starting Year : 2006  
 Final Year : 2009  
 Payback Year : 2015 (6 Years)

NPV in 2025(\$K): -1,025,750  
 1-Time Cost(\$K): 822,263

Net Costs in 2005 Constant Dollars (\$K)								
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	Beyond
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----
MilCon	38,349	24,898	399,394	0	0	0	462,641	0
Person	0	0	-71	-9,810	-58,633	-58,633	-127,148	-58,633
Overhd	4,626	1,559	4,662	-78,079	-84,797	-84,797	-236,827	-86,886
Moving	4,935	0	58,829	191,289	0	0	255,054	0
Missio	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	5,979	6,005	24,337	1,903	1,831	1,831	41,887	1,831
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>53,889</b>	<b>32,463</b>	<b>487,151</b>	<b>105,302</b>	<b>-141,599</b>	<b>-141,599</b>	<b>395,607</b>	<b>-143,688</b>

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
<b>POSITIONS ELIMINATED</b>							
Off	0	0	0	42	0	0	42
Enl	0	0	0	143	0	0	143
Civ	0	0	0	526	0	0	526
<b>TOT</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>711</b>

<b>POSITIONS REALIGNED</b>							
Off	0	0	10	141	0	0	151
Enl	0	0	15	105	0	0	120
Stu	0	2	200	1	0	0	203
Civ	0	0	106	4,926	0	0	5,032
<b>TOT</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>5,173</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,506</b>

Summary:

-----  
 Combines USA-0223 and TECH-0052R.

USA-0223

PIMS 663: Close Ft. Monmouth, NJ. Relocate the US Army Communications & Electronic Command (CECOM) and associated PEO research, development and acquisition functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. Relocate the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY.

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 Bn 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. These organizations are relocated to Base X for COBRA purposes.

USA-0052R

This scenario consolidates C4ISR technical facilities into a fewer locations. The scenario consolidates Ground Sensor, Electronic Warfare, Electronics and Information Systems Research, Development and Acquisition at Aberdeen, MD. Consolidation of research includes moving research in Networks done by the Army Research Institute. The consolidated research organization will be coupled with research in cognitive engineering, human performance and in human factors associated with C4ISR and Networks and Information systems research by ARL to create a Land Network Science, Technology and Experimentation Center, which will perform the fundamental research required to enable Ground Network Centric Warfare. This scensrio consolidates the PEO EIS at Ft. Belvoir, VA.

Each part of the scenario will require moving the People & their Positions (government only) and the Special Equipment & Facilities reported as peerforming that activity. People includes Military (Officers and Enlisted), Civilian and those contractor personnel for whom the government is obliged to provide on-base facilities. Special Equipment includes Mission and Support Equipment as well as those vehicles required to

accomplish the mission being moved.

Action 1: Move the People & their Positions (government only) and the Special Equipment & Facilities reported as doing Ground Sensor, Electronic Warfare, Electronics and Information Systems Research, Development and Aquisition from Fort Monmouth, NJ to Aberdeen, MD.

Action 2: Move the People & their Positions (government only) and the Special Equipment & Facilities reported as doing Ground Sensor, Electronic Warfare, Electronics and Information Systems Research, Development and Aquisition from Fort Belvoir, VA to Aberdeen, MD.

Action 3: Move the People & their Positions (government only) and the Special Equipment & Facilities reported as doing Information Systems Development and Aquisition from PEO EIS at Fort Monmouth, NJ to PEO Enterprise Information System at Fort Belvoir.

Action 4: Move the People & their Positions (government only) and the Special Equipment & Facilities in the Army Research Institute doing Information Systems Research in Networks from Ft Knox, KY to APG, MD.

Action 5: Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL, by relocating and consolidating Ground Information Systems, Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Development and Acquisition to APG, MD.

Action 6: Realign PM Acquistion, Logistics and Technology Enterprise Systems and Services (ALTESS) at 2511 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA, a leased installation in Crystal City, VA, by relocating and consolidating Enterprise Information Systems (EIS), Development and Acquisition to PEO EIS, Fort Belvoir, VA.

