



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, G-8
700 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0700
HSA-JCSG-D-05-468

DCN 8599

DAPR-ZB

29 July 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR OSD BRAC CLEARINGHOUSE

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0715 – DCMA

1. Reference response to information request, 27 July 2005, from Mr. Frank Cirillo, Director, Review and Analysis, BRAC Commission, subject as above.
2. Request/Question: I respectfully request a written response from the Department of Defense concerning the following requests, which pertain to recommendation H&SA-12:

Based on our visit to DCMA headquarters we found DCMA is in the processes of renovating space for organizational consolidation. Additionally, we were told that DCMA's mission would be affected by the planned move given that Fort Lee was not close to a large airport and the Pentagon.

We also found a disparity between the square footage occupied in leased space, the space planned in the COBRA model and that planned by Fort Lee. Currently the command has three locations with approximately 95,000 square feet of space. The COBRA model estimates 146,000 square feet for the administrative building and apportions a need for an additional 41,000 square feet for other construction such a small unit headquarter building and apparently apportions base construction requirements as a result of the planned relocation of DCMA to Fort Lee.

These construction cost include family housing, indoor physical fitness facility etc. For a total military construction footprint of 187,000 square feet, this does not take into consideration the parking required. Given the need for additional VTC facilities Fort Lee plans to construct an 110,898 square foot administration building with an exercise facility a cafeteria and other special space to accommodate 431 civilians, 16 military and 65 contractors. We were told that about 35-40 of the contractors were not actually required to be in the headquarters building.

How was the mission impact of moving DCMA to Fort Lee evaluated? Were alternative locations such as Fort Belvoir or Quantico considered for DCMA? What factors were used to select Fort Lee as the proposed site for relocation?

What consideration was given to the avoidance of PCS costs if the command was located at Fort Belvoir or Quantico? How were PCS costs estimated?

DAPR-ZB

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0715 – DCMA

What are the current construction requirements and costs for DCMA? Is it a normal practice for a base to apportion major construction project requirements for civilians and contractors? Moreover, are all of the contractors within DCMA essential; and, should they drive facility requirements for the BRAC scenario?

I would appreciate your response by August 1, 2005. Please provide a control number for this request and do not hesitate to contact me if I can provide further information concerning this request.

3. Response:

In the certified data provided by DCMA, the organization identified 83,708 usable square feet of space (translates to 104,635 gross square feet) in two buildings in Alexandria, Virginia. DCMA also identified 24,758 usable square feet in another leased location in Manassas, Virginia. This building was not included in the BRAC recommendation due to the understanding that this is a location-specific office and not part of the headquarters operation.

The HSA JCSG consistently estimated space requirements for administrative space by multiplying the number of personnel moving by 200 gross square feet per person and adding to that any specific special space needs identified by an agency. In this case, DCMA identified 593 personnel in the noted buildings via its certified response to BRAC data calls. These personnel consist of 46 officers, 8 enlisted personnel, 483 civilians, and 56 contractors. DCMA also identified 13,519 gross square feet of special space requirements. $593 * 200$ gross square feet per person + 13,519 gross square feet = 132,519 gross square feet. It is correct that the COBRA model indicates a requirement for 146,000 gross square feet of administrative space (FAC code 6100) at Fort Lee. This figure was provided to the HSA JCSG as a certified figure by the U.S. Army. It is slightly higher than the space requirement forecast by the HSA JCSG of 132,519 gross square feet, but the HSA JCSG was required to use certified data to complete its COBRA analyses. During implementation, specific needs of DCMA will be taken into consideration, and construction of a smaller facility than that forecast in COBRA will be undertaken if appropriate to the circumstances existing at the time.

DCMA did not indicate that any of the reported contractors were not required to be co-located with its headquarters facility. All contractors reported in certified data were supposed to be mission critical and, as such, it was assumed that they should be included in space requirements.

The COBRA model calls for a total facility requirement of 205,000 gross square feet that includes the Army's estimate of community facilities (total of 59,000 gross square feet, detailed by type and required square feet) that will be required at Fort Lee to support DCMA. All of these figures were supplied to the HSA JCSG as certified data from the

DAPR-ZB

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0715 – DCMA

Army. A parking requirement of 18,000 gross square feet at a cost of \$941,000 is included in the COBRA model.

