

AIR WAR COLLEGE

AIR UNIVERSITY

JOINT-BASING FUNDING

By

Jeffrey K. McNeely, YD-03, DAF

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

17 February 2010

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 17 FEB 2010		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2010 to 00-00-2010	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Joint-Basing Funding				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air War College,Air University,325 Chennault Circle,Maxwell AFB,AL,36112				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					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 33	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government or the Department of Defense. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Contents

Certificate.....	i
Contents.....	ii
Illustrations.....	iii
Biography.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Previous BRACS.....	1
BRAC 2005.....	2
Recommendation 146: Joint-Basing.....	3
Common Output Level Standards (COLS).....	6
Discussion.....	7
Predicted Savings.....	7
GAO Reports.....	8
Common Output Level Standards (COLS).....	10
Joint-Basing Organizations.....	11
Base Level Maintenance and Sustainment.....	12
Memorandums of Agreement (MOA).....	13
Actual Savings.....	15
Impacts.....	17
Money.....	17
Manpower.....	18
Non-Tangible Affects.....	19
Recommendations.....	19
Conclusion.....	21
Endnotes.....	22
Bibliography.....	23

Illustrations

	<i>Page</i>
Figure 1: Joint-Basing Leads and Bases	3
Figure 2: Joint-Basing Phases	4
Figure 3: Joint-Basing Timeline	4
Figure 4: BRAC 2005 Report Predicted Savings by Installation	5
Figure 5: GAO Report on Standards of Service Levels	10
Figure 6: MOA Predicted Savings by Installation	13
Figure 7: Predicted Manpower Reductions	15

Biography

Jeffrey K. McNeely, PE
Student – Air War College
AETC/A7CAN
Randolph Air Force Base Texas

Mr. Jeffrey K. McNeely, PE, is an in-resident student at the US Air Force Air War College at Maxwell AFB, AL. Mr. McNeely graduated from the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana with a mechanical engineer degree in 1980. He was commissioned through the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps, entering the active duty Air Force in Oct 1980. He served in positions at various levels in Alaska, Korea, Louisiana, Japan, and Texas. He elected to take early retirement in 1997 when the Air Force was drawing down mid-term officers. After retirement, Mr. McNeely worked with a national laundry company renovating and constructing commercial plants across the States. In 1998, he joined the San Antonio Water System to manage their construction inspection offices, overseeing \$180M in construction projects. In 2005, Mr. McNeely returned to the Air Force as a civilian employee at the Air Intelligence Agency (AIA) at Lackland AFB. In early 2005, he moved back to Okinawa, Japan. He was selected as the Deputy Base Civil Engineer at Yokota AB in September 2006. Mr. McNeely left Yokota in 2009, now temporarily assigned to HQ AETC while he attends Air War College.

ASSIGNMENTS / JOBS

October 1980 - November 1982: 3rd Civil Engineer Squadron, Elmendorf AFB, Alaska
November 1982 - December 1984: 554th CESH (RED HORSE), Osan AB, South Korea
January 1985 - October 1987: Site Activation Task Force (SATAF), Barksdale AFB, Louisiana
October 1987 - July 1989: 2nd Civil Engineer Squadron, Barksdale AFB, Louisiana
July 1989 - July 1992: 18th Civil Engineer Support Squadron, Kadena AB, Okinawa Japan
July 1992 - July 1995: 35th Civil Engineer Support Squadron, Misawa AB, Japan
July 1995 - February 1997: 690th Information Operation Wing, Kelly AFB, TX
March 1997 - December 1998: UNIFIRST Corp, San Antonio, TX
December 1998 - March 2003: San Antonio Water System (SAWS), San Antonio, TX
March 2003 - January 2005: 690th Alterations and Installation Squadron, Lackland AFB, TX
January 2005 - September 2006: 718th Civil Engineer Squadron, Kadena AB, Okinawa Japan
September 2006 - May 2009: 374th Civil Engineer Squadron, Yokota AB, Japan
May 2009 - Present: Air War College, Maxwell AFB, AL

EDUCATION

1975 - High school graduate, Anna-Jonesboro Community High School, Anna, Illinois
1980 - Bachelors in Mechanical Engineering, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, Illinois
1996 - Masters in Human Resources Management, Webster University, Saint Louis, Missouri
1986 - Squadron Officer School by Correspondence
1996 - Air Command and Staff College by Correspondence

LICENSE

1997 - Professional Engineer License, State of Texas

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Defense (DOD) has gone through several Base Realignment and Closure programs, commonly called BRAC, since the late 1980's. The rationale was to reduce costs by closing or realigning unneeded installations, functions, and organizations. However, the original estimated savings have turned out to be wildly optimistic. In many cases the savings have totally evaporated, displaced by additional costs that were not predicted or could not be anticipated.

