



**Suggested Commissioner Questions  
Base Closure and Realignment Commission**

**Final Hearing with Department of Defense Officials**

Witnesses:

The Honorable Michael W. Wynne, Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group  
The Honorable Francis J. Harvey, Secretary of the Army;  
General John P. Jumper, Chief of Staff of the Air Force;  
Admiral Robert Willard, Vice Chief of Naval Operations; and  
Admiral Evan Chanik, Director of Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment,  
Joint Staff.

August 20, 2005

New Cost Estimates

1. Since you submitted the Secretary's recommendations in May, there has been time to look at the cost estimates for many of the recommendations, including site surveys for Military Construction. We have requested these updated cost estimates have been provided a very small number to date.
  - a. How do you feel the original estimates compare (or will compare) to the revised estimates? How much of an increase do you think we can expect to see (1995 had an 9% increase in estimated costs, which would equal \$216M in 2005 costs)?
  - b. Given the new cost estimates, do you see any recommendations which will not pay off?
  - c. Has the Secretary considered changing any recommendations due to cost increases?

Savings

2. Has DoD made any force structure decisions after the final COBRA runs that have altered the "facts on the ground" at installations substantially, resulting in either major cost increases or reductions for a particular recommendations. For example, a post BRAC decision to move Fires brigades out of Fort Sill, not accounted for in the COBRA, would save MILCON costs at Fort Sill, resulting in savings to the Operational Army (IGPBS) recommendation, and possibly Net Fires as well. Are there others similar decisions that might alter the COBRA significantly?
3. During a joint Pope/Bragg Commission visit, Garrison leadership identified 7 possible sites to locate FORSCOM headquarters and USARC. Did the 7th

Special Forces Group (SFG) leadership consider some of these alternate sites at Fort Bragg to build new headquarters and barracks to support there expansion? Are joint collocation with AFSOC and the opportunity to train in terrain similar to their AOR the main justifications for the 7th SFG's move to Eglin AFB, or are there other reasons?

4. The Aviation Logistics School move requires significant investment - \$290 million even using the reduced number recently provided by the Department. That puts the proposal in the top 10% of all recommendations for cost. With a payback period of 45 years, is the benefit of such a major investment worth the expense – especially considering we are talking about consolidating enlisted maintenance training with officer pilot training? (E&T5)

5. (Red River Depot) What can you tell us about the DoD plan for the return of assets from the Theater and any impact this would have on the recommendation to close Red River Army Depot?

- a. Is the expectation that all equipment will return to CONUS or OCONUS locations for repair and distribution to units?
- b. Or should we expect a significant portion of those assets to be left in Theater for transfer to Afghan and Iraqi forces?
- c. How can this have been determined if there is not yet an exit strategy from either conflict?

6. (Fort Monmouth, NJ) Regarding the Ft. Monmouth recommendation, the Commission is concerned with the rationale for relocating the Night Vision functions from Ft. Belvoir to Aberdeen. Please explain clearly why this relocation makes sense.

7. (Fort Monmouth, NJ) Does the Army plan to move other RDAT&E activities to Aberdeen in the future by other than BRAC means?

8. The Army's Installation Management Command is being completely re-organized, consolidated and moved by this round of BRAC. As we understand the Army, the burden of developing the detail implementation plans for this BRAC round will be a primary mission of this Command. If the affected personnel don't move, and begin "jumping ship" how can you execute BRAC?

9. Concerning TECH-22, Defense Laboratories, why is the Information Systems Directorate at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base being proposed to move to Hanscom Air Force Base when Rome Research Site is the Headquarters for this Directorate? Also, why is this course of action proposed when Rome is clearly ranked higher in military value than Hanscom?
10. To what extent do you anticipate a problem with the loss of intellectual capital with respect to the two planned recommendations from Naval Base Ventura County to China Lake (TECH 15 and TECH-28)?
11. The Joint Cross Service Groups for the most part did not visit affected units and organizations before making their recommendations. We have found errors that would have been easily corrected had a simple visit been conducted. Why wasn't this part of your standard procedure to insure that you were making valid recommendations instead of combinations by title or simple organizational description of function?
12. (Industrial #19) Fleet Readiness Centers was the single largest 20 year NPV of savings (\$4.724B) on your entire list. It has been very difficult to analyze the accuracy of these savings. How did you evaluate the savings in manpower and engineering process improvement to achieve such a large savings and how confident are you in these savings?
13. We understand the necessity to consolidate management of like functions to realize efficiencies with geographically proximate bases/activities. However, historically BOS accounts have been inadequately funded to meet BOS requirements and facility upkeep. A senior Joint Basing Group official expressed doubt during GAO review that there would be a single funding model because BOS as currently exists has too many diverse activities to model. Regarding H&SA #41 Joint Basing recommendation, how do you intend to insure the Services provide adequate BOS funding?
14. H&SA #49 Relocate Miscellaneous Department of Navy Leased Locations includes Federal Office Building 2 (Navy Annex) which is DoD owned and presumably AT/FP compliant. The Defense Authorization Act 2000 provides for transfer of the property to Arlington Cemetery. Navy Annex is not leased property. Why was it included as a leased item recommendation?

