DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

BASE SUMMARY SHEET

Fort Gillem

INSTALLATION MISSION

Fort Gillem, a 1,500-acre Military Camp, is a logistical support hub for Fort McPherson and is home to a number of tenants including organizations from the Active Component, Reserve Component, Georgia Army National Guard, and other Department of Defense and federal agencies. The fort houses the Army's Atlanta Distribution Center, the equipment concentration site #43 for the 81st Army Reserve Command, and the Army's CID Criminal Investigation Laboratory. A multi-phase capital investment program has been planned for the fort. It includes the expansion of the reserve center, the construction of a new crime investigation and forensics laboratory, and the location of a second recruitment brigade.

DOD RECOMMENDATION

Close Fort Gillem, GA. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Rock Island Arsenal, IL. Relocate the 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52nd Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Group to Fort Campbell, KY. Relocate the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Fort Benning, GA. Relocate the 3rd US Army Headquarters support office to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Headquarters US Forces Command (FORSCOM) VIP Explosive Ordnance Support to Pope Air Force Base, NC. Close the Army-Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) Atlanta Distribution Center and establish an enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the remainder of the 81st RRC units and the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Forensics Laboratory.

DOD JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation closes Fort Gillem, an Army administrative installation and an AAFES distribution center. The recommendation moves the major tenant organizations to Rock Island Arsenal, Redstone Arsenal, Fort Benning, and Fort Campbell. It also moves small components of the Headquarters 3rd US Army and US Army Forces Command to Pope AFB and Shaw AFB. It enhances the Army's military value, is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities to address future unforeseen requirements. This closure allows the Army to employ excess capacities at installations that can accomplish more than administrative missions.

The closure of Fort Gillem also enables the stationing of its tenant units at locations that will increase their ability to associate with like units and promote coordination of efforts. Both the 52nd EOD Group and the 2nd Recruiting Brigade have regional missions in the Southeastern United States. The 52nd EOD Group was co-located with operational forces at Fort Campbell to provide training opportunities. The 2nd Recruiting Brigade is recommended to relocate to Redstone Arsenal because of its central location in the Southeast and its access to a transportation center in Huntsville, AL. The Army is converting the 1st US Army Headquarters into the single Headquarters for oversight of Reserve and National Guard mobilization and
demobilization. To support this conversion the Army decided to relocate 1st Army to Rock Island Arsenal, a central location in the United States. The 81st RRC Equipment concentration Site is relocated to Fort Benning Site where there are improved training opportunities with operational forces.

COST CONSIDERATIONS DEVELOPED BY DOD

- One-Time Costs: $56.8 million
- Net Savings (Cost) during Implementation: $85.5 million
- Annual Recurring Savings: $35.3 million
- Return on Investment Year: Calendar Year (1 Year)
- Net Present Value over 20 Years: $421.5 million

MANPOWER IMPLICATIONS OF THIS RECOMMENDATION (EXCLUDES CONTRACTORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realignments</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANPOWER IMPLICATIONS OF ALL RECOMMENDATIONS AFFECTING THIS INSTALLATION (INCLUDES ON-BASE CONTRACTORS AND STUDENTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Out</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Net Gain (Loss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>(517)</td>
<td>(570)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(511)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(517)</td>
<td>(570)</td>
<td>(511)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(570)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Closure of Fort Gillem will necessitate consultations with the State Historic Preservation Office to ensure that historic properties are continued to be protected. The closure of ranges at Fort Gillem will require clearance of munitions and remediation of any munition constituents. The remediation costs for these ranges may be significant and the time required for completing remediation is uncertain. Groundwater and surface water resources will require restoration and/or monitoring to prevent further environmental impacts. Significant mitigation measures to limit releases to impaired waterways may be required at Rock Island, Fort Campbell, and Fort Benning to reduce impacts to water quality and achieve USEPA Water Quality Standards. Air Conformity determination and New Source Review and permitting effort and consultations with tribes regarding cultural resources will be required at Fort Campbell. This recommendation has the potential to impact noise and threatened and endangered species or critical habitat at Fort Campbell. An Air Conformity Analysis will be required at Fort Benning. Construction at Pope AFB may have to occur on acreage already constrained by TES. This recommendation has the
potential to impact wetlands at Pope AFB and Shaw AFB. This recommendation has no impact on dredging; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or waste management. This recommendation will require spending approximately $1.3M for environmental compliance costs. These costs were included in the payback calculation. Fort Gillem reports $18M in environmental restoration costs. Because the Department has a legal obligation to perform environmental restoration regardless of whether an installation is closed, realigned, or remains open, these costs were not included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance 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.

REPRESENTATION

Governor: Sonny Perdue
Senators: Saxby Chambliss
Johnny Isakson
Representative: David Scott

ECONOMIC IMPACT

- Potential Employment Loss: (1851) jobs (1081 direct and 734 indirect)
- MSA Job Base: 2,777,548 jobs
- Percentage: -0.1 percent decrease
- Cumulative Economic Impact (Year-Year): -0.4 percent decrease

MILITARY ISSUES

Potential mission disruption associated with the relocation of organizations and the support that they provide.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS/ISSUES

A review of community attributes revealed no significant issues regarding the ability of the infrastructures of the local communities to support missions, forces, and personnel. When moving from Fort Gillem to Rock Island Arsenal, the following local area capability improved: Cost of Living and Population. The following capabilities are less robust: Housing, Education, Employment, and Medical. When moving from Fort Gillem to Fort Campbell, the following local attributes are improved: Cost of Living and Population. The following capabilities are not as robust: Housing, Education, Employment, Medical, Safety and Transportation. When moving from Fort Gillem to Redstone Arsenal, the following local attributes are improved: Cost of Living and Population. The following capabilities are not as robust: Child Care, Housing, Medical, and Transportation. When moving from Fort Gillem to Fort Benning, the following local capability is improved: Population. The following capabilities are not as robust: Housing, Employment, Medical, and Safety. When moving from Fort Gillem to Pope AFB, the following capabilities are improved: Cost of Living and Population. The following capabilities are not as
robust: Housing, Employment, Medical, Safety and Transportation. When moving from Fort Gillem to Shaw AFB, the following local capabilities are improved: Cost of Living and Population. The following capabilities are not as robust: Housing, Education, Medical, Transportation and Safety. There are no known community infrastructure impediments to implementation of all recommendations affecting the installations in this recommendation.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL EMPHASIS

Will relocation of any of the organizations at Fort Gillem adversely affect their ability to perform their mission?

What will be the scope of the enclave that is planned for the Georgia National Guard?

How significant will cleanup be at Fort Gillem and did the Department adequately describe the situation in its report?

What are the concerns regarding the tenants that were not addressed in the Department’s report?

Donald Manuel/Army/June 1, 2005
**Fort Gillem**

**Close**

**Recommendation:** Close Fort Gillem, GA. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Rock Island Arsenal, IL. Relocate the 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52nd Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Group to Fort Campbell, KY. Relocate the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Fort Benning, GA. Relocate the 3rd US Army Headquarters support office to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Headquarters US Forces Command (FORSCOM) VIP Explosive Ordnance Support to Pope Air Force Base, NC. Close the Army- Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) Atlanta Distribution Center and establish an enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the remainder of the 81st RRC units and the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Forensics Laboratory.

**Net Cost:** $56.8

**Savings:** $35.5 (71 MIL; 211 CIV)

**Payback:** 1 YR

**Net Cost/Savings Impl Period:** $85.5

**Net PV 20YR Period:** $421.5
UNITS STAYING, CLOSING, RELOCATING, NOT Addressed
BASE VISIT REPORT
FORT GILLEM, GA
10 JUNE, 2005

LEAD COMMISSIONER: The Honorable James H. Bilbray

ACCOMPANYING COMMISSIONER: None

COMMISSION STAFF: Donald Manuel & Aaron Butler

LIST OF ATTENDEES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Dan K. McNeill</td>
<td>FORSCOM and Installation Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Honorable James H. Bilbray</td>
<td>2005 BRAC Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joe Plunkett-Director</td>
<td>USA Installation Management Agency, SE Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL Angela Manos</td>
<td>Installation &amp; Garrison Cdr, Forts McPherson and Gillem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Patsy Jo Hilliard</td>
<td>Mayor, City of East Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Hall</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Forest Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Scott</td>
<td>Congressman, US Rep 13th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJ Ken Casey</td>
<td>Senator Saxby Chambliss Staffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM Andrew Hall</td>
<td>Command Sergeant Major, Forts McPherson and Gillem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Donald Manuel</td>
<td>BRAC Commission Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Aaron Butler</td>
<td>BRAC Commission Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fred Bryant</td>
<td>Governor Sonny Perdue's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Tuere Butler</td>
<td>Congressman John Lewis' Staffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chris Cummiskey</td>
<td>Senator Isakson's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Patrick Moore</td>
<td>Governor Sonny Perdue's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Johnson</td>
<td>Congressman David Scott's Staffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tom Salter</td>
<td>Save Fort Mac &amp; Fort Gillem Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joseph Johnson</td>
<td>Fulton County Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Chandra Harris</td>
<td>Deputy Press Secretary, David Scott's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Howard Butler</td>
<td>Deputy Garrison Commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACOM &amp; Garrison Staff</td>
<td>12 Members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BASE'S PRESENT MISSION: Fort Gillem, a 1,500-acre Military Camp, is a logistical support hub for Fort McPherson and is home to a number of tenants including organizations from the Active Component, Reserve Component, Georgia Army National Guard, and other Department of Defense and federal agencies. The fort houses the Army's Atlanta Distribution Center, the equipment concentration site #43 for the 81st Army Reserve Command, and the
Army's CID Criminal Investigation Laboratory. A multi-phase capital investment program has been planned for the fort. It includes the expansion of the reserve center, the construction of a new crime investigation and forensics laboratory, and the location of a second recruitment brigade.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION: Close Fort Gillem, GA. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Rock Island Arsenal, IL. Relocate the 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52nd Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Group to Fort Campbell, KY. Relocate the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Fort Benning, GA. Relocate the 3rd US Army Headquarters support office to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Headquarters US Forces Command (FORSCOM) VIP Explosive Ordnance Support to Pope Air Force Base, NC. Close the Army- Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) Atlanta Distribution Center and establish an enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the remainder of the 81st RRC units and the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Forensics Laboratory.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION: This recommendation closes Fort Gillem, an Army administrative installation and an AAFES distribution center. The recommendation moves the major tenant organizations to Rock Island Arsenal, Redstone Arsenal, Fort Benning, and Fort Campbell. It also moves small components of the Headquarters 3rd US Army and US Army Forces Command to Pope AFB and Shaw AFB. It enhances the Army’s military value, is consistent with the Army’s Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities to address future unforeseen requirements. This closure allows the Army to employ excess capacities at installations that can accomplish more than administrative missions.

