

1 March 2004

Subject: TABS Actions on Federal Register Comments on DOD Selection Criteria.

1. Purpose. Outlines how TABS addressed public inputs provided on the DOD Selection Criteria.
2. Comments.
 - a. The DOD response to Congress addresses several issues raised during the public comment period.
 - b. It is fair to assume that though the comments are aimed at the DOD Selection Criteria, the specific concern may, in fact, be with the corresponding individual Service.
 - c. TABS incorporates DOD’s response into its analysis. This document summarizes the Federal Register comment and DOD response as well as TABS’s means of incorporating the response.

Finding (Summary)	DOD Response (Summary)	TABS Response
(1) General Comments		
(a) Numerous commentators used the opportunity to provide information on their particular installation.	Statute requires that all installations be considered equally.	TABS will consider all installations equally.
(b) Particular installations, types of installations, or installations designated by Congress as unique assets or strategic ports , should be eliminated from any closure or realignment evaluation.	Statute requires that all installations be considered equally.	TABS will consider all installations equally.
(c) Include the statutory requirement to maintain a core logistics capability and the limitation that DOD spend no more than 50% of its depot-level maintenance and repair funds to contract for the performance of such workload.	It is inappropriate to include any statutory constraints in the selection criteria because they are too varied and numerous, and could preclude evaluation of all installations equally.	TABS will not address statutory constraints; core logistics capabilities will be assessed through logistics attributes and capacity analysis.
(d) Did not receive any requests from local governments that a particular installation be closed or realigned . However, a few private citizens asked that a particular installation be closed or that operations be restricted to limit noise or other community impacts.	None.	None.
(e) Concern about the broad nature of the criteria /requested greater detail, including, in some cases, requests for definitions, specificity regarding specific functions, and explanations of when to close as opposed to when to realign.	The mission diversity within DOD makes it impossible to specify detailed criteria that could be applied to all its installations and functions. Broad criteria allow flexibility of application across the wide range of functions within DOD.	Expectations for specificity will be addressed within the Military Value Analyzer (MVA). The requirement for carefully explaining why a given installation is closed versus realigned will be part of scenario analysis (COBRA, ENV, or local area).
(f) Recommended assigning specific weights to individual criteria and applying those criteria uniformly across DOD.	It would be impossible for DOD to specify weights for each criterion that could be applied uniformly to all installations and functions because of DOD’s inherent mission diversity.	To determine overall DOD criteria weights, TABS uses “bottom-up” weighting, which provides a specific weight to each criterion.

Finding	DOD Response	TABS Impact
(1)(g) DOD should exclude installations with less than 300 authorized civilian positions from BRAC consideration.	While Section 2687 allows DOD to close or realign such installations outside the BRAC process, it does not preclude their consideration within BRAC. To reconfigure its current infrastructure into one in which it maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency, DOD must analyze its entire infrastructure, not just those with 300 or more authorized civilians.	All Army infrastructure in CONUS and territories will be reviewed.
(h) Concern that BRAC would be used as a “back door” method of privatizing civilian positions.	Section 2904 specifically limits the ability to carry out a privatization-in-place of those specified in the recommendations of the Commission. If a recommendation includes privatization, it will be clearly presented.	Privatization-in-place must be more cost efficient than either realignment or closure to be considered; that case will have to be made during scenario development/analysis. TABS will include this as a briefing point in scenario reports.
(i) Conduct a comprehensive study of U.S. military installations abroad and assess whether existing U.S. base structures and locations meet the needs of current and future missions.	DOD will incorporate its global basing strategy into a comprehensive BRAC analysis such that any overseas redeployment decisions influence DOD’s BRAC recommendations.	TABS will include all planned CONUS force structure changes as well as provide some level of capacity against the “risk” of other unplanned re-stationing.
(j) Cautioned against closing and retaining installations in inactive status because of the negative effect such action would have on the relevant local community.	DOD recognizes that job creation gained through the economic reuse of facilities is critically important to mitigate the negative impact of BRAC and will exercise the utmost caution in using its authority to retain installations in an inactive status.	Considered during Criterion #7 analysis.
(k) Give priority to relocating activities within the same state or local community.	Military value must be the primary consideration when selecting receiving locations.	TABS will treat military value as the primary consideration when selecting receiving locations.
2. Military Value Comments		
(b) Concerned DOD would lose sight of the value of service-unique functions when applying criteria that include reference to Jointness.	DOD established the process wherein the MILDEPS are responsible for analyzing their service-unique functions, while JCSGs analyze the common business-oriented support functions.	N/A – TABS captures Army unique capabilities and ensures they are addressed in MVA and Military Value Portfolio (MVP) analysis.
(c) Incorporate the phrase “Preservation of” into the final criteria to ensure that the 2005 BRAC round preserve the infrastructure necessary to support future military requirements	While the criteria proposed by the Secretary do not recite the statutory language verbatim, they do fully reflect the nine factors set out in the statute, and, as such, are legally sufficient. Though DOD agrees that preservation of these assets is important, including the word preservation in the criteria will not further that objective, and may actually force an opposite result.	N/A.