This paper will look at one initiative from the 2005 BRAC report. Joint-Basing was intended to save over \$2.3 billion over 20 years¹ by consolidating support operations from different bases or posts geographically close to each other. The original 2005 BRAC report predicted reductions of 1,153 military and 968 civilian billets.² However, no military billets were taken due to later guidance and directives. Few civilian billets were actually cut. The number of civilian billets to be transferred from the losing to the gaining units actually grew from the original manpower figures. New organizational structures to manage the joint organizations added additional overhead. New requirements for common support activities (such as security, child care, trash pickup, grounds maintenance, etc) will add over 1,000 civilian billets. The research to date indicates no savings will be realized while new expenses will cost almost \$2.7 billion over the same 20 year period. Joint-Basing is actually costing the Department of Defense more money than if the 26 bases and posts had remained separate.

BACKGROUND

Previous BRACS

The original Base Realignment and Closure Commission started in 1988 with the goal of reducing the footprint of the US military due to overall reductions in manpower and missions. The aim was to reduce the existing stateside base infrastructure by 33%³. Overseas bases were

excluded. Additional BRAC sessions were conducted in 1991, 1993, and 1995. Due to various (mostly political) reasons, the actual reductions came out to only 21%⁴. According to the General Accounting Office information in 2005, the revised savings figure for BRAC 1988 thru 1995 was \$28.9 billion through fiscal year 2003, with an annual savings of \$7 billion after that.⁵ 97 bases were completely closed and another 300 realigned.⁶ A study after the 1988-1999 BRAC rounds still showed 20-25 percent excess base capacity.⁷

BRAC 2005

After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, military spending grew rapidly. With a sluggish economy and lagging tax revenues, President Bush saw a need for another round of base closures. After many arguments, Congress passed a bill in 2001 setting up a new BRAC in 2005. This process was different from previous efforts for several reasons⁸. Since the earlier rounds had already taken the “easy” cuts, the 2005 BRAC would be hard-pressed for additional savings without making more difficult cuts. In addition to numerous procedural and organizational changes, major emphasis was on military end strength, capability-based planning, and joint capabilities. This seemed to support Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld’s transformation plans.

Seven cross-service groups were established. These teams developed a series of recommendations for reductions, relocations, and improvements. The Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission report (Vol 1 and 2) was submitted to the BRAC commission in May 2005 with 190 recommendations. The 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission report was published in September 2005. Overall, it reviewed 198 recommendations, approving 22 major closures, 33 major realignments, and numerous smaller realignments. The estimated savings over 20 years was \$35.6 billion⁹ (only \$15 billion when excluding any proposed military reductions).

Recommendation 146: Joint-Basing

The Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross Service Group developed Recommendation 146 titled Joint-Basing. The justification was that most installations, regardless of Service, performed similar functions. The concept was that bases/posts within close proximity could consolidate these support services, saving manpower, funds, contracts, and other resources. The recommendation included realigning 26 bases/posts into 12 joint bases. One Military Department would be assigned as the lead (Supporting) component at each location while the other (Supported) units would transfer the proportional and appropriate resources for their activities. Figure 1 shows the locations and lead services. The program was broken into Phases I and II locations (Figure 2) with specific timelines for each major effort (Figure 3).

Figure 1: Joint-Basing Leads and Bases¹⁰



Figure 2, Joint-Basing Phases¹¹

<u>Phase I Installations</u>	<u>Phase II Installations</u>
NAB Little Creek / Ft Story	Anacostia Annex / Bolling AFB
Ft Myer / Henderson Hall	NS Pearl Harbor / Hickam AFB
Andrews / NAF Washington	Ft Lewis / McChord AFB
McGuire AFB / Ft Dix / NAES Lakehurst	Charleston AFB / NWS Charleston
Navy Base Guam / Andersen AFB	Elmendorf AFB / Ft Richardson
	Lackland AFB / Randolph AFB / Ft Sam Houston
	Langley AFB / Ft Eustis

Figure 3: Joint-Basing Timeline¹²

Event	No Later Than
Phase I Memorandum of Agreements (MOAs) signed	Sept 30, 2008
Phase I Initial Operational Capability (IOC)	Jan 31, 2009
Phase I Full Operational Capability (FOC)	Oct 1, 2009
Phase II MOAs signed	Sept 30, 2009
Phase II IOC	Jan 31, 2010
Phase II FOC	Oct 1, 2010

The estimated savings over 20 years for Joint-Basing was \$2.342 billion (present value), with an initial implementation cost of \$50.6 million and annual savings of \$183.3 million¹³. Figure 4 is a summary of the estimated manpower savings by installation compiled from the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) computer model adopted by DOD at the beginning of the BRAC program, the May 2005 DOD BRAC report to the Commission, and the final September 2005 BRAC report.

