Candidate Recommendation # INT-0012

Candidate Recommendation: Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) facilities at 2nd Street, St. Louis, MO, and Arnold, MO. Relocate all functions to a new facility on Scott Air Force Base, IL

Justification

- ✓ Meets two IJCSG Analytical Framework objectives
  - ✓ Improves mission synergy by collocating functions-achieves operational efficiencies - upgrades work environment; enhances recruitment/retention
  - ✓ Improves COOP/Mission Assurance capabilities
- ✓ Enhances force protection
- ✓ Reduces annual O&M costs associated with aging infrastructure
- ✓ Eliminates excess capacity

Military Value

- ✓ Relative MV scores not determinable because relocating to a location not currently doing this function
- ✓ Military Judgment:
  - ✓ Pro: Better access to comm; better support to NGA military members.
  - ✓ Con: Located between two runways; potential loss of experience due to extra 40 mile commute for majority of current employees

Payback

✓ One Time Cost:	$647.6M
✓ Net Implementation Cost:	$584.4M
✓ Annual Recurring Savings:	$16.0M
✓ Payback Period:	100+ years
✓ NPV (cost):	$356.9M

Impacts

- ✓ Criterion 6: -286 jobs (137 direct and 149 indirect); <0.1%
- ✓ Criterion 7: No issues
- ✓ Criterion 8: No impediments

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis/Data Verification ✓ JCSG/MilDep Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs

✓ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis/Data Verification ✓ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/MilDeps

(U) Candidate Recommendation # INT-0012

(U) Candidate Recommendation: Close National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) facilities at 2nd Street, St. Louis, MO, and Arnold, MO. Relocate all functions to a new facility on Scott Air Force Base, IL.

(U) Justification: This recommendation improves COOP and Mission Assurance, information flow, and mission synergy. The recommendation also addresses Antiterrorism/Force Protection issues identified during assessments conducted since September 11, 2001, and will improve Agency efficiency of operations. In addition, it eliminates all excess capacity at the 2nd Street facilities, accommodates current and surge requirements, and is consistent with the 20-year Force Structure Plan.

(U) Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement the recommendation is $647.6M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department of Defense during the implementation period is a cost of $584.4M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $16.0M with a payback expected in 100+ years. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a cost of $356.9M.

(U) Impacts:

(U) Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 286 jobs (137 direct and 149 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the St. Louis MO-IL Metropolitan Statistical Area economic area, which is less than 0.1% of economic area employment.

(U) Community Infrastructure: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel.

(U) Environmental Impact: Scott AFB is a non-attainment area for 8-hour Ozone. An initial conformity determination analysis indicates that determination is not needed. A minor air permit revision may be needed. There is an issue with land use constraints ands sensitive resource areas at Scott AFB. The base uses safety waivers and exemptions to accomplish the mission. Additional operations may compound the need for safety waivers. Military Munitions Response Program sites exist on the installation and may represent a safety hazard for future development. Scott AFB also has an issue with threatened and endangered species and critical habitat. The Indiana bat is a threatened and endangered specie on the installation and has delayed very limited tree cutting operations (1% of the base). Additional operations may further impact this specie. This recommendation will have no impact on cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; waste management; water resources, or wetlands. This recommendation will require spending approximately $774K for environmental compliance actions. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, or environmental compliance activities.