Department : Army  
 Scenario File : J:\Technical SDC\Results\USA 0223\Close Monmouth less Adelphi\_2May05 v4.1.CBR\Close Monmouth  
 less Adelphi\_4May05 v4.2\Close Monmouth Less Adelphi\_4May05 v4.2.CBR  
 Option Pkg Name: Close Monmouth C4ISR (less Adelphi) at APG  
 Std Fctrs File : J:\Technical SDC\Tools\Army COBRA 6.10\BRAC2005.SFF

Costs in 2005 Constant Dollars (\$K)								
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	Beyond
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
MilCon	38,349	24,898	399,394	0	0	0	462,641	0
Person	0	0	500	35,082	13,464	13,464	62,510	13,464
Overhd	13,923	10,873	16,834	36,962	30,244	30,244	139,081	30,244
Moving	4,935	0	58,895	192,042	0	0	255,873	0
Missio	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	5,979	6,005	24,337	1,903	1,831	1,831	41,887	1,831
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>63,186</b>	<b>41,778</b>	<b>499,960</b>	<b>265,989</b>	<b>45,539</b>	<b>45,539</b>	<b>961,993</b>	<b>45,539</b>

Savings in 2005 Constant Dollars (\$K)								
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	Beyond
	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
MilCon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Person	0	0	571	44,892	72,097	72,097	189,658	72,097
Overhd	9,297	9,314	12,171	115,042	115,042	115,042	375,908	117,131
Moving	0	0	66	753	0	0	819	0
Missio	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,297</b>	<b>9,314</b>	<b>12,808</b>	<b>160,687</b>	<b>187,139</b>	<b>187,139</b>	<b>566,386</b>	<b>189,228</b>

## INFORMATION PAPER

Subject: Impacts of potential transfers of employees on Team C4ISR intellectual capital.

1. Team Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) has been involved in systematic workforce planning efforts since 1999. Initial efforts focused on analyzing work force demographic data (average age, average years of service, attrition rates, etc.) and developing strategies to counteract the aging workforce trends that were occurring not only within Team C4ISR, but nationwide. These efforts culminated in a Team C4ISR work force plan: a systematic analysis of our current workforce, an assessment of future workforce needs, identification of gaps between our current workforce and our future workforce needs, and the development of strategies (e.g., recruitment plans, employee development programs) to close those gaps. As a result of these efforts, Team C4ISR at Fort Monmouth has hired 1600 new employees since FY00.

2. A review of Team C4ISR workforce demographics confirms a finding dating back to our original workforce analyses of 1999: that Team C4ISR will have a large number of retirement eligible employees during the period 2005 to 2010. Within Team C4ISR at Fort Monmouth, 25% of employees are eligible for optional retirement by 2007. (An additional 29% of employees will be eligible for early retirement by 2007.) By 2010, 66% of the overall workforce (38% optional, 28% early) will be eligible for retirement by 2010. Retirement eligibility numbers are especially high at the senior level (GS-14/15 and broadband equivalents), where 65% of senior employees are eligible for either optional (31%) or early (34%) retirement by 2007. In 2010, eligibility increases to 83% (45% optional, 38% early). Although these retirement eligibility numbers are high, our data indicates most of those eligible to retire will not do so immediately upon eligibility (the average retirement age for Team C4ISR is typically 61 or 62). Our experience to date has borne out this prediction. Retirements have not occurred in large waves; they have been much more gradual. Overall attrition within Team C4ISR has remained at or below 7%.

