RECOMMENDATION FOR CLOSURE

NAVY RECRUITING DISTRICTS

Recommendation: Close the following Navy Recruiting Districts:

Montgomery, Alabama
Indianapolis, Indiana
Kansas City, Missouri
Omaha, Nebraska
Buffalo, New York

Justification: This recommendation achieves economies of scale and scope by reducing excess capacity in management overhead and physical resources in the Navy Recruiting District functional area. Through the elimination of leased space, the recommendation results in an annual lease savings of over $682 thousand. The recommendation is consistent with the Commander, Navy Recruiting Command's Transformation Plan, which envisions consolidation of active and reserve recruiting functions, and supports the reallocation of management oversight over all Navy recruiting functions. This recommendation involves the closure of the specified Navy Recruiting Districts only and does not impact the storefront recruiting offices currently assigned to the closing Navy Recruiting Districts. The recruiting offices and associated personnel and resources will be reassigned to the remaining 26 Navy Recruiting Districts.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $2.44 million. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $78.3 million. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $14.5 million with an immediate payback. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $214.5 million.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 68 jobs (41 direct and 27 indirect) over the 2006–2011 period in the Montgomery, AL Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 54 jobs (38 direct jobs and 16 indirect jobs) over the 2006–2011 period in the Indianapolis, IN Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 64 jobs (38 direct and 26 indirect) over the 2006–2011 period in the Kansas City, MO-KS Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 60 jobs (32 direct jobs and 28 indirect jobs) over the 2006–2011 period in the Omaha-Council Bluffs, NE-IA Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment.

Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 53 jobs (37 direct and 16 indirect) over the 2006–2011 period in the Buffalo-Niagara Falls, NY Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 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: A review of community attributes indicates no issues regarding the ability of the infrastructure of the communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

Environmental Impact: This recommendation has no impact on air quality; cultural, archeological, or tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species or critical habitat; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation does not impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental 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.

Attachments:

Supporting Information
COBRA Report
Economic Impact Report(s)
Community Infrastructure Report(s)
Summary of Scenario Environmental Impacts

Supporting Information:

Military Value Analysis Results:

Ranking	DoN Installation	Military Value Score
1	NAVCRUITDIST CHICAGO IL	86.5
2	NAVCRUITDIST SAN DIEGO CA	85.8
3	NAVCRUITDIST PHILADELPHIA PA	85.7
4	NAVCRUITDIST SAN FRANCISCO CA	80.1
5	NAVCRUITDIST SAN ANTONIO TX	78.8
6	NAVCRUITDIST LOS ANGELES CA	77.1
7	NAVCRUITDIST NEW ENGLAND MA	75.2
8	NAVCRUITDIST EAST MEADOW NY	71.6
9	NAVCRUITDIST NEW ORLEANS LA	70.2
10	NAVCRUITDIST JACKSONVILLE FL	70.1
11	NAVCRUITDIST PITTSBURGH PA	69.8
12	NAVCRUITDIST ST LOUIS MO	69.3
13	NAVCRUITDIST DETROIT MI	69.2
14	**NAVCRUITDIST INDIANAPOLIS IN**	**68.8**
15	NAVCRUITDIST COLUMBUS OH	68.0
16	NAVCRUITDIST HOUSTON TX	67.9
17	**NAVCRUITDIST KANSAS CITY MO**	**67.9**
18	NAVCRUITDIST ATLANTA GA	66.6
19	NAVCRUITDIST NASHVILLE TN	66.2
20	NAVCRUITDIST RALEIGH NC	63.8
21	NAVCRUITDIST DALLAS TX	63.7
22	NAVCRUITDIST DENVER CO	63.7
23	**NAVCRUITDIST OMAHA NE**	**63.4**
24	**NAVCRUITDIST MONTGOMERY AL**	**63.2**
25	NAVCRUITDIST RICHMOND VA	62.9
26	NAVCRUITDIST PHOENIX AZ	62.7
27	NAVCRUITDIST MIAMI FL	61.9
28	NAVCRUITDIST MINNEAPOLIS MN	61.7
29	**NAVCRUITDIST BUFFALO NY**	**60.1**
30	NAVCRUITDIST SEATTLE WA	58.5
31	NAVCRUITDIST PORTLAND OR	57.6

Capacity Analysis Results:

	Calculation based on stations managed		
DISTRICT	**Stations Managed**	**Maximum number of stations any district manages**	**Capacity to manage more stations (excess capacity)**
Atlanta	37	58	21
Buffalo	**46**	**58**	**12**
Chicago	47	58	11
Dallas	51	58	7
Denver	44	58	14
Houston	27	58	31
Indianapolis	**50**	**58**	**8**
Jacksonville	50	58	8
Kansas City	**41**	**58**	**17**
LosAngeles	35	58	23
Miami	35	58	23
Michigan	32	58	26
Minneapolis	55	58	3
Montgomery	**40**	**58**	**18**
Nashville	44	58	14
NewEngland	38	58	20
NewOrleans	45	58	13
NewYork	48	58	10
Ohio	32	58	26
Omaha	**28**	**58**	**30**
Philadelphia	52	58	6
Phoenix	34	58	24
Pittsburgh	47	58	11
Portland	40	58	18
Raleigh	38	58	20
Richmond	43	58	15
SanAntonio	41	58	17
SanDiego	47	58	11
SanFranc	58	58	0
Seattle	46	58	12
StLouis	41	58	17
Total	**1312**	**1798**	**486**