The closure of Fort Gillem also enables the stationing of its tenant units at locations that will increase their ability to associate with like units and promote coordination of efforts. Both the 52nd EOD Group and the 2nd Recruiting Brigade have regional missions in the Southeastern United States. The 52nd EOD Group was co-located with operational forces at Fort Campbell to provide training opportunities. The 2nd Recruiting Brigade is recommended to relocate to Redstone Arsenal because of its central location in the Southeast and its access to a transportation center in Huntsville, AL. The Army is converting the 1st US Army Headquarters into the single Headquarters for oversight of Reserve and National Guard mobilization and demobilization. To support this conversion the Army decided to relocate 1st Army to Rock Island Arsenal, a central location in the United States. The 81st RRC Equipment concentration Site is relocated to Fort Benning Site where there are improved training opportunities with operational forces.

MAIN FACILITIES REVIEWED: A tour was conducted of the entire installation and the installation’s master plan was used as a guide during the tour. It was noted that most of Fort Gillem’s square footage is contained in vintage WWII permanent warehousing. Army Air Force Exchange Service distribution center uses much of the warehouse area and actively employs 700-900 employees. The housing area is small with less than a dozen units. A future RCI housing privatization initiative is on hold. The 1st Army Headquarters building is the most distinguished facility on the installation and has been nominated for historic designation. The rail yard is active and is leased to Norfolk & Southern railroad and Fort Gillem has seven miles of track. FEMA has six storage sites throughout the installation where they store large numbers of trailers, mobile homes, water tankers, generators and have plans to build a FEMA
Mobilization Center. The 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site is spread out in a number of sites on the installation and a new maintenance shop for the equipment is well under construction. The new facilities housing the 52nd Explosive Ordnance Disposal Group, 3rd Medical Command, Criminal Investigation Lab the Military Enlistment Processing Center, Army Reserve Intelligence Readiness Center, DoD Mail Decontamination Center, The Forest Park Reserve Center as well as a FORSCOM intel facility and the Ammunition Supply Point.

KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED
- Relocation of FEMA from Fort Gillem will be a significant cost to the federal government.
- 81st RRC plans to only relocate its headquarters with equipment remaining on Fort Gillem’s hardstands making it difficult to envision how large the enclave will be.
- The installation maintains that the cleanup costs projected for Fort Gillem only cleans the installation to industrial standards and that significant costs would be incurred to clean it to a greater standard.
- AAFES is a major employer on the installation and the economic impact of closure was not included in the DoD analysis.
- The relocation costs are significantly at variance with DoD’s estimates.

INSTALLATION CONCERNS RAISED
- The COBRA report states no military construction is necessary at Rock Island for the First U.S. Army’s relocation. Initial First U.S. Army visit to Rock Island indicates this is not true. The cost of replacing their 112,000 square foot building is $42 million.
- The cost of relocating the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) regional communications hub located at Fort McPherson is not accounted for in the DoD analysis. The current investment stands at $1.1 billion. DISA chose Atlanta as the location for this hub because of the significant communications infrastructure available. DISA is in the early stages of developing relocation options and decisions cannot be made until detailed research and analysis is completed.
- Impact of civilian workforce expertise when the Command and Control Headquarters move from Atlanta to smaller rural areas at a time when the commands are all actively engaged in the Global War on Terrorism.
- Impact to operational capabilities will be incurred by moving to an area with only regional airport capability.
- Fort Gillem borders Forest Park, Georgia, which is a Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUB). The Garrison provides capital infusion to the community through contractual support of HUB Zone areas and contractual agreements with two apartment complexes and one hotel to provide continuing support to personnel on Temporary Change of Station at a lease cost of $4.11 million per year.
- The Ammo Supply Point has six earth covered bunkers capable of holding various types of explosives. It is the only Army Ammo Supply Point in north Georgia and also supports the Federal Transportation Security Administration. The Ammo Supply Point is used by the Army Reserve Command, the National Guard, First Army, Third Army,
81st Regional Readiness Command, 52nd Explosive Ordinance Group and other military units.
- Fort Gillem is the third largest employer in Clayton County.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS RAISED:
- Loss of a military presence in a major metropolitan area and its impact on Army recruiting of African Americans.
- Loss of military support to organizations such as FEMA and Homeland security for the Atlanta metro area.
- Loss of a military presence in a community with a major African American presence and the historical significance that the military has played in offering upward mobility opportunities to this community.
- The economic impact to the community of Forest Park which depends heavily on the economic stimulus that Fort McPherson has an unemployment rate of 8.3 percent. Loss of Fort Gillem to the City of Forest park would result in an estimated negative economic impact of $366.2 million in this already economically depressed, predominantly minority community.
- The lack of a military presence in the City of Atlanta which is believed to be a major terrorist target. Fort McPherson has Memorandums of Agreement with the Cities of Atlanta and East Point to be first responders and augment municipal capabilities dealing with emergency situations such as the release of hazardous materials (either biological or chemical).
- The Commission should look at moving Fort McPherson’s missions to Fort Gillem

REQUESTS FOR STAFF AS A RESULT OF VISIT:
- Determine if or how FEMA’s relocation from Fort Gillem affects the economics of the closure
- The planned enclave needs to be better defined in order to calculate is cost and to determine how much of Fort Gillem will close under DoD’s proposal.
- Determine if industrial cleanup standards are sufficient for BRAC sites.
- Determine if BRAC will have to absorb the cost of relocating AAFES.
- Determine if 1st Army’s facilities at Rock Island can be occupied without construction

ADDENDUM TO BASE VISIT REPORT

FORT GILLEM, GA

The following questions were forwarded to the DoD Clearinghouse and DoD’s answers are below each question. The response to these questions help resolve outstanding issues from the base visit. Based on DoD’s response Rock Island Arsenal will have sufficient administrative space to accommodate 1st Army Headquarters without new construction. It is also clear from DoD’s response that the Department’s intent is to concentrate the enclave in the western portion of the installation where the reserve facilities are concentrated with the eastern boundary of the enclave including the new Criminal Investigation Lab. Funds to close AAFES are included in DoD’s analysis and other issues would be resolved during implementation.
MEMORANDUM FOR Army Team Leader, BRAC Commission

SUBJECT: Issues/Concerns/Questions on Fort Gillem, GA

The Commission requested a TABS response to several questions regarding the recommendation to close Ft. Gillem, GA.

Question: First U.S. Army's relocation to Rock Island Arsenal indicates that no construction or renovation is required to replace their current 112,000 SF headquarters building. Can the Department verify that this is a correct assumption?

Answer: Yes, this assumption is correct. Rock Island Arsenal currently has 547,000 SF of excess administrative space. In addition, several administrative Headquarters move off of the installation providing a greater amount of available space.

Question: FEMA's has a significant amount of equipment stored throughout Fort Gillem. What is the Department's plan for FEMA? Remain in the enclave or relocate? Will relocation be a BRAC cost or FEMA's?

Answer: The closure recommendation does not include FEMA in the enclave. The final disposition of FEMA and any costs to relocate will be determined by FEMA and DoD during the implementation of the recommendation.

Question: The 81st RRC plans to leave its equipment at Fort Gillem and only move its headquarters. The equipment is spread throughout Fort Gillem on various hardstands. Was it the Department's intent that the equipment remain and if so it will be consolidated in the enclave?

Answer: The close Ft. Gillem recommendation moves the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site and all of the associated equipment to Ft. Benning, GA. Any equipment associated with the Forrest Park USAR Center will remain in the enclave.

Question: We understand that Fort Gillem can only be cleaned up to industrial standards. Is this level of cleanup sufficient for BRAC closure sites?
SAIE-IA
SUBJECT: Issues/Concerns/Questions on Fort Gillem, GA

Answer: The level of environmental clean-up at Ft. Gillem will be based on the types of contaminants present and the eventual use of the land. The Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM) BRAC environmental office can answer this more fully.

Question: Does the Department plan to relocate AAFES and were the costs considered in the closure decision?

Answer: The Department does not plan to relocate AAFES. AAFES would close the distribution center at Ft. Gillem. $10.5 Million was included in the Army analysis to account for personnel separation costs for NAF employees due to the closure.

Question: Will the ammunition supply point at Fort Gillem remain in the enclave?

Answer: The closure recommendation does not include the ASP in the enclave. The disposition of the ASP will be determined during implementation.

CRAIG E. COLLEGE
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army
for Infrastructure Analysis
DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

BASE SUMMARY SHEET

NAS Atlanta

INSTALLATION MISSION

- The mission of Naval Air Station Atlanta is to provide readiness training for assigned active duty and selected reserve personnel while maintaining full commitment to support the requirements of tenant commands and the fleet.

- Major Commands are: VR-46, MAG-42, CAG-20, VMFA-142, VAW-77, RIPO/RIAC-14, HMLA-773, MWSS-472 and 4th LAAD. NAS Atlanta also provides support to Navy/Marine Corps Reserve Center and the Naval Air Reserve Center.