Finding	DOD Response	TABS Impact
(2)(d) Stressed the importance of maintaining a surge capacity .	DOD believes that, as currently drafted, Criteria #1 and #3 are sufficiently broad to capture the concept of surge.	Addressed by a TABS logistics objective and MVA logistics attributes (#22, 24, 25), which measure utilized and potential capacity, as well as in TABS capacity and scenario analyses (COBRA, ENV, or local area).
(e) Previous BRAC rounds failed to evaluate high-tech research, development, engineering, procurement, and technical facilities accurately, because of the lack of effective criteria to consider the features essential to their performance.	Research, development, engineering, procurement and other technical capabilities are elements of operational readiness and are thus captured within Criterion #1.	Addressed by a TABS RDT&E objective and an RTD&E MVA attribute (#19). JCSGs are examining these technical concepts.
(f) The criteria did not take into account the availability of intellectual capital; critical trade skills; a highly trained work force ; allied presence; and the synergy among nearby installations, DOD facilities, and nearby industrial clusters and academic institutions .	DOD believes they are captured in Criteria #1, 3, and 7.	MVA “Workforce Availability” attribute (#32) assesses workforce availability and quality (education level) and “Accessibility” (#17) measures proximity to other installations. Addressed by a TABS RDT&E objective.
(g) Consider strategic location and irreplaceable properties and facilities as part of military value.	DOD believes these issues are covered under Criterion #2. The strategic location of DOD facilities informs Criteria #1 and #3.	Addressed by a TABS deployment objective. MV analysis considers the strategic location of an installation (access, deployment, proximity to critical facilities). TABS will ensure retention of irreplaceable properties and ensure that specified strategic locations and facilities are retained during scenario analysis.
(h) An installation’s demonstrated ability to transform, streamline business operations , and manage successful programs should be considered as part of military value.	DOD believes Criteria #1 and #3 consider both the ability to perform a mission and the quality of that work, both of which capture the willingness to transform and streamline.	Addressed by a TABS cost objective. MVA attributes for logistics (#21, 24) and RDT&E (#19) give some measure of MV for efficiency. The majority of business streamlining is addressed in scenario analysis (COBRA, ENV, or local area). Analysis of functional “streamlining” is being done by the JCSGs.
(i) Consider an installation’s role in homeland defense, security, domestic preparedness, and the war on terrorism as a part of military value; that an installation’s proximity to and ability to protect vital national assets, transportation facilities, major urban centers and international borders was a key consideration; that geographic diversity or complete isolation should be the real objective in order to enhance security.	Criterion #2 requires DOD components to consider “the availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace...as staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions.” Additionally, as a mission of DOD, all of these issues are captured by the requirements of Criteria #1 and 3.	The attribute “Critical Infrastructure Proximity” (#41) addresses the homeland defense portion of this comment. Geographic diversity will be included in MVP analysis. TABS training objectives address both HD and geographic diversity.

