

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND: HOW IS THE COMMAND
SUPPORTING THE ARMY PLAN?**

by

Mr. Ernest A. Tafoya
Department of Army Civilian

Colonel Charles Allen
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Report Documentation Page			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 30 MAR 2007		2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2006 to 00-00-2007	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Installation Management Command How is the Command Supporting The Army Plan?			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Ernest Tafoya			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5050			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See attached.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 23	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Mr. Ernest A. Tafoya

TITLE: Installation Management Command: How is the Command supporting The Army Plan?

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 27 March 2007 WORD COUNT: 5843 PAGES: 24

KEY TERMS: Installation Management Agency, Installation Management Command, Base Operations

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

On 1 October 2002 the Installation Management Agency (IMA) was formed to consolidate the Army's 184 installations world-wide under the control of 15 Major Army Commands (MACOM) into a single organization. This initiative was designed to consolidate manpower and resources, to standardize base operations throughout all installations, to implement consistent standardized services at all installations, and to continue to improve the quality of life for all Soldiers, civilians, retirees, and their families. The IMA completed its initial implementation phase, finalized the reorganization, and emplaced systems to evaluate quality of life and cost savings. In August 2006, the Department of the Army decided to further transform the Agency to the Installation Management Command (IMCOM) further integrating its command structure. This SRP analyzes IMCOM's strategy to meet the requirements for The Army Plan. It describes IMCOM's basic mission and evaluates the IMCOM's strategy to meet the four overarching strategies for the Army. It concludes with recommendations of ways IMCOM can further support strategic requirements of The Army Plan.

INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND: HOW IS THE COMMAND SUPPORTING THE ARMY PLAN?

A rapidly changing world deals ruthlessly with organizations that do not change... Guided by a comprehensive enduring vision and supporting goals, we must constantly reshape ourselves to remain relevant and useful members of the joint team.

—General Peter J. Schoomaker,
CSA, October 2002

The Transformation for Installation Management Task Force was established in 2002 to recommend an organization in order to bring together the command and control of all Army installations under one headquarters to gain efficiencies and consolidate resources toward a corporate concept of managing the Army's infrastructure. The Installation Management Agency (IMA) quickly became the Army's largest Field Operating Agency with 70,000 employees. IMA consolidated manpower and resources of 15 Major Army Commands (MACOM) to standardize installation operations, establish systems, and processes for effective management throughout all installations while continuing to improve the quality of life for all Soldiers, civilians, retirees, and their families. Since its inception, IMA has developed systems and procedures, developed a strategy, and transformed business practices. IMA transformed again in 2006 into the Installation Management Command (IMCOM) under the unified command of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM). This Strategic Research Paper (SRP) analyzes IMCOM's strategy to meet the requirements for The Army Plan. It will describe IMCOM's basic mission and evaluate the IMCOM's strategy to meet the four overarching strategies for the Army.

On 22 August 2002, General Orders Number 4 directed the ACSIM to manage installations and support services through the establishment of the Installation Management Agency (IMA). The effective date was set for 1 October 2002. The IMA was under the ACSIM, who served under the direction of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment for planning, programming, budgetary, and policy. ACSIM would also directly coordinate with Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA) staff activities and other agencies for all operational matters. The new IMA was organized with its headquarters in Arlington, Virginia and supported by seven Regional Headquarters located at Fort Monroe; Fort McPherson; Rock Island Arsenal; Fort Sam Houston; Heidelberg, Germany; Yongsan, South Korea; and Fort Shafter, Honolulu.¹

Then Secretary of the Army Thomas E. White formally activated the IMA in a ceremony in the Pentagon Courtyard on 1 October 2002. The IMA was the Army leadership's vision to streamline headquarters, create more agile and responsive staffs, reduce layers of review and approval, focus on the mission, and generally transform the Army's installations. "In terms of institutional transformation, the Installation Management Agency implements best business practices into how we run our installations and communities. It is simply a smarter way to do business," observed Secretary White.²

In the same month the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM), issued the *Commander's Guide: Army Installation Standards*. The transformation strategy for installations directed that the ACSIM would act for and exercise authority for the Army Chief of Staff (CSA) in determining policy and integration of doctrine pertaining to the operation of Army installations. Further, the IMA would centrally manage installations by establishing performance metrics and implementing Army-wide standards for installation management and base operations.³