DoD RECOMMENDATION

- Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA.

- Relocate its aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA; Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX; and Robins Air Force Base, Robins, GA.

- Relocate Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem, Forest Park, GA.

- Relocate depot maintenance Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication and Manufacturing, and Support Equipment in support of F/A-18, C-9 and C-12 aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.

- Relocate intermediate maintenance in support of E-2C aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA.

- Consolidate the Naval Air Reserve Atlanta with Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Atlanta located at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Marietta, GA.

- Retain the Windy Hill Annex (for 4th LAAD and MWSS-472).

DoD JUSTIFICATION

- Reduces excess capacity while maintaining reserve forces in regions with favorable demographics.

- The aviation assets will be located closer to their theater of operations and/or will result in increased maintenance efficiencies and operational synergies.

- Relocating Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem creates synergies with joint intelligence assets while maintaining the demographic base offered by the Atlanta area for this function.
The Fleet Readiness Center portion of this recommendation realigns and merges depot and intermediate maintenance activities. It supports both DoD and Navy transformation goals by reducing the number of maintenance levels and streamlining the way maintenance is accomplished with associated significant cost reductions.

**COST CONSIDERATIONS DEVELOPED BY DoD**

- One-Time Costs: $43.0 million
- Net Savings (Cost) during Implementation: $289.9 million
- Annual Recurring Savings: $66.1 million
- Return on Investment Year: Immediate
- Net Present Value over 20 Years: $910.9 million

**MANPOWER IMPLICATIONS OF THIS RECOMMENDATION (EXCLUDES CONTRACTORS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline (2005 COBRA)</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realignments</td>
<td>-1274</td>
<td>-156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANPOWER IMPLICATIONS OF ALL RECOMMENDATIONS AFFECTING THIS INSTALLATION (INCLUDES ON-BASE CONTRACTORS AND STUDENTS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Out</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Net Gain (Loss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Recommendation</td>
<td>-1274</td>
<td>-156</td>
<td>-1274 -224 (68)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobbins Air Reserve base</td>
<td>+64</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-1274</td>
<td>-156</td>
<td>+64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (68) Net Mission Contractor Personnel

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS**

- **Environmental Impact**: There are no known environmental impediments to implementation of this recommendation. The aggregate environmental impact of all recommended BRAC actions affecting the installations in this recommendation has been reviewed and is located at TAB C.
REPRESENTATION

Governor: Sonny Perdue (R)

Senators: Saxby Chambliss (R)
        Johnny Isakson (R)

Representative: Phil Gingrey (R) 11th District
               Tom Price, 6th District

ECONOMIC IMPACT

- Potential Employment Loss: 2196 jobs (1430 direct and 766 indirect)
- MSA Job Base: 2,777,548 jobs
- Percentage: 0.1 percent decrease

MILITARY ISSUES

- Also closing Ft McPherson (4141) and Ft Gillem (1081)
- According to Navy/Marine Corps BRAC staff, Reserve leadership informed on pending closure of several Reserve bases and concurred that NAS Atlanta was least painful due to serious encroachment problems in the surrounding Atlanta metropolitan areas.
- Reduced combat readiness of Reserve units transferred to areas that cannot support personnel requirements.
- Dobbins AFB remains open

COMMUNITY CONCERNS/ISSUES

- No specific issues have surfaced yet, other than the economic impact of losing jobs in the Atlanta area. Local press releases provided at TAB G

ITEMS OF SPECIAL EMPHASIS

- Reserve personnel demographics
- Remaining base infrastructure
- Unique reserve assets and capabilities
- Airspace issues

Bill Fetzer/Navy/23 May 2005
Recommendation for Closure
NAS Atlanta, GA

Payback – Immediate  
Cost = $43M  
NPV = $911M

Relocate  
RES Intel Area 14 to  
Ft Gillam Forest Park, GA

Billets Eliminated  
Medical (111)  
BOS (370)  
?? (175)

USMC Reserves  
From Rome, GA  
(DoN-29)

Close
NAS Atlanta (DoN-13)  
Marietta, GA  
(2186)  
(1498-D/766-ID)

Relocate  
CAG-20, VMFA-142, VR-46  
A/C, pers, equip & supt to  
NAS JRES Base  
Ft Worth, TX

12 F-18s, 4 C-9s, 1 C-12  
Depot Maint & Supt Equip

Relocate  
VAW -77  
A/C, pers, equip & supt to  
NAS JRES Base  
New Orleans, LA

4 E-2Cs, AIMD To FRC

Retain  
Windy Hill Annex  
4th LAAD  
MWSS-472

Low Alt Air Defense  
Marine Wing Supt Sqdrn

Consolidate  
Naval Air Reserve  
With N/MC Reserve Ctr  
@ Dobbins AFB,  
Marietta, GA

Ft McPherson Closing (4141-D)  
Ft Gillam Closing (1081-D)

19 Hueys & Cobras

12 F-18s, 4 C-9s, 1 C-12  
Depot Maint & Supt Equip

4 E-2Cs, AIMD To FRC

19 Hueys & Cobras
Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA
Recommendation for Closure

Recommendation: Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA. Relocate its aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA; Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX; and Robins Air Force Base, Robins, GA. Relocate Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem, Forest Park, GA. Relocate depot maintenance Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication and Manufacturing, and Support Equipment in support of F/A-18, C-9 and C-12 aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX. Relocate intermediate maintenance in support of E-2C aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA. Consolidate the Naval Air Reserve Atlanta with Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Atlanta located at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Marietta, GA. Retain the Windy Hill Annex.

Justification: This recommendation reduces excess capacity while maintaining reserve forces in regions with favorable demographics. The aviation assets will be located closer to their theater of operations and/or will result in increased maintenance efficiencies and operational synergies. Relocating Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem creates synergies with joint intelligence assets while maintaining the demographic base offered by the Atlanta area for this function. The Fleet Readiness Center portion of this recommendation realigns and merges depot and intermediate maintenance activities. It supports both DoD and Navy transformation goals by reducing the number of maintenance levels and streamlining the way maintenance is accomplished with associated significant cost reductions.

Payback: The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is $43.0M. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during the implementation period is a savings of $289.9M. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are $66.1M with an immediate payback expected. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $910.9M.

Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 2,186 jobs (1,420 direct jobs and 766 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Marietta, GA, Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is less than 0.1 percent of economic area employment. The aggregate economic impact of all recommended actions on this economic region of influence was considered and is at Appendix B of Volume I.

Community Infrastructure Assessment: 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: Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX, is in Serious Non-attainment for Ozone (1-Hour) and an Air Conformity Determination may be required. There are potential impacts to waste management. Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA is in Attainment. Robins Air Force Base, GA, is in Attainment. There are potential impacts to cultural, archeological, tribal resources; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; noise; waste management; water resources; and wetlands. No impacts are anticipated for the resource areas of dredging, marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; or threatened and endangered species. For Fort Gillem, GA, and Dobbins Air Reserve Base, GA, there are no anticipated impacts regarding the resource areas of air quality; cultural, archeological, tribal resources; dredging; land use constraints or sensitive resource areas; marine mammals, resources, or sanctuaries; noise; threatened and endangered species; waste management; water resources; or wetlands. This recommendation indicates impacts of costs at the installations involved, which reported $0.2M in costs for waste management and environmental compliance. These costs were included in the payback calculation. This recommendation does not otherwise impact the costs of environmental restoration, waste management or environmental compliance 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.
BASE VISIT REPORT

NAS Atlanta
25 May 2005

LEAD COMMISSIONER: ADM Gehman

COMMISSION STAFF: William Fetzer, Senior Navy/Marine Corps Analyst

LIST OF ATTENDEES:

CAPT King - Commanding Officer, NAS Atlanta & Naval Air Reserve
CDR Bruni – Executive Officer, NAS Atlanta
CDR Ruppel – Executive Officer, Naval Air Reserve
COL Canty – Commanding Officer MAG-42
CAPT Cross – Commander, Carrier Air Group (CAG-20)
CDR Cassidy – Commanding Officer, VR-46
CDR Opatz – Executive Officer, VAW-77
Congressman Phil Gingrey - 11th District, Georgia
Mr. Patrick Moore – Deputy Chief of Staff, Governor Perdue, Georgia
Mr. Jim Irwin – Senior LA to Rep Gingrey
Mr. Chris Cummiskey – SEN Isakson’s Office
Mr. Clyde Taylor – SEN Chambliss’ Office
Don Beaver - Cobb County Chamber of Commerce

BASE’S PRESENT MISSION:

- The mission of Naval Air Station Atlanta is to provide readiness training for assigned active duty and selected reserve personnel while maintaining full commitment to support the requirements of tenant commands and the fleet.
- Tenant Commands include:
  - VR-46 Reserve C-9 Transport Squadron
  - MAG-42 Marine Air Group Headquarters Staff
  - CAG-20 Commander Reserve Air Group 20 Staff
  - VMFA-142 Marine Corps Reserve F-18 Squadron
  - VAW-77 Reserve Navy E-2 Airborne Early Warning Squadron
  - RIPO/RIAC-14 Reserve Intelligence Unit
  - HMLA-773 Marine Corps Reserve Helicopter Squadron
  - MWSS-472 Marine Wing Support Squadron
  - 4th LAAD Low Altitude Air Defense Unit (Stinger Missiles)
- NAS Atlanta also provides support to Navy/Marine Corps Reserve Center and the Naval Air Reserve Center.
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION:

- Close Naval Air Station Atlanta, GA.
- Relocate its aircraft and necessary personnel, equipment and support to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA; Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX; and Robins Air Force Base, Robins, GA.
- Relocate Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem, Forest Park, GA.
- Relocate depot maintenance Aircraft Components, Aircraft Engines, Fabrication and Manufacturing, and Support Equipment in support of F/A-18, C-9 and C-12 aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center West Site Fort Worth at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.
- Relocate intermediate maintenance in support of E-2C aircraft to Fleet Readiness Center Mid-Atlantic Site New Orleans at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA.
- Consolidate the Naval Air Reserve Atlanta with Navy Marine Corps Reserve Center Atlanta located at Dobbins Air Reserve Base, Marietta, GA.
- Retain the Windy Hill Annex as a small, equipment storage and staging site for MWSS-472 (Marine Wing Support Squadron) and the 4th LAAD (Low Altitude Air Defense Unit).