15. The Industrial Cross Service Group had a number of recommendations to reduce and realign capacity for Army and Navy Depots. Why were there no recommendations regarding Air Force Depots?

16. Many of the recommendations were "bundled" to show savings yet when broken down, many individual pieces showed only costs. Was there specific guidance to the Services and Joint Cross Services Groups to specifically "bundle" recommendations to show savings? Were saving goals assigned?

17. The BRAC Commission has virtually received no complaints from anyone concerning any of the 39 State Army Reserve Component Transformation items on the List because they were all coordinated with the effected states' TAGs. On the other hand, the Air Force Air National Guard moves have created a "fire-storm" of complaints from every state involved and was never coordinated with the TAGs. The Air Force took a "top down" approach and did not negotiate at all with TAGs concerning the ANG realignment. We were told that the Air Force was prohibited to talking with the state TAGs. Please explain why it is OK for the Army to do that but not OK for the Air Force.

~~18. After all DoD BRAC recommendations were completed, what review was done to ensure that national and regional security impacts were addressed?~~

19. DoD has testified that many of the individual BRAC recommendations have interdependencies with other recommendations. Is there any documentation of which recommendations are interdependent and in what way?

20. DOD spent over two years developing the recommendations with supporting data, analysis and documentation. These efforts resulted in DOD proposing MILCON projects and developing 1391s for each project.

- a. Why was OSD unwilling to provide the Commander of Naval Installation's most current information to the BRAC Commission for the R&A Staff to review, reconcile and assess?
- b. Since the Department had over two years to develop the construction costs, what are the differences between the 1391 construction estimates and the estimates in the COBRA Runs that make the release of this information difficult?
- c. Are the cost estimates between the COBRA data and the 1391s that different?

17. ~~The Commission~~

21. DOD has recommended to relocate the Officer Training Command (OTC) from the Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL to Naval Station Newport, RI. Based on revised Force Structure Plan (FSP) for FY06 thru FY11, the Average On Board (AOB) student requirements has dropped significantly from DOD's initial assessment of 958 AOB to 463 AOB students. This revised FSP increases classroom square foot excess capacity 78% at OTC Newport, RI.

a. Why is this recommendation still valid with so much excess capacity?

22. **BACKGROUND:** The Department and the Navy have repeatedly testified that Oceana is the only suitable place for the East Coast Master Jet Base. The Navy has also asserted that the ability to co-locate all strike fighter assets provides: "significant cost savings while increasing material, operational and training efficiencies and improves the quality of life and quality of service of our aircrew and maintenance personnel."

However, the Navy's Final Environmental Impact Study of July 2003 stated that only 8 of the 10 F-18 Super Hornet squadrons could be located at Oceana because of noise and air quality concerns. Consequently, 2 of the 10 new Super Hornet squadrons are planned for stand-up at Cherry Point, NC.

**QUESTION:** Doesn't the evidence of developmental encroachment in the Oceana area already constrain the operational readiness, adversely impact the Navy's operating budget to maintain two Super Hornet sites and contradicts the issues that were cited in the Department's 5 August response regarding the advantages of single siting all the Strike fighter squadrons?

23. Has anyone in the DoD seriously studied and analyzed the advantages of relocating the Navy Master Jet Base to Cecil Field FL with the caveat that the field would be provided free and clear of all Non-DoD activities? If so, please advise us today of your assessment.

24. We understand that the Services are conducting site surveys and other detailed analyses related to many of their BRAC recommendations. These efforts provide more detailed and up-to-date data on the BRAC actions.

- a. What are the locations where a field survey has been conducted for the express purpose of defining required to support proposed mission scope or change resulting from BRAC?
- b. Will OSD withhold this information and force the Commission to make a decision with knowledge that the OSD data presenting available to us is inaccurate for major decisions.

- c. We understand that the field surveys have been or are now being scrubbed for detail. After the close examination we would expect that the costs will rise as has been demonstrated by the final costs v. estimates used during past BRAC rounds. How does the Secretary propose to fund the new construction within a constrained budget that may result from a low return on savings that may result from the current BRAC round?