Evolution of IMA 2002 to IMCOM

In the Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Report for the Installation Management Agency, Major General Anders Aadland, the first IMA Director, noted some initial achievements. Though the agency was in its infancy, he declared that "2003 was a historic and decisive year for America's Army and its installations...a profound aspect of the Army's transformation was the Transformation of Installation Management (TIM) initiative that established the Installation Management Agency (IMA). The Army hit the sands of Iraq, IMA was a reality, heavily engaged in providing critical support to Soldiers, families, and DA civilians at home and abroad."⁴ During 2002, IMA continued to evolve into a corporate agency that managed the Army's installations worldwide, employing a workforce of 78,000 people and managing an initial budget of \$8 billion.⁵ FY03 was a challenging building year for IMA. The Army's base support budget and installation management workforce underwent a massive transition. The Major Army Commands (MACOM), where IMA's work had been done in the past, transformed into a single headquarters and began the process of establishing systems, metrics, and new procedures for business practices.⁶

IMA developed common levels of support (CLS) for infrastructure and services to facilitate uniform delivery of installation services within available funding levels. It continued to institute systems such as CLS to provide equitable services across all installations worldwide for the 95 service areas for normal base operations and quality of life programs. It collaborated with other

agencies to increase operations and cooperation to provide services. Cooperating agencies included: the Army Network Enterprise Technology Command (NETCOM), Army Contracting Agency (ACA), Personnel Command (PERSCOM), Army Environmental Center (AEC), Army Community and Family Support Center (CFSC) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).⁷

During FY 03, IMA began its strategic planning process by establishing five goals:⁸

- Goal 1: Manage installations equitably, effectively and efficiently
- Goal 2: Enable the well-being of the Army's people
- Goal 3: Provide sound stewardship of resources
- Goal 4: Deliver superior mission support to all organizations
- Goal 5: Develop and sustain an innovative, team-spirited, highly effective workforce.

The following year brought a new agency director, MG Ronald Johnson. General Johnson's FY2004 Annual Report noted that IMA made progress toward its strategic goals. Efficiencies had been attained through business transformation to manage the agency's resources:

Most importantly we provided great support to warfighters and their families... We returned nearly 10,000 Soldiers to warfighting units through contracting for gate guards, converting military slots to civilian, and through Garrison Support Units CONUS Support Base contract replacement. IMA also provided facilities and support to mobilize and demobilize 350,000 Soldiers through our installations; we trained nearly that many more individual reservists, Department of the Army civilians and contractors through CONUS Replacement Centers; we cross-leveled clothing and individual equipment for deploying Soldiers across unit and installation boundaries in ways that were not possible before; we repaired barracks while Soldiers were deployed; and we upgraded facilities for a large influx of sick or injured Soldiers caught in the limbo of medical holdover.⁹

At the strategic level, MG Johnson reported that "with input from all stakeholders, we developed quantifiable measures and costs for the installation services. With CLS established at every installation world-wide, Soldiers' families will soon know, prior to any Permanent Change of Station (PCS) move, that they can expect quality, consistency and predictability in service delivery."¹⁰ During 2005, IMA implemented the first phase of a \$252 million Barracks Improvement Program (BIP), designed to improve the living conditions for nearly 40,000 Soldiers on 29 installations world-wide by Fiscal Year 2007.¹¹

IMA was tested in 2005 when Hurricane Katrina struck the southern U.S. The Fort Polk Garrison staff provided support to the installation and logistical support to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the Louisiana National Guard and other federal agencies. Services included billeting, airfield operations, manpower, provisions of food and

water. The IMA Southwest Region headquarters personnel responded gallantly, concentrating on addressing the immediate life, health, and safety issues affecting the Soldiers, families, and civilians residing on the installation.¹²

To develop a body of professionals with an understanding of senior leadership that is applicable to Installation Management, the IMA continued to develop its established education programs. It focused on developing its civilian workforce at the GS14/15 level: six employees graduated from the Senior Service Colleges (SSC) in 2006. For academic year 2007, IMA's selections accounted for 14 percent of all SSC slots reserved for civilians.¹³

IMA focused on facilities construction to provide quality of life projects for Soldiers and families. The two projects were barracks improvement and temporary Child Development Centers (CDC). To support Phase I of its Interim CDC Initiative, IMA opened seven facilities; 18 more were in pre-occupancy stage, scheduled for operation by end of the FY2006. The Training Barracks Improvement Program (TBIP) was underway: 147 projects were scheduled; 139 designs have been completed; 75 contracts were awarded. Overall the Army invested \$220 million to improve the living conditions for 86,000 trainees.¹⁴

In August 2006, the Army announced that the Installation Management Agency would become the Installation Management Command (IMCOM) to enhance its ability to support programs for the Army. The new command transformed the Army's installation management structure into an integrated command structure. IMCOM now operated under the command of the Army Chief of Staff, Installation Management (ACSIM) who also oversees the Army Environmental Center (AEC) and the Community and Family Support Center (CFSC). IMCOM was directed to consolidate four U.S. based IMA regions into two, and CFSC and AEC will remain separate entities subordinate to the IMCOM. The new IMCOM would be commanded by a Lieutenant General who also serves as the ACSIM. The director of IMA now serves as the IMCOM's Deputy Commander.¹⁵ LTG Robert Wilson, the new IMCOM Commander, praised the transformation:

This major organizational change will create a far more effective and agile organization to ensure that the world's best Army is supported on the world's best installations.¹⁶

What does the Installation Management Command Provide for the Army

Now that it is a full command that reports to the Secretary of the Army and integrates Army Environmental Center (AEC), Community and Family Support Center (CFSC), and the IMA, IMCOM frees the Warfighters to fight the GWOT by enabling mission commanders to focus on missions and readiness rather than managing day-to-day installation operations and

facilitating large-scale deployments and demobilizations. IMCOM continues to transform business processes to ensure that the garrisons provide the right service level at the right cost, with the right manning and at the right-time based on available funding. By continuing to eliminate Cold War infrastructure and employing modern technology, IMCOM assists in advancing the Army transformation into an expeditionary force, consistent with Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), Global Defense Posture Realignment (GDPR), and Army Modular Force (AMF). IMCOM will continue to consolidate installations functions to free up resources for warfighting.¹⁷ To assess whether IMCOM is prepared to support the missions of the Army, it is important to review the higher level documents of the Department of Defense and the Army. In doing so, we can determine how well IMCOM strategies are aligned with and support direction from its senior headquarters.

Four Strategic Challenges

The National Defense Strategy, the QDR, and the Army Posture Statement identify four strategic challenges that the Army must be prepared for: traditional, irregular, catastrophic, and disruptive missions in an asymmetrical environment. Each of these challenges is characteristic of the threats in the contemporary security environment. The first is irregular where our adversary employs unconventional methods by non-state and states actors to counter stronger state opponents. Such conflicts involve terrorism, insurgency, civil war, etc. The second is catastrophic where our adversary may have surreptitiously acquired and employed a WMD against the US. The third is traditional warfare with another nation state – the challenges may come from states employing legacy advanced military capabilities and conventional military forces seeking to challenge U.S. power. Fourth is disruptive warfare, by which an adversary may emerge as competitors to develop, possess, and employ breakthrough technological capabilities to deny our advantages in particular operational domains.¹⁸

Quadrennial Defense Report

The 6 February 2006 QDR addresses transformation into the 21st Century. Defense leaders advocated the largest BRAC in history in order to right-size the U.S. infrastructure to meet future needs.¹⁹ BRAC decisions were recommended by the Department of the Army and Department of Defense approved by the President and Congress. Executing this decision rests ultimately with the ACSIM and IMCOM. The BRAC 2005 recommended the closure of 13 Active installations, 176 USAR installations; and 211 Army National Guard Facilities in consultation with State Governors, along with numerous leased facilities. DoD will also work toward a new defense enterprise and undertake reforms to reduce redundancies and ensure the efficient use

of business processes. The Department must be responsive to its stakeholders as it improves effectiveness across civilian and military functions.²⁰

National Defense Strategy

The March 2005 National Defense Strategy calls for continuous transformation through changing the way we think, adapting to new perspectives, and refocusing capabilities to meet future challenges.²¹ IMCOM must manage risk through effective force management by sustaining the force and its readiness. Effective business practices enable IMCOM to manage risk.²² Adopting Best Business Practices will support installation commanders' charter to save the Army money and establish systems to gain efficiencies through savings. IMCOM is challenged to support the global defense posture by providing forward facilities and capabilities. It will use main operating bases (MOB) with resident forces and a robust infrastructure to support training, security cooperation, and the deployment and employment of forces for operations.²³

National Military Strategy

The National Military Strategy (NMS) points out that we are at war. To meet the wartime challenges, we must continue to focus on three priorities; winning the War on Terrorism, enhancing joint warfighting and transforming for the future.²⁴ To transform to meet the NMS, IMCOM must focus on two of the eight capabilities that DOD has identified as essential for transformation: protecting critical bases of operation and deploy forces while sustaining U.S. Forces in distant anti-access environments.²⁵ IMCOM must provide force protection for both stateside and overseas installations while it sustains power projection platforms in the U.S. and abroad. When forces are deployed, IMCOM must maintain a reach-back capability for units by providing a bridge for combat power and while taking care of families that remain behind.

Army Posture Statement

The 2006 Army Posture Statement (APS) details how the Army will execute The Army Plan (TAP). The TAP consists of four overarching, interrelated strategies; the strategy focuses on people, forces, training, and infrastructure. The four strategies are: provide relevant and ready landpower; train and equip Soldiers to serve; sustain an all-volunteer force composed of highly competent Soldiers; and provide infrastructure and support to enable the force to fulfill its strategic roles and missions.²⁶ This analysis focuses on the strategic importance of infrastructure.