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION:

- Reduces excess capacity while maintaining reserve forces in regions with favorable demographics.
- The aviation assets will be located closer to their theater of operations and/or will result in increased maintenance efficiencies and operational synergies.
- Relocating Reserve Intelligence Area 14 to Fort Gillem creates synergies with joint intelligence assets while maintaining the demographic base offered by the Atlanta area for this function.
- The Fleet Readiness Center portion of this recommendation realigns and merges depot and intermediate maintenance activities. It supports both DoD and Navy transformation goals by reducing the number of maintenance levels and streamlining the way maintenance is accomplished with associated significant cost reductions.

MAIN FACILITIES REVIEWED:

- NAS Atlanta and assigned Medical and Dental facility physically located on the Dobbins Air Force Base side (northwest) of the airfield.

Note: Dobbins AFB is not closing, but the Navy medical and dental facility is listed for closure.
KEY ISSUES IDENTIFIED

- **Reserve personnel demographics.** When the Reserve Squadrons relocate to a new base, there is concern that the Selected Reserve (SELRES) personnel who are affected may choose to leave the service, causing a gap in the squadron’s manning and operational readiness until new members can be recruited and trained. Additionally, the receiving bases may not have sufficient personnel assets for recruitment and training.

- **Unique Navy/Marine Corps Reserve assets and capabilities.** The NAS Atlanta Navy/Marine Corps Reserve squadrons provide combat ready forces that are presently engaged in the Global War on Terror in the Mideast and monitoring and deterring the drug trafficking along the southern US coast.

- **Remaining base infrastructure.** Because the Navy inhabits only 166 acres of the whole Dobbins Air Force Base, the estimated $900 million savings in personnel costs and base infrastructure support that the Navy realizes will be significantly offset by the increased costs that the USAF will accrue if they reoccupy the facilities that the Navy/Marine Corps units vacate.

INSTALLATION CONCERNS RAISED

- The Reserve demographics of the receiving sites for the relocated Navy and Marine Corps units may not support personnel requirements for the affected units, causing some loss of military readiness.

- COBRA savings cost data for military personnel positions eliminated at NAS Atlanta may be overstated.

- Functional facilities synergy between NAS Atlanta and Dobbins AFB may preclude total closure of the fence line at NAS Atlanta (i.e. the family support facilities and other hangars and ramps located at NAS Atlanta may require Dobbins AFB to retain recently constructed buildings resulting in little or no real savings to DoD in base support and operating costs).

- Loss of full time Navy medical and dental personnel may affect the medical readiness of the estimated 3000 remaining Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Augmentee personnel as well as the Dobbins Air Force personnel.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS RAISED:

- Loss of local civilian jobs.

REQUESTS FOR STAFF AS A RESULT OF VISIT:

- A staff visit was conducted by Bill Fetzer prior to Commissioner’s visit with appropriate contact information exchanged. The Commanding Officer made no requests for additional visits.
MIGRATION

Fort Benning

Fort Jackson

- Drill Sergeant School

- 81st RRC ECS

- Armor Center and School (incl OSUT)

- US Army Reserve Center, Columbus

GAINS

LOSSES
Fort Benning
Realign

4 DoD BRAC Recommendations Affecting Fort Benning, GA

Army-105 / USA-0046Rv2
Army-6 / USA-0121R
Army-39 / USA-0143v3
Army-20 / USA-0243R

Jackson, SC
Drill Sgt. School
Army - 105
Mil -119 Clv -2
Total -121

Ft. Benning, Bid 15
Reserve Center
4 DoD BRAC Rec's
Affecting Fort Benning
Mil +1492 Clv +621
Stu +7782 Contr 0
Total +9995

Gillem, GA
81st RRC Equip Ctr
Army - 6
Mil 0 Clv +93
Total +93

Knox, KY
Armor Ctr School
Army - 20
Mil +9,393 Clv +530
Total +9923

Eliminated
USA-RC
Army - 39
Mil -53 Clv -3
Total -56
Response to E0343

Question:
Please provide requested information on the Armor School move to Ft. Benning

Answer:
Question:
Fort Benning indicates it can support the relocation of the Armor School and Center to Fort Benning. It believes its available training area acreage is sufficient. A question was raised on 26 May by Fort Knox regarding availability of training space at Fort Benning. Please confirm Fort Benning's training space adequacy.

Answer:
Fort Benning has the necessary capacity to effectively create the Maneuver Center. Maneuver/training area and range requirements of the Armor School were major areas of consideration in our analysis in determining the feasibility of creating the Maneuver Center at Fort Benning. To determine the adequacy, Training Circular 25-1 on Training Land, was used to determine maneuver/training area requirements. The primary purpose of this circular is to state the Army's core Maneuver/training area requirements for Army activities based on Army Training and Evaluation Program Mission Training Plans. This provided a solid doctrinal basis to determine requirements. Each course requirement of the Armor School was analyzed, by appropriate members of the Fort Benning Garrison staff, to determine if the installation could effectively train Armor School in addition to their current and projected requirements. Through the efficient use and scheduling of training/maneuver land and ranges, it was determined and certified that sufficient capacity was available to effectively train the Armor School's requirements. This analysis included the planned addition of a light brigade being stood up at Fort Benning. The decision to stand this brigade up at Fort Knox will free up additional training resources.

Question:
Please indicate whether there is a cost advantage to the Army to accomplish this BOLC II training mission at Fort Benning versus Fort Knox.

Answer:
This cost comparison was not analyzed as part of the Maneuver Center recommendation. Clearly the BOLC II training mission belongs to a school house; therefore, it would only make sense to train BOLC II at the Maneuver Center at Fort
Benning. If the commission chooses to leave the Armor Center & School at Fort Knox, then a detailed analysis comparing the costs of conducting BOLC II at each installation should be conducted.

Question:
Please indicate if DoD/DA does not concur with Fort Benning's concept or schedule for implementation of the Maneuver Center at Fort Benning.

Answer:
This question should be directed to the BRAC Division of ACSIM.

Question:
Please comment on whether or not the Maneuver Training recommendation's provision affecting ARI realignment correctly reflects the Army's intention.

Answer:
"The BRAC recommendation from the Technical Joint Cross Service Group (TJCSG) to move the Human Systems Research function from Ft. Knox to APG is not a part of the Maneuver Training Recommendation that moved the Armor School.. The TJCSG recommendation transforms C4ISR research and development for Land Combat to enable Network Centric Warfare. The C4ISR to APG Recommendation collocates the resources to integrate research in individual and networked human behavior with the more traditional C4ISR technologies. The Network is a network of humans. The research and development of concepts and training must be done in concert with that of the sensors, information systems, and communications systems if we are to achieve the potential of Network Centric Warfare. The ARI element at Ft. Knox is the Army element doing human systems research in networks and C4ISR. Their relocation to APG is an essential element of transforming for the future."*

References:

Approved By:  
Date: 13-Jun-05
GEORGIA

Reserve Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gains</th>
<th>Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Build 1 new Army Reserve Center on Ft Benning</td>
<td>• Close 1 Army Reserve Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Realign Army Reserve Units currently on Ft Benning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ft Benning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gains</th>
<th>Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Armor Center and School from Ft Knox</td>
<td>• Drill Sergeant School to Ft Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site from Ft Gillem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ft Gillem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gains</th>
<th>Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• None, close Ft Gillem</td>
<td>• 1st US Army to Rock Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ft Gillem enclave receives Naval Reserve Intelligence unit from NAS Atlanta</td>
<td>• HQs 52nd EOD Group to Ft Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Ft Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FORSCOM VIP EOD support unit to Pope Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• HQs 3rd US Army offices to Shaw Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Close the Army-Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) Atlanta Distribution Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ft McPherson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gains</th>
<th>Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• None, close Ft McPherson</td>
<td>• US Army Forces Command to Pope Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• US Army Reserve Command to Pope Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Third US Army to Shaw Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Army Contracting Agency (ACA) Southern Region to Ft Sam Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IMA SE Region Office and the NETCOM SE Region to Ft Eustis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ft Stewart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gains</th>
<th>Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Validated the temporary stationing of a BCT</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Army Net Personnel Impacts</th>
<th>Active Army MILCON ($M)</th>
<th>Army Economic Impact ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1,400</td>
<td>-1,930</td>
<td>7,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each unit and activity transferred from Ft Gillem and Ft McPherson has been placed to enhance its operational or support capability through consolidations or co-locations. The result of these hard decisions is a basing configuration that better supports our transforming Army and saves money.

- The impact is mitigated by Ft McPherson’s and Ft Gillem’s proximity to Atlanta, with its robust economic development.

- Ft Benning will gain a new importance as the Center for Maneuver Training in the Army. It becomes a focal point for one of the most critical aspects of Army combat capability – the combat Soldier.

- Closing these Reserve Component facilities is offset by the construction of a modern AFRCs that will be the right size and design to support the Guard and Reserve units that will be stationed there. Transforming RC facilities in Georgia will improve training, readiness and quality of life for more than 395 RC soldiers, full-time unit support personnel, and their families.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations Affecting Ft Benning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maneuver Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Realign Fort Knox, KY, by relocating the Armor Center and School to Fort Benning, GA...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Gillem, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Close Ft. Gillem, GA. Relocate the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Ft. Benning, GA...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Drill Sergeant School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Realign Fort Benning, GA, and Fort Leonard Wood, MO, by relocating the Drill Sergeant School at each location to Fort Jackson, SC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC Transformation in Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Columbus, Georgia and relocate and consolidate those units together with Army Reserve Units currently on Fort Benning into a new United States Army Reserve Center on Fort Benning, Georgia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Fully integrate into Maneuver Center operations no later than FY07.