The savings proposed under Recommendation 146 included 1,153 military and 968 civilian positions¹⁴. There were few reductions in Base Operating Support (BOS) funding not associated the manpower reductions. The vast majority of the Joint-Basing savings would be accomplished through these manpower reductions, taken completely by the Supported units.

Figure 4: BRAC and COBRA Reports on Predicted Savings by Location

	COBRA Report Jun 05 # Pers Cuts Mil	COBRA Report Jun 05 # Pers Cuts APF Civ	2005 BRAC Vol I, Part 2, Sect 5 May 05 # Pers Saving Direct Jobs (Mil&Civ)	2005 BRAC Vol I, Part 2, Sect 5 May 05 # Pers Saving Indirect Jobs	2005 BRAC Vol 2, App K Sep 05 # Pers Cuts Mil	2005 BRAC Vol 2, App K Sep 05 # Pers Cuts APF Civ
JOINT-BASE						
Fort Lewis - McChord			422	354		
- Fort Lewis (Lead)	0	0			0	0
- McChord AFB	306	116			306	116
McGuire - Dix - Lackhurst			262	205		
- McGuire AFB (Lead)	0	0			0	0
- Ft Dix	7	82			7	82
- NAS Lakehurst	132	41			132	41
Andrews - Naval Washington			150	103		
- Andrews AFB (lead)	0	0			0	0
- NAF Wash DC	9	9			9	9
Anacostia - Bolling - NRL			0	Unknown		
- Anacostia (Lead)		0			0	0
- Bolling	64	55			64	55
Myer - Henderson Hall			0	Unknown		
- Myer VA (Lead)	0	0			0	0
- Henderson Hall	11	2			11	2
Elmendorf - Richardson			224	188		
- Elmendorf AFB (Lead)	0	0			0	0
- Ft Richardson	84	140			84	140
Pearl Harbor - Hickam			277	234		
- Pearl Harbor (Lead)	0	0			0	0
- Hickam AFB	177	100			177	100
San Antonio			189	193		
- Lackland AFB (Lead)	0	0			0	0
- Randolph AFB	40	69			40	69
- Ft Sam houston	28	52			28	52
Charleston - NWS			264	393		
- Charleston AFB (Lead)	0	0			0	0
- NWS	163	101			163	101
Langley - Eustis			238	306		
- Langley AFB (Lead)	0	0			0	0
- Ft Eustis	68	170			68	170
Norfolk - Fort Story			0	Unknown		
- Little Creek (Lead)	0	0			0	0
- Fort Story	0	0			0	0
Marianas			95	79		
- Navy Region Guam (Lead)	0	0			0	0
- Anderson AFB	64	31			64	31
Total	1153	968	2121	2055	1153	968

In order to standardize the activities of all the Services, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (USD) published supplementary Joint-Basing guidance. In January 2006, the Deputy Secretary for Defense published the Initial Guidance for BRAC 2005 Joint-Basing Implementation. This 80-page document was intended to establish a common framework for Joint-Basing implementation. It mandated the joint bases prepare and sign Memorandums of Agreement (MOA) for all activities impacted. It also gave guidelines for development of new Standard Output Level Standards (COLS). The Base Development and Realignment Manual was published in March 2006 by the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Installations and Environment.

Common Output Level Standards (COLS)

The development of the new Common Output Level Standards (COLS) guidance was a significant undertaking. After the Deputy Secretary of Defense signed the overarching Implementation Guidance in January 2008, the next step was cross-Departmental effort to fill in details. They created multiple teams to analyze 49 Installation Support functions covering 139 sub-functions¹⁵. The final product was 265 performance-based metrics (definitions, outputs, cost drivers)¹⁶. In February 2008 they completed the detailed supplemental guidance for 31 key functional areas, consolidating metrics into the appropriate areas of expertise and responsibility (there was some consolidation and reductions during the planning process). Additional clarification memos were published in 2008 and 2009. The topics ranged from legal to resource management, command authorities to emergency management, and procurement to Non-Appropriated Funds (NAF) management.

DISCUSSION

Predicted Savings

The original premise for savings appears to be reductions in military and civilian manpower. Per the COBRA reports noted previously, reductions are exclusively from the Supported Service units. By joining similar units, any duplicate operations could be reduced, such as only one Commander /command staff from the Supporting Service would be needed, eliminating the Commander / staff billets from the Supported Service units. Since base support operations typically include Personnel, Facilities / Engineering, Security, Logistics, Services / MWR, etc, there could be several opportunities where command sections might be consolidated.