The care for Soldiers and Army Families is an IMCOM mission: TAP mandates a solid strategy to assure Soldiers and their families that their needs will be met.²⁷ TAP also states that the Army is committed to providing quality housing for our single Soldiers and Soldiers with families. The Barracks Modernization Program and Residential Communities Initiative (RCI) are underway. IMCOM is tasked with the strategic requirement to provide infrastructure and support to enable the force to fulfill its strategic roles and missions. Infrastructure plays a vital role in supporting the joint force.²⁸ Improving the infrastructure for the Army Modular Force requires new ranges, maintenance facilities, motor pools, and training facilities. With the Army Material Command (AMC), IMCOM is also completing the transformation of our infrastructure for depots and arsenals to meet the commitments of the 21st Century security environment.²⁹

Flagships of Readiness

Repositioning the Army to respond worldwide is a strategic goal for the Army to improve security and at the same time provide quality installations that are truly “Flagships of Readiness”.³⁰ The Army must complete current requirements for our depots, training bases, and home stations to achieve flagship quality. Quality installations enable the force to build, train, deploy, sustain, and regenerate combat power. They also provide homes and essential support for an Army family to enjoy a greater quality of life. Finally, they provide a workplace for our civilian workforce.³¹

As the Army continues to transform, so should its business operations. We must eliminate redundancy, improve our processes, seek the best use of resources and use outsourcing wisely. We can apply information technology to improve and eliminate functions to achieve cost savings. The Army is already implementing Lean and Six Sigma to pursue business transformation.³²

In the 2006 Army Magazine article, then Secretary of the Army Francis J. Harvey advised that “as we fight the war against terrorism, it is also essential that we build a Future Force better able to meet the complex challenges of the 21st century security environment through transformation and modernization.”³³

Keith E. Eastin, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Environment) also observed that “as the home of combat power, Army installations are critical components of our nation’s force capabilities. To safeguard our nation’s security at home and abroad, the Army needs a global framework of installations, facilities, ranges, airfields and other critical assets that are properly distributed, efficient and capable of ensuring that we can successfully carry out our assigned roles, missions, and tasks.”³⁴ Eastin reported that “we are transforming from a forward

deployed force to a U.S. power projection platform through the efforts of restationing.”³⁵ This restationing effort resides in three initiatives: Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC), Global Defense Posture Realignment (GDPR), and the Army Modular Force (AMF). Stationing decision enable us to focus resources and installations in order to achieve the best value and positioning of future forces. BRAC decisions seek to optimize infrastructure to support the Army. “BRAC 2005 will enable the Army to become a more relevant and ready expeditionary force as a member of the joint team while enhancing the well-being for our Soldiers, civilians and family member living, working and training on our installations.”³⁶ The GDPR consolidates forces returning from overseas into selected CONUS installations. AMF has restructured the Army force to increase the number of combat units and create more effective fighting units through the Brigade Combat Teams (BCT).³⁷

The Army Plan

The Army Plan articulates the Army’s institutional strategy based on our Army senior leadership’s vision. It details how the Army will fulfill its mission to provide necessary forces and capabilities to the Combatant Commanders in support of the National Security and Defense Strategies. It also communicates the Army’s priorities for employing available resources. Analysis of the strategic environment, national guidance, and operational requirements clearly indicates that the Army must be prepared for operations of a type, tempo, pace, and duration different from those we have recently structured our forces and systems to carry out.³⁸ We must likewise prepare our Soldiers, civilians, and families for the sustained challenges of serving a Nation at war.

The well-being of our Soldiers, civilians, and families is inextricably linked to our Army’s readiness. Our Well-Being programs and family support systems must be synchronized with rotation schedules and optimized to support deployed units anchored by flagship installations. We recognize that our Soldiers and their families need an element of predictability and order in their lives. The quality and character of our installations is vital to enhancing the well-being of our Soldiers, civilians, and families.³⁹

Army Campaign Plan

The Army Campaign Plan (ACP) directs planning, preparation, and execution of Army Operations. The plan includes GWOT and directs detailed planning, preparation, and execution of the myriad tasks that the Army must perform everyday within joint and expeditionary capabilities.⁴⁰ At the core of projecting our joint and expeditionary Army is the resource

process: “Without the right people, the proper equipment, top-notch installations and adequate dollars to support all appropriately, the Army will not meet the nation’s demands”.⁴¹

To execute the Campaign Plan and fulfill the intent of the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Staff of the Army (CSA) over the next six years, the Army must improve capabilities for Homeland Defense, implement transformation initiatives, and improve business practices and processes.⁴² To meet the campaign objectives, the Army must change our global footprint by adjusting Army stationing and support infrastructure in accordance with Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS). This enables the Army to execute the National Defense Strategy and support operational deployments and sustained operational rotations.⁴³