*Handwritten notes:*  
Avg 45  
45% over  
55  
Last 5 years  
hired 800  
11% - 5  
36-39 yrs

3. Realigning the Team C4ISR at Fort Monmouth work force to another location outside of the commuting area will most likely result in a significantly increased number of retirements. Historically, about 25 to 35% of a civilian work force will transfer to another location under a realignment. We will most likely experience a smaller percentage of the Team C4ISR work force at Fort Monmouth transferring due to the high percentage of retirement eligible employees. We anticipate that the transfer will compress what would normally have been a gradual number of retirements spread out over seven to ten years to a high percentage of those retirements occurring in a two to three year period. Many employees who would not have considered early retirement (or would not have had the opportunity to retire early) will take advantage of that opportunity in lieu of relocation, further exacerbating the problem. We also anticipate that our losses will be especially high among senior level employees, where retirement eligibility is

higher, causing gaps in critical leadership and technical skills that will take years to overcome. We see this as the first of two major human resources challenges that Team C4ISR at Monmouth would face under a realignment.

4. The second major challenge would be the need to hire large numbers of new employees at the new Team C4ISR location. Because the specialized skills of the employees in Team C4ISR (“domain knowledge” in the engineering and information technology fields, logistics, acquisition), there is typically a significant learning curve for new employees. For interns hired out of College (we would anticipate that the majority of our new hires would be interns), the learning curve is typically five to six years to achieve full “journeyman” level skills. For mid-career new hires, the learning curve may be somewhat shorter, but given the requirement for domain knowledge, and the uniqueness of DoD logistics and acquisition skills, we do not expect a significantly shorter learning curve. There is also a significant cost to hire and train a large contingent of employees. These costs are both tangible (e.g., recruiting, lost productivity resulting from position vacancies) and intangible (e.g., impact on morale of remaining work force). Human Resources Consulting Firms (e.g., Saratoga Institute, Hewitt Associates) have estimated the cost of turnover as high as 150% of annual salary, and this estimate is probably low given the highly skilled and technical nature of our workforce, and the additional requirements of the high number of certified acquisition positions.

Prepared by:  
Mark Fuhring  
DCSPER  
DSN 992-8594

Approved by:  
Deborah T. Devlin  
DCSPER  
DSN 992-2101

## Total Retirement Eligible (Optional + Early)

### Team C4ISR at Fort Monmouth

DCSPER Civilian Personnel Data as of May 2005

#### Engineers & Scientists

	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
Senior	43%	48%	54%	63%	70%	80%
Journeyman	26%	31%	37%	43%	51%	56%
Entry	14%	16%	18%	19%	22%	24%

ES00, ST00, DB4, NH04, GS14-15

DB03, NH03, GS13, GG13

NH03, GS5-12

#### Logistics

	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
Senior	74%	76%	79%	85%	89%	94%
Journeyman	61%	66%	71%	75%	78%	81%
Entry	42%	47%	50%	54%	60%	60%

ES00, NH04, GS14-15

NH03, GS12-13

NH02, GS5-11

#### Contracting

	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
Senior	77%	77%	80%	80%	83%	90%
Journeyman	59%	64%	69%	72%	74%	72%
Entry	11%	11%	11%	11%	12%	12%

ES00, NH04, GS14-15

NH03, GS12-13

GS7-11

#### Other

	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10
Senior	67%	71%	78%	80%	83%	83%
Journeyman	60%	65%	70%	71%	76%	79%
Entry	43%	49%	55%	60%	65%	68%