3. Phased realignment activities no later than FY08.

2. Identity Armor Center and School validated requirements for planning in order to implement no later than FY07.

1. Fully support and have a plan to implement the recommendation.

Considerations:

- To create 1 Maneuver Center at Fort Benning, GA
- (Gain) Consolidate the Armored & Infantry Centers and Schools

Combined Centers of Excellence

Regional installations to Create Joint and
Realign Installations to Create Joint and Combined Centers of Excellence

-- (Loss) Drill Sergeants Training is realigned from three locations (Fort Benning, GA; Fort Jackson, SC; and Fort Leonard Wood, MO) to one location (Fort Jackson)

Considerations:

1. Fully support the recommendation and prepared to execute Fort Jackson’s plan to implement the recommendation.

2. 21 enlisted TRADOC TDA positions. No significant adverse impacts.

3. Can execute in FY06.
occupancy in FY09.

Facilities programmed in existing DD 1391. Expect beneficial
implementation.

1. Fully support and have a plan to implement the recommendation.

Considerations:

Close Fort Gillem, Georgia

To Ft. Benning, GA.

(Cast) Relocate the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site

81st RRC/43rd Equipment Concentration Site Requires Construction of
RC Transformation in Georgia

-- (Gain) Close the United States Army Reserve Center, Columbus, Georgia and relocate and consolidate those units together with Army Reserve Units currently on Fort Benning into a new United States Army Reserve Center on Fort Benning, Georgia

Considerations:

1. Fully support and have a plan to implement the recommendation.

2. US Army Reserve Center Fort Benning requires construction of facilities programmed in existing DD 1391. Expect beneficial occupancy in FY09.
# Implementation Timelines

## Armor Center & School Move to Ft Benning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I: Activation of Maneuver Center at Ft. Benning</th>
<th>Phase II: Realignment of 26 Armor School non-Tank specific POIs to Maneuver Center at Ft. Benning using existing or temporary facilities</th>
<th>Phase III: Move Armor School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Infantry School continues to operate at Ft. Benning</em></td>
<td><em>Move Basic Combat Training to Maneuver Center with start dates in early FY08</em></td>
<td><em>Move 32 remaining POIs and 10,848 students (annually) to Maneuver Center</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Armor School continues to operate at Ft. Knox* | *Move Ft. Knox Regional PLDC in FY08* | *Sequence of moves:*
| *Realign Armor Center staff functions to Ft. Benning to initiate Maneuver Center command & control, doctrine, and futures* | *Move Warrior Training Course to Maneuver Center in FY08* | *19D OSUT (Cavalry)* |
| *Target date is August 07* | *Begin Combined Arms Captains Career Course in FY07* | *63M OSUT (Bradley Mechanic)* |
| *Begin Combined Arms Advanced NCO Course in FY08* | *Maneuver Center is one of three BOLC II sites* | *63A OSUT (Tank Mechanic)* |
| *This moves 20,334 students (annually) to Maneuver Center in FY08* | | *19K OSUT (Tank)* |

---

POI – Program of Instruction; OSUT – One Station Unit Training; BOLC – Basic Officer Leader Course; MC – Maneuver Center; PLDC – Primary Leadership Development Course; BOC – Basic Noncommissioned Officers Course
Implementation Timelines
(continued)

Drill Sergeant School Move to Fort Jackson

- Ft. Jackson Planning: 16 May 2005
- Ft. Jackson Planning & NEPA (FY 06): 7 Nov 2005
- Construct & Move (FY 07): 2 Years
- DOD BRAC Implementation Complete: Dec 2009
- Army BRAC Implementation Complete: Dec 2011
Implementation Timelines
(continued)

81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site Move to Fort Benning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>13 May 2005</td>
<td>16 May 2005 7 Nov 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; NEPA (FY 06)</td>
<td>13 May 2005</td>
<td>16 May 2005 7 Nov 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct &amp; NEPA (FY 07)</td>
<td>8 Sep 2005</td>
<td>Dec 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct (FY 08)</td>
<td>8 Sep 2005</td>
<td>Dec 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move (FY 09)</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD BRAC Implementation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Complete</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relocate & Consolidate Reserve Component Units on Fort Benning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>13 May 2005</td>
<td>16 May 2005 7 Nov 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; NEPA (FY 06)</td>
<td>13 May 2005</td>
<td>16 May 2005 7 Nov 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct &amp; NEPA (FY 07)</td>
<td>8 Sep 2005</td>
<td>Dec 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct (FY 08)</td>
<td>8 Sep 2005</td>
<td>Dec 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move (FY 09)</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD BRAC Implementation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Complete</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army BRAC Implementation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Army Force Structure for Active Duty Combat Brigades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„Train the Army Requirement“</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Train the Army Requirement"

Future Army Force Structure for Reserve Component Combat Brigades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>34 Brigade Combat Teams by Type</th>
<th>RSTA</th>
<th>MIB</th>
<th>SIB</th>
<th>LIB</th>
<th>ARB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 - Infantry Brigade Combat Teams</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Heavy Brigade Combat Teams</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Stryker Brigade Combat Teams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Train & Sustain

|          | 34 | 10 | 3  | 46 | 10 |

RTSA = Reconnaissance, Surveillance, & Target Acquisition Squadron  
MIB = Mechanized Infantry Battalion  
SIB = Stryker Infantry Battalion  
LIB = Light Infantry Battalion  
ARB = Armor Battalion

*This information represents Reserve Component only and does not include the Active Duty.  
*Information based upon Table 5-1, page 31, Department of the Army – BRAC 2005 – Analyses and Recommendations  
*Assumption is the RC BCTs are configured the same as AC BCTs
Fort Knox
Firing Ranges
5,020 Acres

Fort Benning
Firing Ranges
3,173 Acres

(DMPRC & IPBC – 3,600 acres by FY 09)

Total by FY09 = 6,773 Acres

---

The Fort Benning Digital Multi-Purpose Range Complex (DMPRC) will be complete and operational by FY 08.
This range is currently under construction and can meet all tank gunnery requirements.
The United States Army Maneuver Center will:

- Provide the nation with the world’s best trained Armor, Cavalry, Reconnaissance and Infantry Soldiers and adaptive leaders imbued with the Warrior Ethos.

- Act as a Power Projection Platform capable of deploying and redeploying Soldiers, civilians, and units anywhere in the world on short notice.

- Define Armor, Cavalry, Reconnaissance Surveillance, & Target Acquisition and Infantry requirements for materiel developers to meet the needs of the Future Force.
BASE VISIT REPORT
FORT BENNING, GA
3 JUNE 2005

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT
None

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT
Mike Avenick, Army Analysts

List of Attendees
Military Officials
MG Freakley, USAIC Commanding General
COL Riera, USAG Fort Benning, Garrison Commander
COL Harmon, 29th Infantry Commander
Chuck Walls, USAG, Deputy Garrison Commander
Brandon Cockrell, USAG, Director Plans Analysis and Integration
Jay Brown, SAIC, BRAC Coordinator
Bob Brown, USAG, Director Plans, Training, Mobilization and Security
Fred Weekley, USAG, DPTMS, Chief, Range Division
Ken Holloway, USAG, Master Planner
Dean Miller, USAG, Master Planning Division
John Bastone, USAIC, Infantry Futures Group
Dewey Patrick, Installation Management Agency Southeast Region Office
CSM Winterfeld, Assistant Commandant, Non-Commissioned Officers Academy

Civilian Officials
Justin Clay, Senator Saxby Chambliss’ Office, Defense Correspondence
Tucker Shumack, Senator Isakson’s Office, Military Liaison

BASE’S PRESENT MISSION
- Fort Benning is a complex installation with a training mission that spans all five services and three US Army Major Commands. Fort Benning conducts institutional training for Training and Doctrine Command, supports the collective training and deployment of three Forces Command Brigades, one of which is a Modular Heavy Brigade Combat Team; and also supports the initial entry (Ranger Indoctrination Program and Ranger Orientation Program) and collective training of the Special Operations Command’s 75th Ranger Regiment, as well as the cyclical deployment of the Regimental Headquarters and its 3rd Ranger Battalion in support of the Global War on Terror. This is why Fort Benning was rated number two by DoD for functional training and number nine for military value by the Army.
- Fort Benning, the home of the US Army Infantry School and Center, is a premier US Army warfighting school and deployment center. In peacetime
and in war, Fort Benning provides the ranges and maneuver areas principally designed to support the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) mission of conducting to standard the initial entry training (IET) for Soldiers and officers; basic and advanced level noncommissioned officer (NCO) and officer training courses; the Department of Defense's only Airborne and the Army's Ranger schools; and the continued study, testing, and development of joint and combined Infantry doctrine, weapons testing, and tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs). The Infantry School and Center, has the primary mission of training over 71,000 Soldiers, NCOs, and officers annually through FY07 for the Combined Arms and Joint force. This includes over 1240 Marines, 575 Airmen, 440 Sailors, 5 Coast Guard, and 830 foreign military annually.

- In addition, Fort Benning provides the home station and training facilities for Forces Command's (FORSCOM) 3rd Brigade, 3rd Infantry Division (Mechanized); the 36th Engineer Group; the 14th Combat Support Hospital, and the 988th Military Police Company. The Special Operations Command's (SOCOM) 75th Ranger Regiment and its 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment; and numerous other active duty deployable units are also tenants on Fort Benning.