No clear information could be found on exactly where these reductions would become from, what functions would be reduced, etc. The BRAC reported a potential for over 1,100 military reductions due to the Joint-Basing Initiative. According to the MOAs, there were some reductions of the military billets. However, at the same time there were several bases that showed an increase in military billets prior to the 2010/2011 timeframe to fully institute Joint-Basing. The final reduction was 376 military billets (see Figure 6). The guidance did not allow transfer of military billets from the supported Service to the Supporting Service. The military billets were considered embedded, with the billet staying with the appropriate Service but working on the daily Installation Support as required. This allowed military to remain in their parent Service for wartime equipping, training, and deployments.¹⁷ It negated any reduction in military positions.

Before the first Joint Base was created, senior military leadership increased the priority for operational capability over effectiveness or efficiency. In a letter from the Joint Chief of Staff to all the Service Chiefs, in January 2008, Gen James E. Cartwright de-emphasized saving dollars

versus the need to ensure the changes enacted by BRAC 2005 were best for operational capabilities. He said "...the identification of cost savings is secondary to maintaining operational capabilities."¹⁸

GAO Reports

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) conducted several audits of the BRAC programs. The May 2005 GAO Report 05-614, *Observations on Prior and Current BRAC Rounds* had stated high expectations for the 2005 BRAC program to strengthen "...the emphasis on cross-servicing of selected functions and increased jointness in basing decisions."¹⁹

An early report, GAO report 05-556: *Defense Infrastructure, Funding Base Operations & Facilities Support*, Jun 05 stated "...As DOD increasingly emphasizes jointness and potentially joint-basing, problems such as those noted above are likely to increase in the absence of clearer delineation of BOS (base operations support) service requirements and common definitions of BOS functions."²⁰ The issue of needing a standard set of guidelines for base services was addressed. These later became the Common Operating Level of Service (COLS).

GAO Report 07-1203R: *Observations to 2005 BRAC*, Sep 07 stated savings assumptions for some civilian and military personnel reductions lacked manpower studies. "...The Commission expressed a concern that manpower reductions for at least one recommendation, which created several joint bases, were determined through the application of a formula and not through deliberations among commanders of affected installations and, therefore, manpower reductions were directed by the recommendation rather than derived from manpower studies and analyses of the functions to be carried out."²¹ Simply put, the projected savings for many of the joint base operations was made with no real-world experience, input, or forethought.

According to GAO Report 08-159: *Cost Estimates have Increased*, the auditors stated

“...Such joint recommendations involving more than one military component have created challenges in achieving unity of effort.”²² The GAO analysis recalculated the savings “...\$70 million decrease in the estimated savings of establishing joint bases at multiple locations, largely because the Army did not include its share of the expected savings due to unresolved issues concerning joint base operations.”²³ It went on to say, “DOD’s estimates for some key recommendations are uncertain because they are based on implementation details that are still evolving, especially for some complex recommendations such as establishing 12 new joint bases.” The Report stated “...establishing joint bases have been problematic since each service has its own concept of how installations should be managed and organized. In particular, during recent congressional testimony, the Air Force expressed views on joint-basing concepts contrary to those of OSD and the other services.”²⁴ In this report, GAO stated the DOD had revised the annual savings for Joint-Basing from \$183 million annually down to only \$116 million. This was about 2 years after the original plan was approved. As the process matured, it became readily apparent the anticipated savings for Joint-Basing continued to dwindle.

A follow-up report by GAO in 2009 highlighted even more reductions in predicted savings. In the GAO Report 09-217: *Military Base Realignments and Closures*, they stated “...the largest decrease in net annual recurring savings was about \$84 million for the recommendation to establish joint bases, which decreased from about \$116 million in savings in the fiscal year 2008 budget submission to \$32 million in the fiscal year 2009 budget submission.”²⁵ The revised present value of the net savings was estimated to be reduced from the original \$2.3 billion figure to only \$273 million.²⁶

The most detailed report on problems with the Joint-Basing initiative is GAO Report 09-336: *DOD Needs to Periodically Review Support Standards and Costs at Joint Bases and Better*

Inform Congress of Facility Sustainment Funding Uses, Mar 09. This audit was primarily on the issue of Joint-Basing concept, as well as the funding investment by the services for facility sustainment and maintenance operations. The report honed in on the impacts of the revised Common Operating Levels of Service, organizational structures, and traditional lack of funding by the Services for BOS. The report stated "...DOD has required the joint bases to deliver installation support in accordance with the new standards even though the military services have not previously funded installation support in the amounts needed to meet each of the standards. GAO's comparison of 40 selected standards to the service levels currently provided at the nine installations it visited showed that on average service levels would have to increase to meet the standards in about 27 percent of the areas compared. Second, in some instances the services' approach to implementing joint-basing will result in additional administrative costs and the loss of some existing installation support efficiencies."²⁷