According to the Army, it considered the space requirements of all units and organizations relocating to Fort Lee; estimated the aggregate requirements for community facilities these moves would generate at Fort Lee; and assessed these total requirements against available, vacant facilities currently at the installation. The requirements that could not be met by existing excess capacity were considered MILCON and the cost of this construction was apportioned to the recommendations that move units to Fort Lee.

In evaluating the mission impact of moving DCMA to Fort Lee, no factors were identified to the HSA JCSG that indicated that the DCMA headquarters was required to or needed to be located within the National Capital Region, or for that matter, in any particular location in the United States. As such, a military installation outside of the National Capital Region, yet close to an urban area, with a higher military value than DCMA's current space profile was considered a good fit. Neither Fort Belvoir nor Marine Corps Base Quantico was considered as an alternative for DCMA's potential relocation. Carlisle Barracks in Pennsylvania was briefly considered as an alternative, but was not pursued since it was unclear whether space would be made available at this installation via other BRAC actions. The location of Fort Lee near Richmond, Virginia should provide suitable access to airport facilities.

PCS costs in the COBRA model are determined by formulae embedded in the model based on numbers of personnel and old and new locations. Further explanation about this, or any other, aspects of the COBRA model should be sought from the developers of this model. The impact of PCS costs was evaluated by the HSA JCSG in the context of reviewing the entire output of a particular COBRA scenario.

The current construction requirements and costs for DCMA are detailed in the COBRA model output in the report entitled "COBRA Military Construction Assets Report" in the section called "MILCON for Base: LEE, VA (51484)". All inputs for this portion of the report were provided to the HSA JCSG by the Army as certified data. These costs from the COBRA model are detailed in the following table:

DAPR-ZB

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0715 – DCMA

Type of Space	New MILCON GSF	New MILCON Cost (\$000s)
General Admin Bldg	146,000	23,224
Army/Community Facilities:		
Vehicle Maintenance Shop	3,000	498
Small Unit HQ Bldg	16,000	2,785
Large Unit HQ Bldg	4,000	720
Enlisted Unaccompanied Housing	2,000	343
Dining Facility	3,000	838
Vehicle Parking, Surfaced	18,000	941
Chapel	1,000	196
Exchange Sales Facility	5,000	628
Indoor Physical Fitness Facility	2,000	376
Child Care Facility	1,000	190
Recreation Center	1,000	174
Dental Facility	1,000	252
Family Housing Dwelling	2,000	164
Total	205,000	31,329

4. Coordination: N/A.



CARLA K. COULSON

COL, GS

Deputy Director, Headquarters and
Support Activities JCSG

Reference phone call from Mr. Thomas Pantelides to Mr. James Russell dated 1 August 2005 and attached email, same subject.

Mr. Pantelides asked for DCMA clarification on two aspects of the BRAC recommendation to move DCMA HQ and associated HQ activities to Ft. Lee VA:

- Was the mission impact to move DCMA HQ away from the National Capital Region (NCR) adequately addressed in the analysis to include consideration of access to airports and the need to be close to senior customers and stakeholders? Are there synergies at the proposed Ft Lee location with customers and stakeholders?

- Has there been a change to the space requirements since DCMA submitted its original certified data?

Answer to Question 1. With regard to the mission impacts of moving DCMA HQ out of the NCR, the answer is no – these questions were not asked in the data calls and DCMA did not provide any information outside the data calls.

Discussion. DCMA worked closely with the Headquarters and Support Activity (HSA) Joint Cross Steering Group (JCSG) and provided the specific data they requested. DCMA responded to two (2) specific questions posed in the original data call that were used to evaluate the mission need for DCMA to remain in the NCR. These questions centered on meetings between DCMA Senior Executive Service (SES) leaders and DoD/Federal Government Senior Executives and Congress. In addition we responded to two (2) questions regarding the existence of a statutory requirement to remain in our current location, and a statutory requirement to be in the DC area.