ES00, DE04, NH04, GS14-15, GG14-15

DE03, NH03, NK3, GS12-13, GG12-13

DE02, DK02, NH02, NK02, NJ02, GS1-11, GG7-11

**Fort Monmouth's *Direct* Economic Impact by NJ Congressional District in FY04**

Congressional District	Representative	Party Affiliation	FM Personnel Living in NJ	Total Salaries and Benefits	Total NJ-Only Acquisitions	Direct Economic Impact
1	Robert Andrews	D	10	\$ 736,774	\$ 15,825,280	\$ 16,562,054
2	Frank LoBiondo	R	8	\$ 601,840	\$ 175,890,352	\$ 176,492,192
3	Jim Saxton	R	503	\$ 44,417,937	\$ 2,073,902	\$ 46,491,839
4	Chris Smith	R	1379*	\$ 121,672,287	\$ 5,670,676	\$ 127,342,963
5	Scott Garret	R	13	\$ 1,260,273	\$ 4,773,374	\$ 6,033,647
6	Frank Pallone, Jr.	D	1714**	\$ 139,545,831	\$ 20,172,696	\$ 159,718,527
7	Michael Ferguson	R	84	\$ 7,287,232	\$ 2,808,913	\$ 10,096,145
8	Bill Pascrell, Jr.	D	11	\$ 864,859	\$ 20,707,749	\$ 21,572,608
9	Steven Rothman	D	19	\$ 1,558,495	\$ 6,068,450	\$ 7,626,945
10	Donald Payne	D	37	\$ 3,004,762	\$ 726,591	\$ 3,731,353
11	R. Frelinghuysen	R	11	\$ 1,006,454	\$ 4,073,140	\$ 5,079,594
12	Rush Holt	D	2045***	\$ 154,868,567	\$ 605,491,099	\$ 760,359,666
13	Bob Menendez	D	22	\$ 1,562,865	\$ 334,233	\$ 1,897,098
<b>Total for FY04</b>			<b>5856</b>	<b>\$ 478,388,176</b>	<b>\$ [REDACTED]</b>	<b>\$ 1,343,004,631</b>


\* Includes 33 Military

\*\* Includes 41 Military

\*\*\* Includes 486 Military

**Note:** The data above relates strictly to New Jersey. Employees residing in New York and Pennsylvania are excluded from the data, as are Acquisitions not related to the State. Additionally, the word "Direct" indicates the absence of any multiplier effects on the data.

- 109th Congress:
- 01 Robert E. Andrews (D)
  - 02 Frank A. Lautenberg (R)
  - 03 Jim Saxton (R)
  - 04 Christopher H. Smith (R)
  - 05 E. Scott Pataki (R)
  - 06 Frank Lautenberg (R)
  - 07 Mike Ferguson (R)
  - 08 Bill Pascrell, Jr. (D)
  - 09 Steven M. Hoffman (D)
  - 10 Donald M. Payne (D)
  - 11 Rodney F. Frelinghuysen (R)
  - 12 Paul D. Hall (D)
  - 13 Robert Menendez (D)



FALL ONLY DINSICK

**PRESS RELEASE**

U.S. Army Fort Monmouth

**CONTACT: Timothy Rider  
732-532-1258****RELEASE NO. 05-10  
April 4 2005****Fort Monmouth measures New Jersey economic contribution: \$3.24 billion, 22,774 jobs**

Fort Monmouth's economic impact on New Jersey is measured at \$3.24 billion with responsibility for 22,774 New Jersey jobs for federal fiscal year 2004 according to an analysis by fort personnel.

The analysis relied upon a still-valid methodology used by the New Jersey Commerce and Economic Growth Commission in a similar analysis it completed in cooperation with Fort Monmouth in 2002.

The analysis of overall economic impact includes the direct effect of \$478.4 million for payroll and benefits received by the fort's military and civilian federal employees, as well as the [REDACTED] million in contracts awarded by fort organizations to New Jersey companies or to companies of other states for work performed at Fort Monmouth.

Along with estimated spending by government travelers to Fort Monmouth, aid paid to local schools and estimated private sector pay received by family members of Fort Monmouth employees, direct expenditures from Fort Monmouth to New Jersey amounts to \$1.415 billion.

The total estimated economic impact of \$3.24 billion is obtained by multiplying the direct New Jersey expenditures by an economic revenue multiplier of 2.29.

The economic revenue multiplier is a tool that was used by economists in the 2002 report to calculate the additional spending resulting from the direct contributions of Fort Monmouth to the New Jersey economy.

The 5,856 government jobs at Fort Monmouth held by New Jersey residents in fiscal year 2004 yield an estimated total of 22,774 jobs in the state when the labor multiplier of 3.889 is applied. Approximately 200 Fort jobs are held by New York and Pennsylvania residents.

The employment multiplier is a tool that was used by economists in the 2002 report to calculate the additional jobs created by all New Jersey businesses supplying, servicing or benefiting from direct spending.