Common Output Level Standards (COLS)

The GAO report gave a major reason that support costs were expected to raise is that OSD has required that the joint bases deliver installation support in accordance with the 267 new support standards, even though the military services have not previously funded installation support in the amounts needed to meet each of the standards."²⁸ The report references their study of 40 selected standards out of the 267 joint base service-level standards. At each installation they investigated the level of service that the installation was currently providing with the new standard. As shown in Figure 5, in about 27 percent of areas they compared, the joint base would have to increase their level of service previously provided to meet the standards." Since the Services would no longer be allowed to under-fund these programs, the net result will be increased sustainment and maintenance funding to be allocated to these bases.

Figure 5: GAO Report on Standards of Service Levels²⁹

Installation	Number of support areas compared*	Current service level meets the standard		Current service level is below the standard	
		Number of areas	Percentage	Number of areas	Percentage
Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek	38	23	61	15	39
Fort Story	37	27	73	10	27
Fort Lewis	40	26	65	14	35
McChord Air Force Base	39	32	82	7	18
McGuire Air Force Base	40	25	63	15	38
Fort Dix	38	31	82	7	18
Naval Air Engineering Station Lakehurst	36	22	61	14	39
Charleston Air Force Base	40	34	85	6	15
Naval Weapons Station Charleston	38	31	82	7	18
Total	346	251	73	95	27

*Source: GAO analysis of information provided by each installation.

Joint-Basing Organizations

The GAO Report 09-336 also mentioned the impact of several organizational changes stemming from the joint base initiative that were not anticipated during the development of the DOD and BRAC commission reports. The report stated “...Another key reason that joint-basing is expected to increase installation support costs is that the military services’ approach to joint-basing implementation will result in some additional administrative costs and the loss of some existing installation support efficiencies. For example, additional costs for installation administration are expected at the six joint bases where the Air Force will be the lead component.”³⁰ Traditional installations have one primary commander that is responsible for both the mission of the base (such as flying) as well as the base support. In these bases, the Air Force chose to create a new management level under the Air Base Wing concept. While the mission responsibilities stay with the flying wing commander, a comparable-level base support wing commander and associated staff are created. Even though this position normally comes from the previous mission support group structure, there is some duplication of administrative functions between the two wing units. The GAO report mentioned that the McGuire - Ft Dix - Lakehurst

joint base organization would require 19 additional billets. In all cases where the Air Force was the lead, the Air Force took no manpower reductions and in some bases increased billets. While the other Services that were the Supporting organization, they absorbed the new workload, manpower, and assets from the Supported organizations utilizing their existing organizational structure. However, no true reductions or savings were realized. This goes counter to the January 2008 Joint Basing Initial Implementation Guidance that stated “Billets required to staff the Joint Base organization, for both supporting and supported components, are expected to come from and not exceed existing manpower resources at the current installations.”³¹

Base Level Maintenance and Sustainment

Another issue impacting the predicted savings due to Joint-Basing noted by the GAO report was traditional underfunding of base level facility maintenance and sustainment programs by all the Services. Legacy Base Operating Support (BOS) shortfalls due to initial under-funding the programs have ranged from at least 10% (Air Force) to 17% (Army)³². After including further funds reductions due to diversions of funds to other programs, several of the bases undergoing the Joint-Basing initiative have been unfunded in prior years by as much as 60%.

The January 2008 BRAC Guidance required mandatory contribution to 100% funding for all expenses, particularly COLS for implementation period. It stated “...The total resources for the Joint-Basing will be based on the new organization delivering Installation Support at the MOA documented output levels.”³³ The MOA would be the final document outlining the approved output levels of service and required costs. The April 2008 Supplemental Guidance for Resources required the bases identify all resources provided for levels of service currently provided and those required to meet the COLS. It explicitly required the Joint Base Commanders to perform all support functions at the full COLS levels.³⁴ However, the various

Joint-Basing Standards that were finalized and published in Feb and Mar 2008 showed that not all Services were not providing them at the newly agreed upon levels. While the majority of the COLS were consistently being met by all the Services, some programs had discrepancies. As example, the Navy estimated an \$800,000 shortfall for Prestige Custodial services³⁵ and \$1.5 million shortfall for Real Property& Engineering Services.³⁶ The MOA guidance also directed full funding to COLS levels.³⁷

Memorandums of Agreement (MOA)

The culmination of all the guidance directives, agreements, plans, etc were the Memorandums of Agreement (MOA) required at each Joint-Basing location. The Supporting Base took the lead in organizing the management team to research and document all the information needed to be included in the MOA. The Joint Basing guidance specified a format for the MOA and the data to be included. The MOA's ranged in size from 121 pages for Ft Myer-Henderson Hall to 990 pages for Ft Lewis - McChord.