- Fort Benning is also the home station for and provides training facilities for the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC), which has the mission to train cadets, NCOs, and officers from over 25 Western Hemisphere countries (over 1400 Soldiers annually).

- The only permanent Continental United States Replacement Center (CRC) is located at Fort Benning. The CONUS Replacement Center facilitates the individual readiness processing, training, and onward movement of non-unit related uniform service personnel from all service components, DoD civilian personnel, and civilian military contractors into and out of various combatant commanders areas of responsibility. In fiscal year 2003, the CRC processed over 13,000 and in fiscal year 2004 over 15,000 individuals that were further deployed or redeployed to and from 27 destinations around the globe. This was in support of six operational exercises and four operational contingencies.

- In support of the Global War on Terror a Mobilization Troop Command (MTC) executes unit mobilization operations on Fort Benning. The MTC supports all Reserve Components mobilizing and demobilizing through Fort Benning. Currently, the MTC manages up to 600 personnel daily with surge capacity of over 2,200 daily which we processed this past December.

### SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDATION NAME</th>
<th>Recommendation's Impact on Fort Benning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maneuver Training</td>
<td>-- (Gain) Relocate Armor Center &amp; School from Ft. Knox to Ft. Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Drill SGT School</td>
<td>-- (Loss) Relocate Drill Sergeant School to Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fort Gillem, GA
Jackson

RC Transformation in Georgia

--- (Gain) Relocate the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site from Ft. Gillem to Ft. Benning

--- (Gain) Create an United States Army Reserve Center on Ft. Benning

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

Establishes a Maneuver Center of Excellence combining the Armor and Infantry Centers and Schools. Locating the center at Fort Benning enhances training effectiveness, doctrine, combat development, and operational effectiveness. Additionally it consolidates both Infantry and Armor One Station Unit Training (OSUT) which allows the Army to reduce the total number of Basic Combat Training location from five to four.

Relocating the Drill Sergeant School to Ft. Jackson fosters consistency, standardization and training proficiency. It enhances military value, supports the Army's force structure plan, and maintains sufficient surge capability to address future unforeseen requirements.

Relocating the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site will provide improved training opportunities with operational forces, as well as, being consistent with the Army's force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities to address future unforeseen requirements.

Establishing a new United States Army Reserve Center will enhance military value, improve homeland defense capability, greatly improve training and deployment capability, create significant efficiencies and cost savings, and is consistent with the Army's force structure plans and Army transformational objectives. Additionally, it provides the opportunity for other Local, State, or Federal organizations to partner with the Reserve Components to enhance Homeland Security and Homeland Defense at a reduced cost to those agencies.

COST CONSIDERATIONS DEVELOPED BY DOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-time Costs</th>
<th>Manuever Center</th>
<th>Single DSS</th>
<th>Fort Gillem, GA*</th>
<th>RC Transformation in GA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Savings during Implementation</td>
<td>$244.1M</td>
<td>$7.6M</td>
<td>$85.5M</td>
<td>$3.54M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Recurring Savings</td>
<td>$123.3M</td>
<td>$2.5M</td>
<td>$35.3M</td>
<td>$5.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value over 20 Years</td>
<td>$948.1M</td>
<td>$31.3M</td>
<td>$421.5M</td>
<td>$44.8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All of Ft. Gillem recommendations do not involve Ft. Benning.
MANPOWER IMPLICATIONS OF ALL RECOMMENDATIONS (EXCLUDES CONTRACTORS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Installation</th>
<th>Mil Net</th>
<th>Civ Net</th>
<th>Student Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maneuver Training</td>
<td>Fort Benning</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>7,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Drill SGT School</td>
<td>Fort Benning</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Gillem, GA</td>
<td>Fort Benning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC Transformation in Georgia</td>
<td>Fort Benning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,168</strong></td>
<td><strong>687</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,724</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPACT
- Gain – 2,186 military, 687 civilians jobs, and 7,877 average daily students
- Loss – 18 military and 153 students

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS
- Fort Benning has no significant environmental impact from the recommendations.

MILITARY ISSUES
- Fort Benning fully supports and is prepared to implement all BRAC recommendations proposed for the Maneuver Center.
- Fort Benning’s net maneuver training area consists of 142,126 acres. The maneuver area is further divided into 63,694 acre for light maneuver and 78,432 acres for heavy maneuver. While utilization has increased over last three years, the utilization percentages for each training area varied from 1% to 23%. The available training days to support Armor School training is in excess of 190 days. Based on the data submitted by the Armor School (major training requirements, training land categories, and required days to train), Fort Benning can support the relocation of the Armor School and Center to Fort Benning.
- Fort Benning possesses unrestricted air space. Since first starting Airborne operations in the 1940’s, military aircraft fly daily without civil airspace restrictions. Consequently, Fort Benning performs over 103,000 Airborne jumps annually, close air support training with Air Force aircraft during field exercises, and recently became the home of all RAVEN Unmanned Arial Vehicles (UAVs) training.
- Fort Benning tested the second phase of Basic Officer’s Leader’s Course (BOLC II). In July Fort Benning will execute the pilot course to train initial students and certifies all BOLC II instructors in a train the trainer format. In January 2006 Fort Benning will stand-up two companies of BOLC II for classes. With the establishment of the Maneuver Center at Fort Benning, and the currently available facilities, Fort Benning can accept the additional two companies programmed to operate at Fort Knox in FY06. Additionally, Fort Benning can accommodate this decision for $10M where Fort Knox requires $15M to establish facilities for the two companies, train
for two years, and then relocate, at an unknown cost, to Fort Benning and Fort Leonard Wood. According to Fort Benning if $10M of the $15M is redirected to Fort Benning, BOLC II can begin with four companies in FY06 at Fort Benning.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS RAISED

- The community fully supports the recommendations and is currently preparing to support and welcome the realigned Soldiers, families, civilians and support staff into the tri-community.

VISIT FINDINGS

- Fort Benning currently stated and showed (see attached Fort Benning Maneuver Center Plan) that it has a concept for the future Maneuver Center and a phased realignment plan that implements the recommendations to create a Maneuver Center that combines the Armor Center and School with the Infantry Center and School.

- MG Freakley, the Commanding General of the US Army Infantry Center and School, Fort Benning, GA, presented an initial concept plan and schedule for the Maneuver Center recommendation’s implementation at Fort Benning. The plan will implement the recommendations by activating the Maneuver Center in FY07, consolidating the Armor School’s non-tank specific programs of instruction in FY08, and consolidating the Armor School’s tank specific programs of instruction in FY09.

- MG Freakley, on 3 June 05, directed the formation of a Maneuver Center Realignment Coordination Cell (MCRCC) led by an Armor Colonel in coordination with the US Army Armor Center and School. On 6 June 05 the MCRCC will begin operations and jointly work with Fort Benning’s Maneuver Center 2009 Process Action Team established on 17 May 05. This organization will develop for consideration by the Army’s leadership concepts and planning schedules for the BRAC Maneuver Center recommendations implementation.

- Fort Benning believes the synergy created by the Maneuver Center will provide a combined arms (Armor and Infantry) warrior culture that will produce the finest Soldiers and adaptive leaders for a joint and expeditionary force. Fort Benning indicates that Armor and Infantry training will be done to Army standards through the current, projected, and BRAC implementation constructed facilities.

- Fort Benning indicated that the scheduled and unobligated 2005 expenditure at Fort Knox of $15M for construction to initiate an officer training course (Basic Officer Leadership Course – Phase II “BOLC II”) in the next few years is uneconomical since that course will be transferred to Fort Benning and Fort Leonard Wood, and therefore would later incur duplicate construction costs.

- Fort Benning indicates it is ready to implement the recommendation to relocate the Drill Sergeants School from Fort Benning to Fort Jackson in 2006.
Fort Benning indicated it is ready to implement the recommendation to relocate the 81st RRC Equipment Concentration Site from Fort Gillem to Fort Benning in FY09.

- Fort Benning indicated it is ready to implement the recommendation to construct and facilitate occupancy of a new United States Army Reserve Center in FY09 to consolidate Fort Benning area Reserve Component units into one center.

- An Army Research Institute (ARI) field office at Fort Knox supports with research the Armor Center, and similarly at Fort Benning another ARI field office supports the Infantry Center. When the implementation of the Maneuver Center recommendation causes the Armor Center to relocate to Fort Benning, the Fort Knox ARI field office is directed by BRAC recommendation to relocate to Aberdeen Proving Grounds, MD, to perform assigned research. The Fort Knox ARI field office has indicated that the BRAC recommendation (Maneuver Training) for ARI realignment does not meet ARI research needs. ARI officials confirmed in an email (attached) on 3 June 05 via the Fort Benning ARI office that the recommendation as written is inconsistent with ARI's view of Army needs. The Army is being asked to comment on whether or not the recommendations affecting ARI realignment correctly reflects the Army's intention.
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60 Minutes

ATLANTA, GA REGIONAL HEARING - SCHEDULE OF WITNESS

(*actual clock time may slip based on time required for Commissioner questions following Georgia presentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *11:00AM-11:11AM | 11 Minutes | **Opening Remarks**
|                 |          | Senator Richard Shelby
|                 |          | Senator Jeff Sessions                                                   |
| 11:11AM-11:19AM | 8 Minutes | **Redstone Arsenal**
|                 |          | Ms. Irma Tuder
|                 |          | Mr. Joe Fitzgerald, Tennessee Valley BRAC Committee                     |
| 11:19AM-11:26AM | 7 Minutes | **Anniston Army Depot**
|                 |          | Mr. Nathan Hill, Calhoun County Chamber                                 |
| 11:26AM-11:33AM | 7 Minutes | **Fort Rucker**
|                 |          | Mr. Charles Nailen, Friends of Ft. Rucker                              |
| 11:33AM-11:44AM | 11 Minutes | **Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base**
|                 |          | BG Paul Hankins, USAF (Ret.), Montgomery Chamber                        |
| 11:44AM-11:53AM | 9 Minutes | **Birmingham Air National Guard**
|                 |          | MG C. Mark Bowen
|                 |          | The Adjutant General                                                   |
| 11:53AM-11:57AM | 4 Minutes | **Closing Remarks**
|                 |          | Governor Bob Riley                                                     |
Trip Report

Location: Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000

Visit Date: 7 June, 2005

Purpose of Visit: Review proposed BRAC actions with functional and garrison personnel, examine plans to accommodate gains, conduct tours of critical sites, review requirements of functions leaving the installation.