The economic impact for fiscal year 2004 is slightly higher than the \$3.16 billion for fiscal year 2003. Fort Monmouth was responsible for slightly fewer jobs in 2004 than the 5,900 jobs held by New Jersey residents in 2003.

Fort Monmouth is the home of many organizations, primarily including those responsible for research, development, acquisition, fielding and support of Command and Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance systems for the Joint Warfighter.

QUESTIONS FOR POSSIBLE  
USE BY COMMISSIONERS

### Questions for Ft. Monmouth:

1. The justification for the recommendation to "Relocate the US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY" states that this move "increases training to enhance coordination, doctrine development, training effectiveness and improve operational and functional efficiencies". Please discuss these improvements.
2. Part of the recommendation is to "Relocate the Joint Network Management System Program Office to Fort Meade, MD." What are the functions that these personnel perform, and what is the efficiency that will be gained from this movement?
3. Please elaborate on the functions and mission of people impacted by the recommendation to "Relocate Information Systems, Sensors, Electronic Warfare, and Electronics Research and Development & Acquisition (RDA) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD."
4. Are there any drawbacks to consolidating the PEO EIS functions at Ft. Belvoir?
5. An additional part of the recommendation is to: "Relocate the Budget/Funding, Contracting, Cataloging, Requisition Processing, Customer Services, Item Management, Stock Control, Weapon System Secondary Item Support, Requirements Determination, Integrated Materiel Management Technical Support Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and reestablish them as Defense Logistics Agency Inventory Control Point functions; relocate the procurement management and related support functions for Depot Level Repairables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and designate them as Inventory Control Point functions, detachment of Defense Supply Center Columbus, OH, and relocate the remaining integrated materiel management, user, and related support functions to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD."
  - a. How are these functions currently performed and organized?
  - b. Can you please articulate the efficiencies which will be gained through this movement.
6. Please discuss the recommendation to "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" and the benefits from the justification that state: "The recommendation establishes a Land C4ISR Lifecycle Management Command (LCMC) to focus technical activity and accelerate transition."
7. Are there any concerns regarding the payback portion which states: "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."

8. Is there any additional information that you would like to communicate that might impact on these recommendations?

## Commissioner prep questions - Ft. Monmouth

- 1) What can you tell us about your workforce demographics?
- 2) The staff gave you 8 questions for the record regarding the recommendation to close Ft. Monmouth. We would like your candid responses to these questions, things like your comments on any challenges to moving functions to Aberdeen.
- 3) Is there anything unique about the installation that you would like to tell us?
- 4) Will the movement of the US Military Academy Prep School to West Point create any hardships to those students?

## Fort Monmouth

**BRAC 05 recommends to close Fort Monmouth, and realign both mission functions and major tenants into multiple locations that results in consolidation of like or similar functions into synergy specific installations to increase efficiencies and reduce costs. Key to this closure is the relocation of CECOM, a Major Subordinate Command of the AMC, to Aberdeen Proving Grounds as a complement to the synergy being established at Aberdeen. Utilization of the total capacity of the RDT&E Command is enhanced by consolidation. Non-RDT&E tenants/activities are realigned to installations that have like mission functions where Army and DoD synergy is enhanced.**

### Incoming Activities

None

### Departing Activities

What: Communications-Electronics Command (CECOM), Communications-Electronics Research Development and Engineering Center (CERDEC), Development and Acquisition Logistics Support, Software Engineering Center, Program Executive Office for Intelligence, Electronic Warfare and Sensors (PEO IEW&S), Program Executive Office for Command, Control, Communications Tactical (PEO C3T) to Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.

Why: Research, Development and Acquisition (RDA), Test and Evaluation of C4ISR technologies and systems are currently split between several major sites – Ft Monmouth, NJ, Ft Dix, NJ, Adelphi, MD and Ft Belvoir, VA - and several smaller sites, including Redstone, AL, and Ft Knox, KY. Consolidation of RDA functions into two major sites achieves efficiency and synergy at a lower cost than would be required for multiple sites. Further, Combining RDA and T&E requires test ranges – which cannot be created at Ft Monmouth. This action preserves the Army's "commodity" business model by near collocation of Research, Development, Acquisition, and Logistics functions.