Contained within these MOA's are the total number of military and civilian manpower billets allocated to the Joint Basing operation either thru existing Supporting Unit billets and/or transferred billets from the Supporting Units. Figure 6 is a summary of the manpower and funds shortfalls as documented in the 12 MOAs.

For reasons mentioned earlier in this paper, the MOA's did not include any transfer of military billets. Overall, almost 14,700 civilian APF personnel are involved in the new Joint-Basing organization. Compared to the number of civilian billets before the Joint-Basing program started, there was a net growth of over 1,300 civilian billets (the column in Figure 6 is the number of reductions, so increases are shown as negative figures). The bulk of the increases (1,055) were at three Army installations where they were the Supporting unit at only one.

Figure 6. Predicted Savings by Installation, data extracted from Memorandums of Agreement for the 12 Joint-Basing locations

JOINT-BASE	MOA 2008/2009 Starting # Mil	MOA 2008/2009 # Pers Cuts Mil	MOA 2008/2009 # Pers Xfer Mil	MOA 2008/2009 Starting # APF Civ	MOA 2008/2009 # Pers Cuts APF Civ	MOA 2008/2009 # Pers Xfer APF Civ	MOA 2008/2009 # COLS Shortfall APF Civ	MOA 2008/2009 COLS Shortfall \$K BOS (2011 annual)
Fort Lewis - McChord								
- Fort Lewis (Lead)	25	0	25	1410	-579	1989	62	\$ 13,300
- McChord AFB	658	0	658	300	0	300	56	\$ 7,500
McGuire - Dix - Lackhurst								
- McGuire AFB (Lead)	1023	0	1023	421	0	421	50	\$ 6,303
- Ft Dix	0	0	0	394	0	394	38	\$ 1,248
- NAS Lakehurst	151	0	0	262	0	303	7	\$ 2,354
Andrews - Naval Washington								
- Andrews AFB (Lead)	1358	72	1286	449	3	446	79	\$ 17,341
- NAF Wash DC	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	\$ -
Anacostia - Bolling - NRL								
- Anacostia (Lead)	22	0	22	241	0	241	31	\$ 8,971
- Bolling	290	0	0	310	0	310	24	\$ 2,337
Myer - Henderson Hall								
- Myer VA (Lead)	44	0	0	609	0	471	17	\$ 1,325
- Henderson Hall	1	0	0	12	0	12	0	\$ 355
Elmendorf - Richardson								
- Elmendorf AFB (Lead)	1451	26	1425	584	-2	586	78	\$ 7,759
- Ft Richardson	11	-5	16	551	-168	719	125	\$ 21,267
Pearl Harbor - Hickam								
- Pearl Harbor (Lead)	473	107	366	1428	-71	1499	11	\$ 5,239
- Hickam AFB	613	7	606	553	4	549	75	\$ 8,434
San Antonio								
- Lackland AFB (Lead)	965	37	928	1891	-52	1943	144	\$ 20,887
- Randolph AFB	252	0	252	1014	15	999	24	\$ 6,993
- Ft Sam houston	24	0	24	850	-308	1158	56	\$ 9,552
Charleston - NWS								
- Charleston AFB (Lead)	886	41	845	320	-2	322	65	\$ 6,560
- NWS	68	13	55	361	-5	366	37	\$ 4,555
Langley - Eustis								
- Langley AFB (Lead)	1504	91	1413	423	-5	418	24	\$ 4,041
- Ft Eustis	140	25	115	351	-60	411	49	\$ 9,220
Norfolk - Fort Story								
- Little Creek (Lead)	202	27	175	153	-18	171	5	\$ 1,545
- Fort Story	4	0	0	27	0	27	44	\$ 1,718
Marianas								
- Navy Region Guam (Lead)	284	-1	285	254	-57	311	9	\$ 4,440
- Anderson AFB	697	-64	0	327	-4	331	51	\$ 8,226
Total	11150	376	9519	13495	-1309	14697	1176	\$ 181,470
Note: Delta is non-transferred Mil				Note: Civ growth before COLS			PV (@3% for 20yr)=\$2.69B	

The manpower tables derived from the various MOA's showed a clear picture that there was little regard for reductions and savings in the final negotiations and planning. These overall

increases in manpower do not even include the 1,176 additional civilian billets listed as “shortfalls” in order to meet the requirements of all the COLS programs. This is a far cry from the original BRAC 2005 report that estimated a reduction of 968 civilian billets. The impact to the Services will be expensive and long-lasting.