Commissioner: This is a net gaining site. No Commissioner visited the site. No Commissioner visits are planned.

Lead Analyst: C. Dean Rhody, Army Team. No other BRAC personnel were on this trip.

Major BRAC Recommendations Affecting Installation:

Gains -
- Second Recruiting Brigade from Ft Gillem closure (167 personnel)
- Aviation Technical Test Center realigned from Ft Rucker (140 personnel)
- Army Material Command realigned from Ft Belvoir (1222 Personnel)
- Missile Defense Agency from various leased space (700 personnel)

Losses -
- Ordnance, Munitions & Electronic Maintenance School realignment to Ft Lee (1442 personnel)
- Information Systems Development & Acquisition realignment to Aberdeen Proving Grounds (37 Personnel)
- Joint Program Office Robotics (Robotic Development and Acquisition) realigned to PEO GCS at Detroit Arsenal (77 personnel)
- Inventory Control Point realigned to DCS, Richmond, VA (71 personnel)

Summary of actions: Agenda attached. Conducted interviews with garrison commander, Master Planner, Chief Robotics Systems Joint Projects Office, Deputy Commandant OMEMS, and various staff personnel.

Summary of findings:

Issues not requiring clarification -
- Infrastructures shortfalls may require additional augmentation in roads (widening of one road from two- to four-lanes) and water (minor increase to treated water distribution system). Handled through implementation.
Issues requiring clarification –

- Joint Program Office Robotics (Robotic Development and Acquisition) is already a joint Army-Marine operation with Navy funding. Its mission is developing, testing, and even fielding cutting-edge robots for use in theater. Robotic devices essentially have three integrated components: the vehicle that carries the payload, the payload, and the software to make the robot work. The DOD proposal would split out the vehicle and transfer it to PEO GCS at Detroit Arsenal. Detroit Arsenal does not have the land necessary to test such devices. Additionally, the robot is usually developed as a unit. While the Redstone personnel indicated that the recommended split could work, there is no clarity on how such a split would increase military value over the present arrangement. Will require clarification from DOD on estimate of military value gained.

- OMEMS conducts training in hazardous devices with emphasis on explosive ordnance disposal (EOD). The school element that conducts the training is heavily involved in supporting the FBI Hazardous Devices Training facility, located on Redstone Arsenal. The training facility is a national resource, training both federal and state personnel. Additionally, the explosives used in the training may exceed the capacity of Ft Lee both in terms of range safety fans and noise abatement issues. No such problems exist at Redstone Arsenal. Will require clarification from DOD on intent for the location of the training and any mitigating actions required.

Other –

During his testimony before the Committee, Dr Craig College cited previous PCS experience for major RDT&E moves. He stated that only 25% of the existing workforce transferred to the new site. The local community of Huntsville has conducted previous highly successful efforts under such conditions to draw in as many of the existing workforce as possible. The actual number at Redstone in a previous BRAC move was 75% transfer. Recommend that the Commission defer any consideration of this issue unless additional information is provided.

C. Dean Rhody
Senior Analyst
Army Team, BRAC Commission
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response to Northern Virginia</td>
<td>Tuder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of Redstone</td>
<td>Vaughn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC - USASAC</td>
<td>Bergantz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMDC/MDA/Other Considerations</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPO - Robotics</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Wing Air Platform</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD Training Department</td>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Functions of Communications and Electronics</td>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Redstone Highlights
REDSTONE HIGHLIGHTS

- Redstone is Army's highest ranked Research and Development Center.
- 37,000 Acres - No significant encroachment on environmental issues.  
- Full-length airfield on Redstone - Two commercial runways less than a mile from the border of Redstone.
- 130+ agencies located at Redstone.
- 900,000 people in region.
- Second largest Research Park in the Nation.
- Two major universities with 45 graduate degree programs and 17 Ph.d programs. Information in DoD recommendation to the contrary is incorrect.
- Regional airport - 100 daily flights - 9 round-trips daily to D.C.
- 32,000 people work at Redstone.
- BRAC recommendations combine much of the Department of Defense Missile Programs to a single location.
- AMC relocation collocates the Command with its largest commodity purchaser (AMCOM").
- Redstone has over 25,000 missile and aerospace specialists in the area.
- 32,000 people work at Redstone, over 20,000 other defense and aerospace contractors work off-base.
- Over 50% of Army's foreign military sales occur at Redstone.
- The area is one of the leading high-tech areas in the Country.
- Redstone is a secure, government-owned base far outside the National Capitol Region.
- The people WILL MOVE - 1995 BRAC move than 60%, technical and acquisition experts moved to Redstone from St. Louis.
RECENT NEWS EVENTS ABOUT OUR AREA


- Huntsville "One of Nation's Top Values for Salaries and Cost of Living," Salary.com, May, 2005
Response to Presentation of Northern Virginia
Response to Presentation of Northern Virginia

On July 7, 2005, representatives of Northern Virginia presented their position to the BRAC Commission. They contended that the recommendations of the DoD were in violation of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended (the “Act”). They also contended that DoD failed to consider the fact that many of the current workforce would not relocate to other areas, and the result would be a significant loss in capability. We disagree with the positions taken by Northern Virginia, in part, for the reasons stated below.

Virginia’s Position: Vacating leased space, ensuring force protection and reducing military presence in the National Capitol Region were never part of the Act’s criteria contained in Section 2913(f) of the Act and are in violation of BRAC law.

Redstone’s Response: The criteria are not to be read in a vacuum. The criteria should be evaluated in light of the real world conditions under which our military is forced to operate. Leased space in an expensive area such as Northern Virginia is a cost issue, a force protection issue and an efficiency issue.

In leased space, DoD does not own the space. Generally, it is subject to a pass-through of property taxes (and future increases) over which it has no control. Rents are, to some degree, controlled by a long-term lease, but generally have cost of living adjustments. And, when the lease expires, DoD has nothing except a long history of rent payments and uncertain costs in the future. Location of government-owned property on a military base is a better value for DoD, and DoD was correct in considering leased property in a less favorable light.

Additionally, prior Commissions have looked unfavorably at leased space when evaluating DoD recommendations. When one considers the very high lease costs in Northern Virginia, it is difficult to contemplate a situation where DoD would not consider the impact of leased space. The “leased space” issue raised by Virginia is without merit.

The two other factors related to Northern Virginia are the concerns about the National Capitol Region and force protection. Again, the suggestion that DoD ignore these considerations in its determination of military value is to ignore the world as it exists today.

Force protection concerns are real. There have been two terrorist attacks on government buildings in recent years (Oklahoma City and the Pentagon). To require that military buildings be located where they can be protected is important for our Nation’s defense. In 2003, DoD issued the “Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings.” These standards and setbacks protect critical employees, their missions and the facilities which they occupy. It has been acknowledged that the leased space in Northern Virginia cannot meet those standards.

To expose significant research and development to facilities that do not meet the standards places our entire country at risk. Force protection is a real concern, and DoD was correct in considering it in establishing military value of an installation.

Virginia contends that consideration of the Nation’s Capitol Region in evaluating the criteria established in Section 2903(f) was improper and, therefore, the recommendations of
DoD, which took that factor into consideration, should be rejected. It is blatantly apparent that any space in and around the Capitol Region is at much higher risk than a facility located on a military base outside of the Region. The District of Columbia and Northern Virginia, as shown by the attacks on 9/11, are high-risk areas. DoD’s desire to remove as much of the risk as possible and disseminate the facilities and talent to more secure areas is clearly good judgment that impacts our readiness and future mission capabilities.

As it relates to expensive leased space in Northern Virginia that cannot be given adequate force protection, Virginia is proposing rejecting decisions that save money, protect DoD missions and diversify the risks that our Nation faces. DoD properly applied the military criteria of Section 2903(f), and the decisions should be upheld.

**Virginia Position:** The personnel will not relocate outside of the area, and there will be a significant loss of capability.

**Redstone's Response:** History, at least as it relates to Redstone, does not support Virginia's findings. In the 1995 BRAC, DoD recommended that the aviation function of the Aviation and Troop Command in St. Louis be relocated to Redstone. The same arguments were made at that time - the people were highly-qualified, could get other jobs and would not move outside the area. After a very aggressive effort by the cities around Redstone, which included numerous visits to the St. Louis area, over 60% of the positions moved. It is believed this is the highest percentage of any major relocation in BRAC history. If the area has a good quality of life, opportunities for the employee and his or her family and good working conditions, the employees will relocate. History has shown that to be true.

**Correction to DoD Statement**

**University Programs near Redstone:** Finally, the area wishes to correct a statement in the DoD recommendations that there are limited university advance degree programs in the area around Redstone. There are two large universities in Huntsville which offer over 60 advanced degree programs, primarily in technical areas. In fact, many of the programs are in support of military and aerospace activities at Redstone. We are uncertain of the source of the information suggesting there were only two such programs, and we desire to see the record corrected in this area.
Relocation of Army Materiel Command (AMC) and USASAC
RELOCATION OF ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND (AMC) AND USASAC

**DOD RECOMMENDATION:** Move Army Materiel Command and U. S. Army Security Assistance Command from Ft. Belvoir, Virginia to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama.