To support the expeditionary force, the ACSIM is responsible for facility planning to establish home station operating centers (HSOC) in order to provide reach-back and expanded expeditionary command and control (C2) capabilities.⁴⁴ Consistent with the efforts to adjust the Global Footprint, ASCIM will develop and implement near-term and long-term facilities for current and future force.⁴⁵

The ACP tasks the ACSIM to direct the IMA (now IMCOM) to fulfill program requirements and provide sustainment/restoration and modernization for the Army’s infrastructure, along with other critical resources for installation support of stationing and basing of BCTs, support brigades, functional brigades, theater armies, and theater subordinate commands. This will be accomplished in coordination with the gaining MACOMs. The IMCOM Commander will provide strategies, resources, and integrated processes to ensure facilities and installation infrastructure support for stationing, basing, and deployment support decisions.⁴⁶

Annex B of the Campaign Plan (Lines of Operation, Change 2) for installations (LO15), cites the requirement to manage, modernize, and refine installations as strategic assets throughout the Army, thereby ensuring that installations support a Joint and Expeditionary Force on which our Soldiers, families and civilians live, work, train, mobilize, deploy to fight, and are sustained as with a reach back for support system in place. ACSIM will support these lines of operation in coordination with IMCOM who executes the plan.⁴⁷

Army Force Generation (ARFORGEN) requirements call for the ACSIM to develop and implement a holistic unaccompanied personnel housing (UPH) strategy for the Army.⁴⁸ Current operations, transformation, and BRAC have created a complex planning environment which requires a holistic, synchronized approach to all force re-posturing actions for future Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS) stationing actions.⁴⁹ ACSIM will direct IMA (IMCOM) to ensure that the one-time facility costs, identified in the AR 5-10 Stationing

Packages are valid and deconflicted from other stationing actions and that relevant requirements and funds are programmed.

AR 5-10 assigns responsibilities and prescribes policies and procedures governing the Army stationing process. Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA) is expected to execute stationing actions (activations, inactivations, realignments, and relocations) at the lowest cost consistent with mission accomplishment using existing available facilities at the gaining installation to the maximum extent possible.⁵⁰

Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations & Environment (ASA-I&E) has responsibility for policy development, program oversight, and coordination of a wide variety of Army activities. These include (but are not limited to): design, construction, operations, maintenance and management of Army installations; privatization of Army family housing, real estate, utilities and other infrastructure programs; environmental compliance, clean-up and site disposal programs; and management of the Army's safety and occupational health programs. ASA-I&E also co-chairs the Installations Program Evaluation Group (PEG) of the Army Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (APPBS).⁵¹

Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management

The Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (ACSIM) serves as the Army proponent for installations. ACSIM provides policy guidance and program management on all matters relating to overall management and resourcing of Army installations worldwide. The ACSIM ensures the availability of efficient, effective base services and facilities. The ACSIM is responsible for policy promulgation, guidance and programs, and budget authority for the execution of Army installation operations and Army Corps of Engineers' military construction functions. The ACSIM establishes and prioritizes an annual budget of over \$14 billion, which funds the operation of all installations worldwide. He is responsible for facilities maintenance and repair; new facility construction; execution of base realignment and closure (BRAC) decisions; Army environmental programs, family and morale, welfare and recreation (MWR) programs.⁵²

IMCOM Strategy compared to the Army's Interrelated Strategies

When both the Army's four overarching and interrelated strategies are compared to IMCOM's overarching, interrelated strategies, it is evident that the IMCOM strategic goals systematically support the Army's strategies (see below). IMCOM's goals are focused on using

its people, forces, training, and infrastructure focus to develop and maintain installations as “flagships of readiness”. The 2007 Army Posture Statement strategies are identical to the 2006 strategies; likewise systematically support TAP.

<u>2007 Army Strategies</u>	<u>2006 IMCOM Goals and Objectives</u>
Provide Infrastructure and Support	• Optimize resources and employ innovative means to provide premier facilities and quality services • Build and sustain a state of the art infrastructure to support readiness and mission execution
Train and Equip Soldiers and Grow Adaptive Leaders	• Develop and retain the best leaders and most professional work force to accomplish Army goals and objectives
Provide Relevant and Ready Landpower	• Be a streamlined, agile organization that is customer-focused and results-driven in support of current and future missions
Sustain an All-Volunteer Force	• Enhance the well-being of the military community

Table 1.

