

**Minutes of JPAT Working Group meeting, 28 August 2003.**  
**Topic: Transportation and Movement**

**1. Attendance**

a. The following members attended the meeting:

Joanna Chan	CEAC
James Auchter	SAFM-CES
John Desiderio	OSD BRAC
Jack Leather	Navy BRAC
Frank Sosa	AF BRAC
Ryan Ferrel	JCSG HSA
Richard Snow	SAF / FM
Art Levesque	R&K Engineering
John Dovich	R&K Engineering
Paul Freund	AF BRAC
Armando Drake	DLA / JCSG S&S
COL Peter DeSalva	JCSG Tech

b. The following were at the meeting as observers:

Marcia L. Kilby	OIG DoD Auditor
Donna Horvarth	AAA
Andrea Beck	AAA
Dharam Jain	DoD IG
Tom Mahalek	GAO

c. The following groups did not send a representative:

JCSG Medical  
 JCSG E&T  
 JCSG Intel  
 JCSG Industrial

**2. Opening Remarks.** MAJ Smith opened the meeting by stating the purpose and objectives of the session. He then indicated the topics for the next 3 JPAT working group meetings;

4 September – Industrial base installations

11 September – Environmental topics

18 September – Information technology infrastructure

He also stated that the environmental expert meeting would be held on 3 September. John Desiderio stated that he was trying to get OSD's position on how

## THE ARMY BASING STUDY (TABS) GROUP

environmental restoration costs were to be considered in relationship to COBRA return on investment analysis. MAJ Smith then proceeded with the first agenda item, the discussion of a housing privatization item.

**3. Agenda Item #1. Housing privatization item. Summary of comments and discussion.** MAJ Smith reviewed what had been decided at the privatization working group meeting (21 August). He stated that his review of housing privatization showed a need for COBRA to be able to simulate the conversion of government housing to privatized housing according to a given privatization schedule. COBRA currently shuts down government housing only as a function of the movement of personnel. However, COBRA now must be able to address the conversion of government housing to privatized housing within the time frame of the scenario. The JPAT accepted MAJ Smith's recommendation and agreed to the following changes to Data Input Screen #5 that will allow the analyst to shut down housing based on a privatization schedule:

- a. COBRA will treat privatized housing as off post housing.
- b. To simulate the conversion of government owned housing to privatized housing COBRA will shut down the installation's government family housing based on the housing privatization schedule. To implement this, there will be new data entry fields for government housing shutdown schedule identical to that for other facilities shutdown that will enable the analyst to input the percent being shutdown for any of the six years shown on the screen. For example, if base Y is going to privatize its housing starting in 2005 and ending in 2007, COBRA will close 33% of family housing in 2005, 33% of family housing in 2006 and the final 33% in 2007.
- c. The change in Family Housing Operations will be calculated according to the algorithm for Family Housing Operations Savings on page 72 in the algorithm manual. The change in Housing Allowance Costs will be calculated using the algorithm for Housing Allowance Costs on page 74 of the algorithm manual. This and the privatization contract piece should cover most situations. It should be noted that there are no BRAC costs or savings associated with this. This only enables the analyst to account for a housing privatization action and track the change in family housing operations and housing allowance costs accordingly

**4. Agenda Item #2. COBRA standard factor for facility rehabilitation (vice new construction). Summary of comments and discussion.**

- a. MAJ Smith reviewed the discussion and decision regarding the value of the Rehabilitation vs. New Construction standard factor from the 6 August JPAT working group meeting. At present, COBRA determines the cost of rehabilitating a building by determining the cost of a new facility and multiplying the cost by a factor of 0.75. The 0.75 factor is based on statutory limits on what organizations

## THE ARMY BASING STUDY (TABS) GROUP

can spend to rehabilitate existing building (75% of new construction cost). R&K made an intuitive argument to show that this number was conservative, but could not offer any hard data to support the assertion; the JPAT voted to keep the factor at 0.75.

b. MAJ Smith presented a proposal to reduce the rehabilitation standard factor from 0.75 to 0.47. As previously stated, the 0.75 seems too conservative and would not capture the benefits of using rehabilitated facilities versus the construction of new facilities. MAJ Smith based his recommendation on his own research and a methodology presented in his report, Determining a Rehabilitation Construction Standard Factor for COBRA. This report is attached. The JPAT agreed with the methodology, but, since the data used in preparing the report was Army specific, wanted to take the proposal back to the other Services and OSD construction experts to determine any Service specific, or other, issues. The working group members will report back on their findings and a decision will be made.