The meeting question asked how many times our SES members and Flag/General Officers held in-person meetings in the DC area with Senior Executives of DoD and other federal government entities and how many times our senior leadership met with members of Congress and their staffs. In our particular case, with only eight (8) SES members (2 of which are located at field activities in Boston MA and Los Angeles CA) and one General Officer, our meeting counts were unquestionably lower in number than other activities with higher graded leadership positions. However, other DCMA Headquarters personnel, generally at the GS-14/15 level frequently attend senior level DoD meetings, participate in Integrated Process Teams (IPTs), policy working groups, and acquisition advisory panels. We were not asked questions, via the data calls or otherwise, concerning DCMA senior leadership transportation and/or travel requirements within the agency, i.e. to and from DCMA field offices, or to and from major customer activities e.g., Military Buying Commands.

BRAC data call questions, by their nature, were very quantitative. Qualitative information, such as the need to be close to major airport facilities or in close proximity to high level customers, was not asked for in the data call nor was information about these qualitative factors provided by DCMA. There simply was not a forum for that type information. As the HSA JCSG indicated in their memo to you, DCMA was only asked to provide data on one scenario – the move to Ft Lee. We know of no other options that were explored nor any other scenarios studied which included DCMA remaining in the NCR.

Regarding any synergies with other activities at Ft. Lee, we don't see any. Ft Lee does not currently house any major DCMA customers or stakeholders. Activities moving to Ft Lee include predominantly Commissary Support and Logistics Training activities – neither of which are DCMA customers or stakeholders.

Answer to Question 2. In response to the second issue about changes in space requirements, the answer is yes – in the time between our original data submission and our response to the scenario data call, our requirements changed due to changes in the way the Agency is organizing Information Technology and Human Resources personnel.

Discussion. After the initial data calls, we were presented with a specific Scenario Data Request described as “Close 1 leased space location in Springfield, VA and relocate DCMA Headquarters to Ft. Lee.” We were only asked to respond to the Ft. Lee scenario. No other options/scenarios were provided or solicited. This data call asked for numbers of individuals to be duty stationed at Ft. Lee, as well as any special needs space such as communications centers, IT facilities, dining facilities, auditorium facilities, etc. We provided our most up-to-date projection of number of DCMA and support contractor personnel to be stationed at Ft. Lee. This estimate was slightly higher than originally provided (Capacity Data Call) because of re-alignments and consolidations mainly impacting our IT and Human Resources organizations, implemented since the original data call.

Since the data calls ask for us to project for FY 2010, further variations are expected based on budget and FTE realities. As the HSA JCSG suggests in their memorandum, the specifics on the size and space requirements of any new building would need to be reevaluated prior to starting construction. The need for dining facilities, auditoriums, etc would be dependent on availability at whatever location is ultimately selected.

Reference phone call from Mr. Thomas Pantelides to Mr. James Russell dated 1 August 2005 and attached email, same subject.

Mr. Pantelides asked for DCMA clarification on two aspects of the BRAC recommendation to move DCMA HQ and associated HQ activities to Ft. Lee VA:

- Was the mission impact to move DCMA HQ away from the National Capital Region (NCR) adequately addressed in the analysis to include consideration of access to airports and the need to be close to senior customers and stakeholders? Are there synergies at the proposed Ft Lee location with customers and stakeholders?

- Has there been a change to the space requirements since DCMA submitted its original certified data?

Answer to Question 1. With regard to the mission impacts of moving DCMA HQ out of the NCR, the answer is no – these questions were not asked in the data calls and DCMA did not provide any information outside the data calls.

Discussion. DCMA worked closely with the Headquarters and Support Activity (HSA) Joint Cross Steering Group (JCSG) and provided the specific data they requested. DCMA responded to two (2) specific questions posed in the original data call that were used to evaluate the mission need for DCMA to remain in the NCR. These questions centered on meetings between DCMA Senior Executive Service (SES) leaders and DoD/Federal Government Senior Executives and Congress. In addition we responded to two (2) questions regarding the existence of a statutory requirement to remain in our current location, and a statutory requirement to be in the DC area.

The meeting question asked how many times our SES members and Flag/General Officers held in-person meetings in the DC area with Senior Executives of DoD and other federal government entities and how many times our senior leadership met with members of Congress and their staffs. In our particular case, with only eight (8) SES members (2 of which are located at field activities in Boston MA and Los Angeles CA) and one General Officer, our meeting counts were unquestionably lower in number than other activities with higher graded leadership positions. However, other DCMA Headquarters personnel, generally at the GS-14/15 level frequently attend senior level DoD meetings, participate in Integrated Process Teams (IPTs), policy working groups, and acquisition advisory panels. We were not asked questions, via the data calls or otherwise, concerning DCMA senior leadership transportation and/or travel requirements within the agency, i.e. to and from DCMA field offices, or to and from major customer activities e.g., Military Buying Commands.