Installation Management Command Strategic Map

The IMCOM Mission Statement directs the installation’s community leaders to: “Manage Army Installations to support readiness and mission execution – provide equitable services and facilities, optimize resources, sustain the environment and enhance the well-being of the Military community.”⁵³ The IMCOM Strategic Plan specifies four major goals and objectives (overarching, interrelated strategies and strategic initiatives):

The first goal is to develop and retain the best leaders and most professional workforce to accomplish Army goals and objectives. The objectives to attain this goal are to develop leaders that can effectively lead others with a supportive culture and manage resources. Additional objectives are to ensure continuity of leadership and sustain a learning environment that drives continuous improvement in performance.⁵⁴

The second goal is to optimize resources and employ innovative means to provide premier facilities and quality services. This goal is accomplished by developing and formalizing strategic business partnerships; deploying and institutionalizing processes while aligning resources to validated requirements. IMCOM will continue to identify risks, opportunities, liabilities and implement actions.⁵⁵

The third goal is to be a streamlined agile organization that is customer-focused and results-driven in support of current and future missions by defining and continuously improving

processes that are streamlined, standardized and repeatable across the command. To meet this goal requires actions that include: institutionalizing knowledge management, gaining resources by effective organizational structure and clarifying roles and responsibilities. To be successful, IMCOM must build relationships of trust and confidence through open communication with all its customers and stakeholders, internal and external.⁵⁶

The fourth goal is to build and sustain a state-of-the-art infrastructure to support readiness and mission execution and enhance the well-being of the military community by demonstrating stewardship of environmental resources, outsourcing facilities and services (to include personnel) when economical while maintaining mission support. To provide infrastructure support, IMCOM must continue to plan and design installations that embraces and adapts to changing requirements. IMCOM will continue to seek and develop advanced concepts and technologies to facilitate state of the art installations.⁵⁷

Assessment

Army Base Operations Support (BOS) for FY08, will be funded at \$8.133B providing only a minimum level of support for installation operations. In FY05 through FY07, the BOS budget was under-funded, but the Army recognized these under-funded budgets and realigned funds during the year of execution. In FY05, the Army also migrated funding from Sustainment/Restoration and Modernization (S/RM) to BOS. The FY08 budget fully funds force protection, utilities, food services, real estate leases, and civilian pay. However, the FY08 funding request continues to assume risk in fire and emergency services, municipal services, facilities engineering, information technology, logistic programs, and quality of life services needed for the All-Volunteer force.⁵⁸ As discussed earlier, how much does it truly cost to run the Army's infrastructure today?

The United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) report Defense Infrastructure – Issues Need to be Addressed in Managing and Funding Base Operations and Facilities Support (June 2005) found that Congress appropriated increased funding for Base Operations (BASOPS) in recent years, at times more than was requested by DoD. Approved increases in the past years however, have been less than the cost of BOS services provided at Army military installations and in most budgets, by hundreds of millions of dollars. The GAO reported that resources designated for S/RM and other purposes were redesignated to meet BOS needs.⁵⁹ The Army's budgetary request for BOS were approved by Congress from 2001-2004; in fact, congressional appropriations exceeded the Army's requests in each of those years.⁶⁰ At the same time funding turbulence across BOS and facility sustainment accounts was exacerbated

in fiscal year 2004 as the Army withheld funds that otherwise would have been designated to fund BOS and S/RM; those funds were redirected to pay for the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT), although some funding was restored by the end of the FY.⁶¹

The trend continued in FY2006 with a total budget authority for the Army which was \$131.2 billion.⁶² Based upon the precedence set by the Army's FY2004 request for BOS funding of \$5.756 billion which was 65 percent of the amount it projected as being needed to provide traditional levels of services, the budget fell short of requirements⁶³ IMCOM internally funded the installations at 90% funding for BOS and 90% for SRM, thus the actual impact at the installation level was that they received 55% of the funding required to run their respective installation.

Not mentioned in the GAO report is Activity Based Costing (ABC), a system which is a business management tool to allow managers to track historical costs for their activity. This system was proposed early in the formation of the then-IMA in January 2003. It was to be developed for garrison commanders and regional offices to track the amount of resources expended daily or yearly to build supportive evidence for budget requests and allow IMA/ACSIM to manage resource allocation for priority services.

Although ABC is addressed in the IMCOM organizational charts, it is not prescribed as a detailed process or system for implementation. IMCOM currently has no plan to implement ABC across the command to address true expenditures and funding requirements for the Army or the Congress. Most business organizations have systems in place to give the Chairman of Board an expenditure cost for the day or year with a return of investment analysis.

If funds are cut, leaders must establish their own priorities with existing resources to accomplish priority missions. If the costs are unknown, the prudent decisions are hard and may be impossible to make. So what were intended to be decisions made at the Department of the Army level and IMCOM become decentralized to local garrison commanders and reinforce the disparity in delivery of services.