### **5. Agenda Item #3. Movement of military vehicles. Summary of comments and discussion.**

1) MAJ Smith presented the recommendations developed at the transportation expert meeting to combine the data elements for Military Light Vehicles and Military Heavy Vehicles on Data Entry Screen #3 into one data element covering all military vehicles. The unit of measure for this data element would be tons as that is the measure by which rail or line-haul charges would be calculated. Discussion of this recommendation began with COL DeSalva stating that most movement contractors charge per "lift". One lift being equivalent the loading of one rail car. MAJ Smith, speaking from his experience as a tank company commander, agreed with COL DeSalva's observation. MAJ Smith added that one rail car can haul one tank or two lighter vehicles. Based on these comments, and input from other members, the JPAT agreed on the following:

- a) Vehicles are defined as any mission equipment that can be rolled onto a rail car.
- b) COBRA will assume one lift, or railcar; can carry one heavy vehicle or two light vehicles.
- c) A Heavy Vehicle is defined as a vehicle that requires its own rail car.
- d) A Light Vehicle is defined as a vehicle that can share a rail car with one other light vehicle. This includes trailers and other non-prime movers.
- e) Mission Equipment is defined as all of the equipment on a unit's table of equipment minus the vehicles.
- f) Support Equipment is defined as all other equipment required by the unit to perform its mission.

## THE ARMY BASING STUDY (TABS) GROUP

g) Each installation will be required to provide a Vehicle Lift Rate (price/lift/mile). This will be added to Data Entry Screen Four - Base Information Static. Military Vehicle Rates will be removed from Standard Factors Tab Three - Transportation.

h) COBRA will determine military moving costs by using the gaining installation's Freight Rate and Vehicle Lift Rate.

i) COBRA assumes all moves are overland. If the move is done by a different method, the cost of the move should be calculated outside COBRA and entered into Screen Five - Base Information AS One Time Moving Costs.

j) To clarify the difference between mission equipment and vehicles, in Data Entry Screen Three - Movement Table, Mission Equipment will be changed to Non-Vehicle Mission Equipment.

### **6. Agenda Item #4. PCS costs. Summary of comments and discussion.** The JPAT working group discussed each of the data elements in the Standard Factors Tab Three – Transportation.

The group agreed to the standard factors on this screen, once the values are updated, with the following exceptions:

a) Under Household Goods, the JPAT agreed to divide Military HHG (Lb/single) into one factor for officers and one factor for enlisted. Also, the name of the factors will reflect that this factor is for unaccompanied personnel, not just single personnel.

b) The JPAT agreed that Officer HHG (Lb/Family) and Enlisted (Lb/Family) will be changed to read accompanied enlisted and accompanied officer personnel for clarification as to the intended use of the factors.

c) Art Levesque suggested that Routine PCS standard factor may not be necessary and that the One Time Officer and Enlisted PCS Cost should be used. R&K will investigate this and report back to the JPAT.

b) The JPAT agreed to add a standard factor for average cost for storage in transit per PCS move. This was the result of input from the transportation expert session that this type storage cost can be significant and needs to be captured. US Army CEAC representatives indicated they could assist in determining the value for this factor.

### **7. Other JPAT working group items discussed:** While addressing transportation and movement items, the JPAT entered into a general discussion of the purpose and utility of Data Entry Screen Eight - Base Information (Unique). This screen has been a part of COBRA since it was developed. However, the screen is designed to

## THE ARMY BASING STUDY (TABS) GROUP

capture unique costs/savings that over-ride COBRA's algorithms and do not lend themselves to standardized comparative analysis. Since the purpose of COBRA and the COBRA JPAT is to provide a basis for consistent and standardized comparative analysis across DoD, it was agreed that this screen should be removed from COBRA. The JPAT also agreed that all possible contingencies could be accounted for in Data Entry Screen Five - Base Information (Dynamic).

### 8. Old Due Outs

#### a. R&K Engineering

- 1) Tasked to determine a value for the site preparation standard factor that can be certified.
- 2) Tasked to find the source of the statutory limit of spending 75% of the cost of a new building to rehabilitate an old one. MAJ Smith's proposal will meet this requirement if agreed by the JPAT.
- 3) Tasked to find out when the next DoD FPG is slated to be published.

b. A standard factor is needed to account for the cost to install new IT equipment in military construction. This value will be discussed at a follow on JPAT meeting on IT in general.

c. MAJ Smith - Find the source of civilian employment factors. Initial data was found, we now need to process it.

d. R&K - Find HAP standard factors with Corps of Engineers. MAJ Smith will formally request the values through the TABS trusted agent.

### 9. New Due Outs

a. Confirm transportation standard factors through MTMC and the Joint Travel Regulations.

b. MAJ Smith to provide a copy of his report on the new rehab factor.

c. OSD still owes the Services a position to what extent BRAC 2005 will cover environmental costs.

d. Services owe comment on the 0.47 factor after the report is delivered.

### 10. Schedule

AUG 7	Construction	<b>Completed</b>
AUG 14	Civilian/Military Pay	<b>Completed</b>
AUG 21	Privatization/Leases	<b>Completed</b>
AUG 28	Transportation Relocation	<b>Completed</b>
SEP 4	Industrial Base	<b>Read Ahead Due SEP 2</b>
SEP 11	Environmental	

## THE ARMY BASING STUDY (TABS) GROUP

SEP 18	Information Technology
SEP 25	Medical TriCare
OCT 2	RC Issues (+) tenants
OCT 9	BOS
OCT 16	SRM

David A. Smith  
MAJ, ISCF 49  
ORSA Analyst  
TABS  
(703) 696-9778  
David.Smith5@hqda.army.mil