BRAC data call questions, by their nature, were very quantitative. Qualitative information, such as the need to be close to major airport facilities or in close proximity to high level customers, was not asked for in the data call nor was information about these qualitative factors provided by DCMA. There simply was not a forum for that type information. As the HSA JCSG indicated in their memo to you, DCMA was only asked to provide data on one scenario – the move to Ft Lee. We know of no other options that were explored nor any other scenarios studied which included DCMA remaining in the NCR.

Regarding any synergies with other activities at Ft. Lee, we don't see any. Ft Lee does not currently house any major DCMA customers or stakeholders. Activities moving to Ft Lee include predominantly Commissary Support and Logistics Training activities – neither of which are DCMA customers or stakeholders.

Answer to Question 2. In response to the second issue about changes in space requirements, the answer is yes – in the time between our original data submission and our response to the scenario data call, our requirements changed due to changes in the way the Agency is organizing Information Technology and Human Resources personnel.

Discussion. After the initial data calls, we were presented with a specific Scenario Data Request described as “Close 1 leased space location in Springfield, VA and relocate DCMA Headquarters to Ft. Lee.” We were only asked to respond to the Ft. Lee scenario. No other options/scenarios were provided or solicited. This data call asked for numbers of individuals to be duty stationed at Ft. Lee, as well as any special needs space such as communications centers, IT facilities, dining facilities, auditorium facilities, etc. We provided our most up-to-date projection of number of DCMA and support contractor personnel to be stationed at Ft. Lee. This estimate was slightly higher than originally provided (Capacity Data Call) because of re-alignments and consolidations mainly impacting our IT and Human Resources organizations, implemented since the original data call.

Since the data calls ask for us to project for FY 2010, further variations are expected based on budget and FTE realities. As the HSA JCSG suggests in their memorandum, the specifics on the size and space requirements of any new building would need to be reevaluated prior to starting construction. The need for dining facilities, auditoriums, etc would be dependent on availability at whatever location is ultimately selected.



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, G-8
700 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0700
HSA-JCSG-D-05-486

DAPR-ZB

5 August 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR OSD BRAC CLEARINGHOUSE

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0715 (DCMA Questions) – BRAC Proposed Move of DCMA to Ft. Lee

1. References:

- a. Phone call from Mr. Thomas Pantelides, 2005 BRAC Commission to Mr. James Russell, DCMA, 1 August 2005, subject as above.
- b. Email from Mr. Thomas Pantelides, 2005 BRAC Commission to Mr James Russell, DCMA, 1 August 2005, subject as above.

2. Enclosure 1 is in response to reference 1.a. The HSA JCSG provides the following information in addition to the DCMA response.

3. Representatives of DCMA met with members of the HSA JCSG on several occasions during the BRAC process. DCMA was invited to give an overview presentation about its organization to the HSA JCSG on December 12, 2003; this assisted the JCSG in understanding DCMA's mission and functions. There were several other meetings between DCMA senior leadership and senior members of the JCSG to discuss DCMA's concerns, including one as recent as May 9, 2005. As a result of such discussions, the JCSG was aware of DCMA's concern about location requirements that impact transportation access. While a relocation to Richmond would move the agency farther away from airports in the immediate Washington, DC area, the JCSG believes that access to Richmond International Airport should provide sufficient commercial airline service to meet the agency's needs.

Further, DCMA was provided an opportunity to update all relevant information with regard to information used in the BRAC recommendation via the Scenario Data Call (SDC) process at the end of 2004. Only one SDC package was sent to DCMA, but the information provided and certified by DCMA in response was used as input for both the Fort Lee scenario and the alternative scenario at Carlisle Barracks. It was not considered necessary to ask DCMA to respond to two separate SDC packages when the questions and replies about the organization's locations and personnel would have been exactly the same.

DAPR-ZB

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0715 (DCMA Questions) – BRAC
Proposed Move of DCMA to Ft. Lee

4. Coordination: N/A.

Enclosure
As stated



CARLA K. COULSON

COL, GS

Deputy Director, Headquarters and
Support Activities JCSG