Funds requirements are also specified in the MOAs. Of particular interest is the shortfall needed to ensure the COLS requirements are fully funded. The estimated additional funds requirement starting in 2011 is approximately \$181.5 million per year. Amortized over the same 20 years (assuming 3% interest) as the original BRAC \$2.3 billion savings, the estimated Present Value of the additional costs is \$2.69 billion.

Senior officials involved with the Joint-basing initiative continue to state that the increased cost of installation support at these locations might be at least partially offset in the future. They surmise that as experience is gained as the Services work together, some new best practices and/or operational efficiencies will be identified and adopted. No explanation has been given on specific examples where additional savings might be realized. No real-world reductions have been noted to date.

Actual Savings

When looking back at the original BRAC COBRA report, it is not possible to ascertain how they calculated the savings of \$2.3 billion over 20 years. This author can only surmise they guessed that there would be a savings from a reduction of personnel from the Support Base as their assets were being transferred to the Supporting Base. The only firm data is the breakdown of number of civilian billets being reduced, all at the bases/posts that were being absorbed by their neighboring, larger installation. The predicted reductions compared to the number of billets finally transferred varied from 0% to a high of 41%. The overall average was 16%.

Figure 7: Predicted Manpower Reductions

JOINT-BASE	2005 BRAC Sep 05 # Personnel Saving Direct - Civ Vol 2, App K	Civilian Billets To Be Eliminated Cobra Report	MOA Civilian Billet Transfers	Theoretical % Reduced Compared to Civ Manpower	MOA Civilian Billet COLS Shortfall
Fort Lewis - McChord	116				
- Fort Lewis		0	0	0%	118
- McChord AFB		116	300	39%	56
McGuire - Dix - Lakehurst	123				
- McGuire AFB		0		0%	50
- Ft Dix		82	394	21%	45
- NAS Lakehurst		41	303	14%	7
Andrews - Naval Washington	9				
- Andrews AFB		0	0	0%	79
- COMNAV District Wash		0	0	0%	15
- NAF Wash DC		9	0	0%	0
Anacostia - Bolling - NRL	55				
- Anacostia		0	0	0%	31
- Bolling		55	310	18%	24
Myer - Henderson Hall	2				
- Myer VA		0	0	0%	17
- Henderson Hall		2	12	17%	0
Elmendorf - Richardson	140				
- Elmendorf AFB		0	0	0%	78
- Ft Richardson		140	719	19%	125
Pearl Harbor - Hickam	100				
- Pearl Harbor		0	0	0%	11
- Hickam AFB		100	549	18%	75
San Antonio	121				
- Lackland AFB		0	0	0%	144
- Randolph AFB		69	999	7%	24
- Ft Sam Houston		52	1158	4%	56
Charleston - NWS	101				
- Charleston AFB		0	0	0%	65
- NWS		101	366	28%	37
Langley - Eustis	170				
- Langley AFB		0	0	0%	24
- Ft Eustis		170	411	41%	49
Norfolk - Fort Story	0				
- Little Creek (Navy)		0	0	0%	5
- Fort Story		0	27	0%	44
Marianas	31				
- Navy Region Guam		0	0	0%	9
- Anderson AFB		31	331	9%	51
Total	968	968	5879	16%	1239

While the 2005 BRAC team originally planned for reductions in manpower when the bases/posts support operations were consolidated, it appears the individual units did not

volunteer to reduce their manpower. They probably all thought that they needed X people to do their jobs under the old system and still required the same X people to the same job on their installation (even though they may be working for someone on a nearby installation). The gaining units apparently had the same general concept. A fire station or child care center on the Supported Base Y required the same equipment and staffs as when they were operating under their previous leadership. Except for some minor overhead positions, most units stayed relatively unchanged. The BRAC calculations appeared to assume some “economy of scale” and efficiencies would result. A 10% reduction might have appeared reasonable in 2005/2006.

IMPACTS

The purpose of the Joint Basing concept was to gain efficiencies and savings from consolidating similar support serves at geographically close installations. According to the January 2008 Initial Guidance, “...all savings and efficiencies must be reflected in the MOA.”³⁸ Careful review of all 12 MOA’s showed NO savings or efficiencies have been realized. Based upon the current trend that all savings have evaporated and replaced by additional expenditures, the likelihood of future savings is doubtful. If any positive efficiencies are derived, they will be small and have little impact upon the budget.