Future Issues facing IMCOM

The Army Family Housing (AFH) account provides family housing for Soldiers and their families and eliminates inadequate homes. The Army relies on local communities as its primary supplier of family housing and will continue to privatize or build AFH at U.S. locations where necessary. The budget supports the elimination of inadequate foreign family housing at enduring locations by the end of FY09. The reduction of the U.S. inventory of inadequate housing at enduring locations has already been funded by the FY07 budget through

privatization, conventional military construction, demolition, and divestiture of uneconomical or excess units. Family housing at non-enduring locations will be disposed of based on BRAC recommendations and foreign redeployment of US Forces.

The Base Realignment and Closure 2005 FY08 budget is \$4.0B, with \$724.4M of which is allocated for BRAC and GDPR. The Army has carefully planned and must now orchestrate the 1,200+ actions required to fully implement BRAC 2005 by 15 September 2011. Any delays or interruption in BRAC funding will unravel the Army's plan for stationing and the BRAC plan by delaying building new brigades, by reducing forces available for rotations, and by complicating reset strategies – with operational consequences. The Army is currently executing BRAC 2005 under a Continuing Resolution (CR) which caps spending based on FY06 levels. This means that \$2.8B of the FY2007 BRAC program cannot be executed unless restrictions are lifted under an expanded CR. Further, cuts to the Army's continued requests will result in deferring programmed construction projects to later years to complete the BRAC program.⁶⁴

The 2007 Army Posture Statement details compelling needs to fully fund quality of life of programs and infrastructure, (the 2006 APS did not address funding requirements). The 2007 APS addresses the need to fully fund the infrastructure in order for the Army to meet the requirements of the National Defense Strategy while synchronizing the Global Defense Posture Realignment, Base Realignment and Closure, and numerous initiatives required to complete the requirements. Critical for IMCOM is the requirement to fully fund Base Operations and Sustainment accounts to provide uniformly high standards for our Soldiers, families, and Army Civilians, while ensuring predictable spending levels needed to plan and execute operations at all of our installations. Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization accounts require full funding to slow the deterioration of Army infrastructure.⁶⁵

Conclusion

The establishment of the IMA was critical to meet the initial requirements of the GWOT to build systems for the Army's infrastructure to care for families when their Soldier deploys. The tactical commander is now focused on combat operations while the garrison commander keeps the tactical commander informed and takes care of day-to-day base operations and sustains a reach-back capability for deployed units. When units redeploy IMCOM is prepared to meet the requirements for force projection for future combat operations.

Throughout its initial years, IMA formed a strategy to support an Army at War by focusing on readiness, force projection, global repositioning, the streamlining the organization to ensure that the Army family has a predictable standard of living. The transformation of IMA into

IMCOM strategically changed the command structure and afforded installation management with direct representation on the Army Staff. IMCOM is now a major player on the Army Staff and directly linked with the Community Family Support Center and the Army Environmental Center for continuity of base operations. However, funding will remain a key requirement to complete transformation, global repositioning, and BRAC.

To bridge from the tactical level (installation) to the strategic level (IMCOM), we must identify operational tools needed to execute the strategy. Common levels of support have been established. However, a corporate system to record costs on a daily basis throughout the command warrants review. Until the IMCOM can inform the Army and Congress the real costs of running installations, we will not receive the funding required. Rather, we will continue to rely on a budget that does not allow IMCOM to prioritize services and provide expected common levels of support throughout the command. A possible solution would be full implementation of an activity based costing system to demonstrate actual costs for a realistic budget while implementing common levels of support.

For the near future IMCOM is postured to support AFORGEN to support the three force generation phases: Reset, Ready, and Available. In the Reset Phase, IMCOM provides facility support to individual training along with maintenance support to reset with the Army Material Command. IMCOM facilitates redeployment of Soldiers and equipment, and provides reintegration training for Soldiers and their families. In the Ready Phase, IMCOM provides facility support for collective training and mobilization support. IMCOM has a strategic plan to support the building of combat power and provide support for combat units building combat power while on their installation. In the Available Phase, installation support is critical while maintaining deployment readiness support and reach-back support while the installation continues to provide Family Support.

This paper set out to assess whether IMCOM is strategically postured to support the Army Plan. While there are still issues to be addressed, the IMCOM strategies are appropriately aligned with those of the Army. Thus IMCOM is postured to support the Army Mission by providing equitable services and facilities, optimizing resources, sustaining the environment and enhancing the well-being of the Military community

Endnotes

¹ U.S. Department of the Army, *General Orders No. 4* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 22 August 2002).

² U.S. Army News, "Installation Management Agency Activated," Installation Management Agency, available from <http://www.ima.army.mil/southwest/sites/about/history.asp>; Internet; accessed 1 December 2006.

³ Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, *Commander's Guide: Army Installation Standards* (Washington, D.C.: Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, October 2003), 3.

⁴ Installation Management Agency, *Fiscal Year 2003 Annual Report* (Washington, D.C.: Installation Management Agency, 2003), available from <http://www.ima.army.mil/sites/news/archives.asp#2003>; Internet; accessed 1 December 2006.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid., 7.