What: The US Army Military Academy Preparatory School to West Point, NY.

Why: Consolidates Army Academy training from two locations to one location and promotes training effectiveness and functional efficiencies

What: Inventory Control Point functions for Consumable Items to Defense Supply Center Columbus, Ohio, and reestablish it as Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Inventory Control Point (ICP) functions.

Why: Supports the migration of the remaining Service Consumable Items to the oversight and management of a single DoD agency/activity.

What: Procurement management functions for Depot Level Repairables to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, and designate them as Defense Supply Center Columbus, Ohio, Inventory Control Point functions.

Why: Supports the acquisition management of Depot Level Reparables to a single DoD agency/activity.

What: Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems to Ft. Belvoir, VA.

Why: DoD has identified a need to consolidate various Department of Defense research functions. In order to fulfill this objective, the research functions at Ft. Monmouth will be moved to an Army installation with higher research value to the Department.

What: Joint Network Management System Program Office to Fort Meade, MD.

Why: DoD has identified a need to consolidate various Department of Defense research functions. In order to fulfill this objective, the research functions at Ft. Monmouth will be moved to an Army installation with higher research value to the Department

**Quantitative Results**

Net Personnel Impacts <sup>1</sup>			MILCON Cost Estimate
Military	Civilian	Student	
-417	-4,652	-203	0

- 5272

**Implementation Timeline:**

According to BRAC law, these actions must be initiated within two years and completed within six years from the date the President transmits the report to Congress.

**Internal Communications:** (Fort Monmouth Work Force)

- The Army is seeking an installation to a full spectrum research, development, acquisition, test and evaluation (T&E) center for C4ISR Systems. Ft Monmouth has a long and storied history, and has made significant contributions to supporting the Army's missions; however, the Army must now look to future requirements and develop an installation portfolio that can support and sustain its new force structure and missions as the Army transforms to an expeditionary force.
- Each unit and activity transferred from Ft Monmouth has been placed to enhance its operational or support capability through consolidations or co-locations.
- The result of these hard decisions is a basing configuration that better supports our transforming Army and saves money.

<sup>1</sup> Based on FY03 ASIP data. Does not reflect any personnel changes resulting from standard programming and Command Plan actions since FY03.

**External Communications: (Civilian community)**

- The indirect economic impact of this closure is estimated at a reduction of 1.15 percent of the economic area employment.
- The Army is committed to working with local communities as Ft Monmouth closes to smooth the transition process.
- Fort Monmouth has played a long and storied role in the history of the US Army and it was a difficult decision to close it.
- The transformation objectives of the US Army seek to retain installations that are capable of accepting multiple missions.

**Approving BRAC Recommendations - Statutory Steps:**

- 16 May 05 SECDEF forwards Recommendations to BRAC Commission
- 08 Sept 05 BRAC Commission recommendations due to President
- 23 Sept 05 President approves/disapproves Commission recommendations
- 20 Oct 05 Commission resubmits recommendations (if initially rejected by President)
- 07 Nov 05 President submits final recommendations to Congress. Once submitted, the plan becomes final within 45 legislative days, unless Congress passes a joint resolution to block the entire package.

**BRAC Recommendations impacting Fort Monmouth**

- Close Fort Monmouth
- Inventory Control Points to DLA

# IVT Overlay Layers for Fort Monmouth Main Post 5 Mar 04



- ### Legend
- Installation Boundary (Red outline)
  - Wetland Area (Blue hatched pattern)
  - Flood Zone Area (Light blue hatched pattern)





Image © 2003 Space Imaging LLC

# Recommended New Jersey Base Realignments and Closures



## Fort Monmouth Statistics

Total Acres: 1,149	Total Personnel: 5,632
Acres Owned: 1,138	Mil: 353
	Civ: 4,566
	Other: 713