- The recommendation is supported on the basis of cost savings and collocation with similar functions.
- Redstone's military ranking is 48 of 334 DoD entities - superior to the ranking of Ft. Belvoir.
- Collocates AMC with its largest buying subordinate command. AMC has minor activities at Ft. Belvoir.
- Redstone already does one-half of Army's foreign military sales (FMS). USASAC relocation to Redstone would provide significant efficiencies and savings.
- DoD's Acquisition University - South is located at Redstone.
- Net present value to DoD over 20 years is a savings of $122.9M (includes all Army HQ and FOA moves). Total estimated one-time cost to implement the recommendations is $199.9M. Net implementation costs during period is $111.8M. Annual recurring savings after implementation is $23.9M, with payback expected in 10 years.
- Relocation of AMC headquarters and USASAC to a military installation that is farther than 100 miles from the Pentagon provides dispersion away from the National Capitol Region. Redstone has full force protection.
- Collocates AMC Headquarters and USASAC with existing and relocated MDA operations, relocated Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) Headquarters and activities already at Redstone.
- No infrastructure impediments. No environmental or encroachment issues.

**Related Issues:**

1. DoD's recommendation in this area also closes Red River Army Depot and DLA's collocated Distribution Center and relocates missions. The Army Materiel Command Logistics Leadership Center is also collocated with Red River Army Depot, but is not addressed in BRAC recommendations. With the Depot and Distribution Center closing, the Logistics Leadership Center should be moved to Redstone Arsenal for the synergy of collocation with the Defense Acquisition University - South, AMCOM (the Army's largest Life Cycle Management Command) and Army Materiel Command Headquarters, the primary customers of students of the Logistics Leadership Center.

2. The DoD Joint Cross Services Group recommended the consolidation of Depot Level Procurement Management. *The recommendations relating to any transfer of*
management responsibility for Depot Level Reparable management consolidation of aviation and missile spares should be reassessed and reversed.

- The correct prerogatives of the AMCOM CG, in the new Life Cycle Management Command (LCMC), as the manager for worldwide aviation and missile readiness, would be eroded by DLA, not the AMCOM team, buying critical reparables.

- Workload leveling in the buying activity would be problematic, and the LCMC Soldier Focused Logistics PM "trail boss" model being followed in AMCOM with the PM as the life cycle manager would be complicated if procurement functions for reparables move.

- These reparable items are procured in the billions of dollars, and "savings" in this recommendation are considered suspect. It only takes a few errors in procuring high cost reparables to be devastating to readiness and to easily off-set any purported savings.

- Aviation and missile reparable items are readiness critical parts, complex in design, involve flight safety, are high unit cost, long production lead-time items, and require the full Team Redstone technology base to manage them correctly.
Relocation of Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC)
RELOCATION OF SPACE AND MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND (SMDC)

**DOD RECOMMENDATION:** Consolidate SMDC Headquarters and staff into the new Von Braun complex facilities at Redstone Arsenal, out of leased space in Northern Virginia.

**Background:** SMDC Headquarters is a 3-star Army Major Command (MACOM) that is dual-hatted as a Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense. SMDC evolved from Huntsville-based organization lineage (Safeguard, BMD, etc.). This realignment:

- Consolidates/establishes a Missile Defense Center of Excellence at Redstone Arsenal and leverages the capabilities of the Missile Defense Agency; PEO, Missiles and Space, PEO Aviation; Aviation and Missile Command (AMCOM); NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center; and US Army Corps of Engineers.


- Supports the total Life Cycle Management approach to missile acquisition, from cradle to grave, and from concept/S&T through retirement/demilitarization.

- Relocates SMDC Headquarters outside the National Capitol Region (> 100 mi). This permits force protection of SMDC Headquarters at Redstone Arsenal versus Northern Virginia.

- Most of SMDC is already located at Redstone.

Relocation of Major Functions of Missile Defense Agency (MDA)
RELOCATION OF MAJOR FUNCTIONS OF MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY (MDA)

**DOD RECOMMENDATION:** Relocate all MDA functions, except the Battle Management and Sensor Directorates, to Redstone Arsenal, out of leased space in Virginia.

**Background:** The relocation of these MDA functions is part of the DoD recommendation to move both the MDA functions and the Headquarters component of the Army's Space and Missile Defense Command to Redstone Arsenal, AL. This realignment:

- Consolidates/establishes a Missile Defense Center of Excellence at Redstone Arsenal and leverages the capabilities of the Missile Defense Agency; PEO, Missiles and Space, PEO, Aviation; Aviation and Missile Command (AMCOM); NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center; and US Army Corps of Engineers.
- Supports the total Life Cycle Management approach to missile acquisition, from cradle to grave, and from concept/S&T through retirement/demilitarization.
- Relocates MDA functions outside the NCR (>100 mi). This permits force protection of MDA entities at Redstone Arsenal, versus National Capitol Region.
- Military value ranking of MDA in Virginia is 329 of 334. Redstone is ranked 48.
Reconsideration of Relocation of Joint Program Office for Robotics
RECONSIDERATION OF RELOCATION
OF JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE FOR ROBOTICS

**DOD RECOMMENDATION:** Relocate the joint robotics program development and acquisition activities from Redstone Arsenal, AL to Detroit Arsenal, Warren, MI.

**Reconsideration Request:** Leave the Joint Robotics Program development and acquisition at Redstone.

**Background:** Unmanned systems development is the "rocket science" of the 21st century. Today, all unmanned systems, current and transformational, are managed at Redstone. Moving ground vehicle programs to Detroit Arsenal will fragment collaborative development and take away from Redstone a vitally important national asset, both technical and economic.

- Robotic Systems development is already aligned under PEO GCS. Robotic Systems platforms are vehicles, but the most complex part of the systems are the Payloads and Controls (what the systems do). Integration of technical capabilities is critical to unmanned systems and that is done at Redstone.

- Unmanned Systems (UGV, UAV and Payloads) are developed and integrated at Redstone Arsenal. All of the Army's transformational unmanned ground and airborne systems (under the Future Combat Systems) are developed at Redstone. Collaboration between all the Army's Unmanned Systems (UGV and UAV) is critical to Transformation and can be done most effectively at Redstone.

- The BRAC recommendation to realign joint robotics to Warren, MI, misrepresents costs as savings. The relocation of Joint Robotics does not save anything, but rather costs $3.9M. The BRAC data analysis represented the total of both the Joint Robotics move ($3.9M cost) and the Woodbridge move ($21M savings) together to show overall savings. In fact, the only savings results from the Woodbridge move. The recommendation underestimates the costs to move Joint Robotics Development, which is a one time net cost for implementation of $7.4M; Annual net recurring cost of $4.1 M; and net present value cost of $60.6M.

- Several unmanned systems companies have established themselves in Huntsville, and the Army Future Combat Systems Lead Systems Integrator established the unmanned systems management in Huntsville because of the center of gravity established at Redstone Arsenal. A move to Detroit will have far reaching adverse impacts on the synergy of these capabilities, the growth of Huntsville's robotics business base and its recognition as a leader in unmanned systems development.

- Detroit Arsenal does not have, and cannot develop, the necessary test and training facilities that exist and are in use at Redstone Arsenal.

- Redstone Arsenal has over many years become a leading center for DoD systems integration and technology utilization and transfer. As this transformation has occurred, the emphasis on the vehicle or bus has given way to the systems capability to meet
evolving requirements. The importance of Robotics is not the vehicle but the systems capability. Redstone is the leader in systems integration of robotics systems.
Relocation of 2\textsuperscript{nd} Recruiting Brigade
RELOCATION OF 2ND RECRUITING BRIGADE

**DOD RECOMMENDATION:** With the closing of Fort Gillem, GA, the 2nd Recruiting Brigade should be relocated to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

**Background:** Fort Gillem, an Army administrative installation and AAFES distribution center, is recommended for closure. This recommendation also relocates the 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal. The Brigade has regional missions throughout the Southeastern United States. Its relocation to Redstone:

- Enhances the Army's military value.
- Maintains adequate surge capabilities.
- Is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan.
- Allows the Army to use excess capabilities at an installation that accomplishes more than administrative missions.
- Places the Brigade in a central location in the Southeast consistent with its recruiting mission.
- Provides access to nearby transportation center in Huntsville, AL.

Additionally:

- There are no significant infrastructure issues.
- Payback expected in one year.
- Savings of over $421M over twenty years is forecast.
- No known environmental impediments.
Relocation of Rotary Wing Air Platform
RELOCATION OF ROTARY WING AIR PLATFORM

**DOD RECOMMENDATION:** Realign the Army's Aviation Technical Test Center (ATTC) at Fort Rucker, AL and Robins Air Logistic Center (ALC), GA functions to Redstone Arsenal, AL.

**Background:** This Air Land Sea & Space recommendation realigns and consolidates those activities that are primarily focused on Rotary Wing Air Platform activities in Development, Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (DAT&E). This action creates the Joint Center for Rotary Wing Air Platform DAT&E at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, AL. Implementation of this recommendation builds upon existing rotary wing air platform technical expertise and facilities in place at Redstone and provides focused support for future aviation technological advances in rotorcraft development.

- Establishes Center for Rotary Wing Air Platform Research and Development, Acquisition, Test, and Evaluation.

- Enhances synergy by consolidating rotary wing work to major sites, preserving healthy competition and leveraging climatic/geographic conditions and existing infrastructure, minimize environmental impact.

- Collocates aircraft and aircraft support systems with development and acquisition personnel to enhance efficiency and effectiveness of rotary wing platform design and development activities.

- Post-1995 BRAC, the Army established Redstone Arsenal as a Rotary Wing Center of Excellence with multi-platform acquisition, sustainment, technology research and development. Addition of ATTC and Robins activities further expands Redstone's rotary wing mission.

- No infrastructure impediments.