Finding	DOD Response	TABS Impact
(2)(j) In some areas of the country, expanding civilian use of adjacent lands is encroaching upon military properties and has impacted critical training requirements and preparations for deployments; installations located in rural regions with access to large areas of operational airspace over land and water as well as direct ingress/egress routes from water to land will be key to future military operational and training requirements.	DOD believes that issues of encroachment are captured by Criterion #2.	Overall encroachment/environmental impact on operations and training lands is measured in various ways by six MV attributes (#9, 10, 11, 12, 39 40). Encroachment on training lands is addressed by TABS training and installation objectives.
(k) Consider the difficulty of relocating missions and functions requiring federal nuclear licenses or environmental permits as part of military value.	The ability to accommodate current and future force requirements, which includes federal licensing and permitting requirements, is covered under Criteria #1, 2, and 3. Furthermore, the impact of environmental compliance activities (i.e., permits and licenses) is also specifically captured in Criterion #8.	TABS considers all identified unique missions and supporting functions (e.g., hard to obtain permits) in MV analysis. When installations are reviewed against requirements these functions are included. Critical/difficult-to-acquire environment permits such as chem.-DEMIL will also be part of the scenario analysis (COBRA, ENV, or local area) and DOD Criterion #8.
(l) Concerned that the “cost of operations” language in Criterion #4 would appear to encourage the closure or realignment of an installation in a high cost of living area , despite important strategic reasons for retaining that installation.	DOD believes “costs” are an inextricable component of military value because all equipment, services, and military salaries are dependent on the availability of this resource. Therefore, the extent to which one installation can be operated at less cost than another is worthy of consideration, particularly for business operations, although the importance of this will vary depending on the function involved.	MVA does assess costs using the “Affordability” (#27), “Area Cost Factor” (#34) and Variable Cost Factor” (#34) attributes. Costs are also addressed in the TABS cost objective. Though cost will be a factor, scenario analysis (COBRA, ENV, or local area) will ensure that if an installation has a strategic characteristic that cannot be replicated at a lower cost option, the installation will be retained for its “higher” military value.
(3) Other Considerations		
(b) Recommended a standardized interpretation of the cost criteria .	DOD agrees that costs and savings must be calculated uniformly and is improving the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) model for calculation of costs, savings, and return on investment in accordance with Criterion #5.	TABS addressed implementation and long-term cost in COBRA.
(c) Total mission support costs associated with reestablishing or realigning a military activity should be considered, including such things as the costs of reestablishing intellectual capital; relationships with nearby businesses and academic institutions ; the costs associated with mission disruption; the costs of contractor relocations, and the availability/reliability of raw materials /supplies.	DOD has improved COBRA to more accurately and appropriately calculate a variety of costs of BRAC actions in accordance with Criterion #5.	DOD indicates that COBRA will address these factors. TABS will also address them in scenario analysis (COBRA, ENV, or local area).

Finding	DOD Response	TABS Impact
(3)(d) Consider a recommendation’s total resource impact on the Federal Government , and reflect both costs and savings.	DOD’s application of its cost and savings criterion will “take into account the effect of the proposed closure or realignment on the costs of any other Federal agency that may be required to assume responsibility for activities at the military installations.” DOD will issue guidance to the MILDEPs and JCSGs that incorporate this requirement into the application of Criterion #5.	This will be addressed in scenario analysis (COBRA, ENV, or local area).
(e) Consider a closure or realignment’s impact on the local community and on military retirees in the area who rely on the installation’s medical facilities, commissary, and other activities.	While military value criteria must be the primary consideration, the impact of a closure or realignment on the local community, including military retirees, will be considered through Criterion #6.	Scenario analysis with Criterion #6, the economic impact model.
(f) Recognize that their state, facility, or community was affected by closures and realignments in prior BRAC rounds and that they, therefore, be protected in this round ; that the current BRAC round respect decisions made in prior BRAC rounds – and not take any action inconsistent with a prior recommendation	The BRAC statute specifically requires the DOD consider all military installations in the United States equally, without regard to whether that installation has previously been considered for closure or realignment.	All Army infrastructure in CONUS and territories will be reviewed.
(g) GAO suggested that DOD clarify two issues: (1) its intention to consider potential costs to other DOD activities or federal agencies that may be affected by a proposed BRAC recommendation under the criterion related to cost and savings and (2) the extent to which the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration , waste management, and environmental compliance activities will be included in cost and savings analyses of individual BRAC recommendations.	(1) DOD will take into account the effect of the proposed closure or realignment on the costs of any other federal agency. (2) DOD policy guidance has historically stipulated that environmental restoration costs were not to be factored into analyses of costs and savings when examining potential BRAC installations, since DOD was obligated to restore contaminated sites on military installations regardless of whether or not they were closed. DOD concurs with GAO that determining such costs could be problematic in advance of a closure decision, since reuse plans for BRAC properties would not yet be determined and studies to identify restoration requirements would not yet be completed. DOD will issue guidance to the components to clarify its plans for considering environmental costs.	Federal impact is addressed above. Environmental costs will be included in a manner that is consistent with DOD policy.
(h) Criterion #7 should be included in military value and receive priority consideration.	DOD believes that factors falling within this criterion can be applied within the military value criteria if they directly relate to the elements of Criteria #1, 2, 3, and 4.	TABS agrees with DOD’s policy; several local area attributes (e.g., #27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 36) are captured in MVA.

