

**Minutes of JPAT Working Group meeting, 2 October 2003.
Topic: Reserve Issues Summary**

1. Attendance

a. The following members attended the meeting:

John Desiderio	OSD BRAC
Jack Leather	Navy BRAC
Frank Sosa	AF BRAC
Art Levesque	R&K Engineering
John Dovich	R&K Engineering
COL Steven Evans	JCSG Tech
Jack Francisco	DLA / JCSG S&S
Omer Alper	Navy BRAC
Charles Sachs	HSA / JCSG
COL Bob Freniere	SAF / IEBP
Mary Marshall	ANG / XPY
Ray Knapp	JCSG HSA
Joan Muskeyvalley	JCSG Ind
Bob Ralston	JCSG HSA
Ryan Ferrell	JCSG HSA
Ray Quesenberry	JCSG HSA
Paul Freund	AF BRAC
CDR M K Baldwin	OPNAV N095
Spence Ebeling	HQMC Reserve Facilities
Omer Alper	Navy BRAC
MAJ Terence Peterson	NGB-ARA
Armando Drake	DLA
COL Peter DeSalva	JCSG Tech
Mike Phigley	NGB-ARI
Alex Yellin	OSD BRAC
Freddy Poole	OCAR-PAE

b. The following were at the meeting as observers:

Marcia L. Kilby	OIG DoD Auditor
Andrea Beck	AAA
Donna Horvath	AAA
Jim Reifsnyder	GAO
Tom Mahalek	GAO

c. The following groups did not send a representative:

JCSG E&T

THE ARMY BASING STUDY (TABS) GROUP

JCSG Med
JCSG Intel

2. Opening Remarks. MAJ Smith stated that the topic of next week's JPAT working group meeting would be Base Operating Systems (BOS). He also stated that a special session on Net Present Value (NPV), Return on Investment (ROI), leases and fair market value will be held on 8 October at 1300 in the TABS conference room in Rosslyn. The session then moved to Agenda Item #1, Reserve Components BRAC costs.

3. Agenda Item #1. Reserve Component (RC) BRAC Costs.

a. Based on the lessons learned from previous BRAC rounds, the group agreed that there is a need to identify the costs incurred by RC units and activities as a result of base BRAC actions. The group then identified the following potential one-time and recurring costs:

1. Need to replace the loss of informal or formal support from active units that are realigned. (This might include range and training land operations and management.)
2. Need to replace the loss of BOS support when installations are closed or realigned.
3. Increased recruiting costs due to relocation.
4. Contract berthing costs incurred when a reserve unit loses the billeting provided at a closed installation.
5. Increased transportation costs when a unit must travel longer distances to training locations as a result of losing a training facility to BRAC action.

b. The group agreed that, when developing a scenario, the analyst must consider costs from, but not limited to, the above list. Other costs identified in the development of the scenario should also be included. All such costs must be provided to the COBRA user in order that they can be entered into one of the following cells in Screen 5 - Base Information (Dynamic):

1. One-time Unique Costs.
2. Activity Mission Costs.
3. Misc. Recurring Savings.

c) As with all costs entered into Screen 5, RC costs must have auditable documentation to support the cost value. This documentation is developed by the analyst who creates the scenario and must be provided to the COBRA user.

d) The JPAT agreed that COBRA does not need a special line in Screen 5 for RC costs. Instead, the potential RC costs that must be considered should be identified and defined in the COBRA User's Manual and a checklist should be provided, not only to COBRA users, but also the analysts generating scenarios.

THE ARMY BASING STUDY (TABS) GROUP

e) Some members of the group expressed concern that part-time reservists are not counted as part of an installation's population in COBRA. COBRA population data includes only full-time reservists. While accepting that there is some validity to this concern, the JPAT agreed that part time reservists should not be included in COBRA population data since the model's algorithms are not structured to address the very different status of part-time reservists with respect to COBRA analysis. As an example, part-time reservists do not PCS and do not incur the costs associated with a move. Some discussion addressed attempting to determine a "full-time equivalent" for part-time reservists but it was agreed that this is not possible because the amount of time a part-time reservist spends on active duty varies so greatly.

4. Agenda Item #2. RC Enclaves.

a. An enclave is defined as a section of the military installation consisting of designated land and facilities that remain operational and continues with its current role and functions subject to specific modifications. RC units and other non-DoD organizations occupy enclaves on closed or realigned installations. In the case of RC units, the enclave provides a home-station, maintenance facility, or training location for Inactive Duty Training and Annual Training.

b. The JPAT agreed that there are three principle costs associated with the enclave:

1. Sustainment Costs. The COBRA user will have to determine or be given the facilities required for the enclave. The user can then use the DoD Facilities Pricing Guide's (FPG) sustainment cost factors to determine the sustainment costs requirements for the enclave. A screen can be added to COBRA to input each of the required enclave facilities along with the associated Facilities Analysis Category (FAC) code. (This is one alternative. We may use Data Entry Screen Seven – Base Information (Construction) for this.) COBRA can then determine the sustainment costs as it does for other facilities.

2. Personnel Costs. The enclave will have assigned full-time military (AGR, FTM, etc.) and civilian personnel. The analyst who generates the scenario will have to know the full-time personnel requirements for the enclave and enter that in the COBRA model in Screen 6 - Base Information, Scenario Changes by Year.

3. Base Operating System (BOS) Costs. The current BOS function in COBRA uses population as the independent variable. The proposed new BOS function (also using population as the independent variable, but with a fixed BOS cost) will be used to generate the enclave's BOS costs. If the scenario analyst feels that this function will under-estimate BOS, then the analyst can find a value for the additional costs and the COBRA user will enter additional costs as either a one-time or recurring cost in Screen 5.

THE ARMY BASING STUDY (TABS) GROUP

5. Agenda Item #3 -Tenants. Installation DoD tenants are included as part of an installation's population and already addressed in COBRA analysis. Non-DoD tenants need to be treated like any other unit on the installation. If an installation closes, then the scenario analyst will be responsible for relocating the tenant to another installation, creating an enclave, or calculating the cost to move the tenant to a civilian facility. This value will be provided to the COBRA user and entered into Screen Five.

6. Old Due Outs:

a. R&K Engineering

1. Tasked to determine a value for the site preparation standard factor that can be certified. **Still Working**
2. Tasked to find out whether or not there are conversion factors. **Working to see if RPLANS can do it.**
3. R&K - Find HAP standard factors with Corps of Engineers. **Dave Bohl USACE is working with R&K to determine values.**

7. New Due Outs. None

8. Policy Issues. None identified

9. Schedule:

AUG 7	Construction	Completed
AUG 14	Civilian/Military Pay	Completed
AUG 21	Privatization/Leases	Completed
AUG 28	Transportation Relocation	Completed
SEP 4	Industrial Base	Completed
SEP 11	SRM	Completed
SEP 18	Information Technology	Completed
SEP 25	Special Instructions Catch-Up	Completed
OCT 2	RC Issues (+) tenants	Completed
OCT 9	BOS	Read Ahead due 6 OCT
OCT 16	NPV/ ROI / FMV / Leases	
OCT 23	Environment	
OCT 30	Medical and TriCare	
NOV 6	S/RM revisited	
NOV 13	Standard Factors	

David A. Smith
MAJ, ISCF 49
CRSA Analyst
TABS

THE ARMY BASING STUDY (TABS) GROUP

(703) 696-9778

David.Smith5@hqda.army.mil