⁸ Fiscal Year, 13.

⁹ Installation Management Agency, Introduction remarks by MG Ronald Johnson, *Fiscal Year 2004 Annual Report* (Washington, D.C.: Installation Management Agency, 2004, available from www.ima.army.mil; Internet; accessed 13 March 2007), i.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Installation Management Agency, *Meeting the Challenge, A Five-Year Retrospective* (Washington, D.C.: Installation Management Agency, 2006), 6.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., 7.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ US Army News, "Army Establishes Installation Management Command," 2 August 2006; available from <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/news/2006/08/mil060802-arnews01.htm>; Internet; accessed 1 March 2007.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Bob Crawley, *IMCOM Activation*, Information Paper (Washington, D.C.: Installation Management Command, 2006), 27 December 2006, available from <https://www.us.army.mil/suite/authenticate.do?c=ZXJuZXN0LnRhZm95YTphc2RmQVMxMjMhQA==>; Internet; accessed 14 February 2007.

¹⁸ U.S. Department of the Army, *2006 Posture Statement* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 10 February 2006), 1.

¹⁹ U.S. Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review Report* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, 6 February 2006), viii.

²⁰ Ibid., 65.

²¹ U.S. Department of Defense, *The National Defense Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense, March 2005), 10.

²² Ibid., 11.

²³ Ibid., 19.

²⁴ U.S. Department of Defense, *The National Military Strategy*, (Washington, D.C.: Chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff, 2004), iv.

²⁵ Ibid., 20.

²⁶ 2006 Posture Statement, i.

²⁷ Ibid., 19.

²⁸ Ibid., 20.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., 22.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid.

³³ The Honorable Francis J. Harvey, "Building the Future While Serving Our Nation," *Army: Magazine of the Association of the United States Army* (October 2006): 13.

³⁴ Keith E. Eastin, "Army Installations Transforming with the Force," *Army: Magazine of the Association of the United States Army* (October 2006), 57.

³⁵ Ibid., 58.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid., 60.

³⁸ U.S. Department of the Army, "Section 1: Army Strategic Planning Guidance FY 2006 – 2023," in *The Army Plan FY 2006 – 2023* (Washington, DC,: U.S. Department of the Army, 2006), 3.

³⁹ Ibid., 7.

⁴⁰ U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Campaign Plan (U)* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 12 April 2004), 2.

⁴¹ Ibid., 7.

⁴² U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Campaign Plan Change 2 (U)* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 30 September 2005), 9.

⁴³ Ibid., 11.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 16.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 18.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 34.

⁴⁷ Ibid., B-4.

⁴⁸ Ibid., F-11.

⁴⁹ Ibid., H-1.

⁵⁰ U.S. Department of the Army, *Stationing*, Army Regulation 5-10, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 1 April 2001), available from http://www.army.mil/usapa/epubs/pdf/r5_10.pdf, 1; Internet; accessed 1 December 2006.

⁵¹ *The Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations & Environment (ASA-I&E)*, Home Page, available from <http://www.asaie.army.mil/Public/IE/default.html>; Internet; accessed 1 December 2006.

⁵² LTG Robert Wilson, Commander's Biography, The Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, available from <http://www.imcom.army.mil/site/commander/default.asp>; Internet; accessed 3 December 2006.

⁵³ Philip Jessup, Installation Management Command, "Strategic Plan" (Briefing Slides) (Washington, D.C., 011300R October 2006), 1.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 2.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Installation Management Command, Subject: Base Operations Support (BOS) Information Paper (Washington, D.C.: Installation Management Command, 8 February 2007), available from <https://www.us.army.mil/suite/portal/index.jsp>; Internet; accessed 14 February 2007.

⁵⁹ U.S. Government Accountability Office, Report to the Subcommittee on Readiness, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, *Defense Infrastructure, Issues Need to Be Addressed in Managing and Funding Base Operations and Facilities Support*, (Washington, D.C.: June 2005), available from www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-05-556; Internet; accessed June 2005, 4.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 12.

⁶¹ Ibid., 13.

⁶² Frank A. DiStasio, *Fiscal Year 2007 Army Budget Analysis* (Arlington: Association of the United States Army, 2006), 21.

⁶³ U.S. Government Accountability Office, 14.

⁶⁴ Soulhee Spitz, Installation Management Command, *Base Realignment and Closure 2005*, Information Paper (Washington, D.C.; Installation Management Command, 31 January 2007), available from <https://www.us.army.mil/suite/portal/index.jsp>; Internet; accessed 14 February 2007.

⁶⁵ U.S. Department of the Army, *2007 Posture Statement* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, 14 February 2007), vi.