Finding	DOD Response	TABS Impact
(3)(i) Consider the social as well as the economic impact on existing communities.	Because social impact is an intangible factor that would be difficult for DOD to quantify and measure fairly, issues of social impact are best addressed to the BRAC commission during its process of receiving public input.	TABS will not consider the social impact on communities in its analysis.
(j) Consider the ability of community infrastructure to support the military; DOD views that ability as evolving, and considers the willingness and capacity of the community to make additional investments.	DOD must focus on the existing, demonstrated ability of a community to support its installation, since potential investment actions may not translate into reality.	TABS will not consider potential investment on the part of the community in its analysis.
(k) Requested clarification that Criterion #8 includes consideration of the impact of the closure or realignment on historic properties.	DOD will consider historic properties as a part of Criterion #8.	TABS considers historic properties in Criterion #8.
(l) Stated that the criteria should consider the effect of closures and realignments on the quality of life and morale of military personnel and their families.	DOD believes that quality of life is captured throughout the criteria, particularly by Criterion #7.	TABS includes attributes (#27-31) and objectives that directly assess QOL/well-being in MVA.

4. Below is a list of “key words” and DOD’s interpretation of their correlating criteria.

R. Dow/696-2646

Key words	DOD Criteria
Surge capacity	1,3
RDTE	1
Retain intellectual capital	1,3,7
Trained workforce	1,3,7
Proximity to other installations, academia, industrial clusters, etc.	1,3,7
Strategic location	1,3
Synergy with nearby industrial clusters	1,3,7
Impact on federal agencies	5
Environmental restoration costs	8
Soldier QOL	All, 7
Irreplaceable properties & facilities	2
Streamlined business operations	1,3
Proximity to critical national assets	1,2,3
Encroachment	2
Licenses & permits	1,2,3,8
Cost of operations	4
Synergy with nearby academic institutions	1,3,7
Availability of raw materials/supplies	5
Historic properties	8
Irreplaceable properties & facilities	2

MVA Attribute Listing	
1.	Direct Fire Capability
2.	Indirect fire Capability
3.	MOUT Capabilities
4.	Heavy Maneuver Area
5.	Light Maneuver Area
6.	Joint Airspace
7.	General Instructional Facilities
8.	Applied Instructional Facilities
9.	Air Quality
10.	Noise Contours
11.	Soil Resiliency
12.	Water quantity
13.	Mobilization History
14.	Force Deployment
15.	Materiel Deployment
16.	Ops/Admin Facilities
17.	Accessibility
18.	Connectivity
19.	RDT&E Mission diversity
20.	Test Range Capacity
21.	Munitions Production
22.	Ammunition Storage Capacity
23.	Joint Workload
24.	Maintenance/Manufacturing
25.	Supply & Storage Capacity
26.	Crime Index
27.	Affordability
28.	Employment Opportunities
29.	Housing Availability
30.	Medical Care Availability
31.	In-state Tuition Policies
32.	Workforce Availability
33.	Joint Facilities
34.	Area Cost Factor
35.	C1 Target for Focus Facilities
36.	Variable Cost Factor
37.	Buildable Acres
38.	Brigade Capacity
39.	Environmental Elasticity
40.	Urban Sprawl
41.	Critical Infrastructure Proximity