N. M. Davis

COBRA REALIGNMENT SUMMARY REPORT (COBRA v6.10) - Page 1/2  
 Data As Of 8/20/2005 3:23:02 PM, Report Created 8/20/2005 3:23:06 PM

Department : Headquarters and Support JCSG  
 Scenario File : C:\Documents and Settings\gingrick\My Documents\198M - Joint Med CMD\HSA0115 Excursion Joint Med Group to I  
 Option Pkg Name: Excursion MED to Leased Space  
 Std Fctrs File : C:\Documents and Settings\gingrick\My Documents\COBRA 6.10 April 21 2005\BRAC2005.SFF

Starting Year : 2006  
 Final Year : 2010  
 Payback Year : 2012 (2 Years)

NPV in 2025(\$K): -316,275  
 1-Time Cost(\$K): 106,249

Net Costs in 2005 Constant Dollars (\$K)

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	Beyond
MilCon	8,046	0	0	89,406	0	0	97,453	0
Person	0	0	0	0	43	-5,526	-5,483	-5,526
Overhd	363	173	30	1,447	-9,773	-10,079	-17,838	-10,135
Moving	0	1,000	0	0	2,050	0	3,050	0
Missio	0	0	0	0	-17,600	-17,600	-35,200	-17,600
Other	500	0	0	200	-6,437	-33,250	-38,987	350
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,910</b>	<b>1,173</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>91,053</b>	<b>-31,717</b>	<b>-66,485</b>	<b>2,994</b>	<b>-32,911</b>

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
<b>POSITIONS ELIMINATED</b>							
Off	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enl	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civ	0	0	0	0	89	0	89
<b>TOT</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>89</b>

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total
<b>POSITIONS REALIGNED</b>							
Off	0	0	0	0	643	0	643
Enl	0	0	0	0	113	0	113
Stu	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civ	0	0	0	0	514	0	514
<b>TOT</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,270</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,270</b>

Summary:

Screen One Footnotes  
 (Revised 04/13/05)

HSA-0115

Close Skyline 1; relocate TMA to the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda. Realign Skyline 4 and 5, by relocating TMA to Bethesda. Realign Skyline 6, by relocating TMA and Army Office of the Surgeon General(OTSG) to Bethesda. Realign the Hoffman 2 building, by relocating the OTSG to Bethesda. Realign Bolling AFB, by relocating the AF Medical Support Agency to Bethesda. Realign Potomac Annex, by relocating the FUMED to Bethesda.

REVISION HISTORY

2005 04 13 (Ref: SCREEN7)

This run incorporates changes from Anne Davis integration memo dated 12 April 2005. This memo directed the change of MILCON PAC from 6102 to 6100 for the following gaining installations:

1. NMMC Bethesda

2005 04 14 (SCREEN5 \NMMC Bethesda)

One-Time Unique Costs (\$K) 2010 Revised to \$K 6,666 to reflect Integration Process Memo (p. 5) change for Scenario HSA-0115

COBRA REALIGNMENT SUMMARY REPORT (COBRA v6.10)    Page 2/2  
 Data As Of 8/20/2005 3:23:02 PM. Report Created 8/20/2005 3:23:06 PM

Department : Headquarters and Support JC3G  
 Scenario File : C:\Documents and Settings\gingrick\My Documents\198M - Joint Med CMD\HSA0115 Excursion Joint Med Group to I  
 Option Pkg Name: Excursion Med to Leased Space  
 Std Fctrs File : C:\Documents and Settings\gingrick\My Documents\COBRA 6.10 April 21 2005\BRAC2005.SFF

Costs in 2005 Constant Dollars (\$K)

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	Beyond
MilCon	8,046	0	0	89,406	0	0	97,453	0
Person	0	0	0	0	4,846	2,335	7,181	2,335
Overhd	761	571	428	1,844	5,146	4,841	13,592	4,841
Moving	0	1,000	0	0	2,050	0	3,050	0
Missio	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	560	0	0	200	499	350	1,549	350
TOTAL	9,308	1,571	428	91,451	12,541	7,526	122,825	7,526

Savings in 2005 Constant Dollars (\$K)

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	Beyond
MilCon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Person	0	0	0	0	4,803	7,861	12,664	7,861
Overhd	398	398	398	398	14,920	14,920	31,430	14,976
Moving	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missio	0	0	0	0	17,600	17,600	35,200	17,600
Other	0	0	0	0	6,935	33,600	40,536	0
TOTAL	398	398	398	398	44,258	73,981	119,630	40,437