Money

The largest impact to the Services and the original 26 installations will be money. Joint Basing will cost the Department of Defense additional funds compared to the original organizational structure. In the early stages of coordination, some Services were worried that the level of effort and funds expended to keep their installation up to their standards would be reduced when another Service took over management responsibilities. As is well know, the Air Force has traditionally concentrated more on base support services and facility appearance than

her sister services. With the coordination by all Services with the new (higher) COLS and the MOA agreements requiring the Supporting organization to meet these standards, this concern was avoided. Additional manpower and BOS costs (See Figure 6 for compilation of information derived from the various MOAs) require additional funds to be sourced to cover the mandated requirements. While the individual Joint Bases will receive the benefits of additional funding, this will have a broader negative impact for the military Services. Since additional Defense dollars will probably not be available (assuming zero \$ growth in the budgets), then the additional funding for these 12 joint locations must be withheld from other Service programs and/or bases/posts. This will enlarge the disparity between the normal, single-Service installations and the Joint-basing sites. The joint bases will get higher levels of service, they will be fully funded, and the other installations will have to take cuts in their services to pay for it.

Manpower

Another area being impacted by Joint-basing will be Manpower. The original intent was to DECREASE civilian positions by almost 1,000. As noted as early as the September 2005 BRAC Report, the Commission was uncertain of manpower savings because they were not “...derived from functional analyses and manpower studies”,³⁹ but through only a generic formula developed by DOD. However, the end result will be an INCREASE of more than amount (1,176 as shown at the bottom of Figure 6). Traditionally, military and civilian billets have been essentially capped. They are not simply created, but more often traded and moved around to meet the highest priorities. The only solution would be to utilize draw-downs elsewhere in the Services’ budgets to plus-up the Joint Bases. However, the joint-basing requirements will not be a high priority relative to needs elsewhere in the Services. Unless actions are implemented for these locations, the additional manpower for the Joint Bases will remain unfunded and vacant.

Non-Tangible Affects

There are many non-tangible affects to the civilian and military workforce because they will now be incorporated into an unfamiliar organizational structure. Many personnel have been working for a particular military Service for their entire career, but are now required to integrate into another Service's culture. This will continue to cause uneasiness and emotions from employees, possibly impacting productivity. For the base populace from the Supported organizations, they will have to learn to operate under a new base support environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of the timelines and deadlines to enact Joint Basing at all the mandated locations, it is impossible to stop the process at this time. Some have already implemented the changes (1 October 2009 for Phase I) while the last is to be completed by 30 September 2010 (Phase II). At the working level, the organizations appear to be working together with the common goal of making the Joint Base as functional as possible for all parties. If the Joint-Basing concept is to see any net savings, some of the ground rules for its implementation will have to change. This would require the reconsideration of some policies and guidance from OSD and CJCS level. The following proposals would normalize the Joint Bases to the majority of the military establishment and prevent a large portion of the net cost increases identified previously.

Reduce mandatory funding levels: All Services have traditionally been forced to under-fund base support operations. In the constrained budget environment of today's military, the levels of funding have been anywhere from 65%-90%⁴⁰. Just because these 26 installations are converting to Joint Base operations should not make them immune from the same funding restrictions that all bases must endure. Unless additional BOS funding from Congress is provided specifically for these locations, it would be fair to all installations to equally distribute the funding shortfalls

to everyone, including the Joint Bases. All organizations at the Supporting and Supported locations must understand that funding is limited to no more than previous levels. All base support services would then generally remain at their previous levels.

Personnel Shortfalls: Most bases / posts had been adequately performing their missions before Joint Basing with the manpower levels they had. While there were known shortfalls, leadership had to make conscious decisions on priorities to do the most they could with the resources available. It is recommended that this condition remain a purview of leadership at the installation level. Fill rates of civilian billets at the Joint Base locations should be no greater than at any other military installation.

Re-evaluation of the Common Output Levels of Service (COLS): The original development of the COLS appears to have been done with the primary goal of quickly getting consensus by all the Services with no regards to costs. Since each Service would not want to accept a level of service LESS than what they were providing previously, the net result was any new standard was a product of the highest common denominator. This “choose the best from each list” concept was not the most cost-effective. The committees that developed each standard in 2008 should reconvene with the new goal of developing revised standards at the lowest adequate and cost-effective level. While this would require some Services to accept a few reductions, the overall benefit would be cost savings to the Joint Bases and to the entire Department of Defense (assuming the revised standards would become the norm at all military installations).

Future BRAC actions: Recommend they incorporate lessons learned from this Joint Basing exercise. The panel should study the actual versus projected savings / costs for all previous BRAC initiatives to see how accurate the initial calculations were. Once other BRAC tasks are analyzed to the level of detail as Joint-Basing, many (if not most) of the previous savings would

be found to be highly over-rated. As in this case, they might find more situations where the planned savings actually turned into additional costs. Therefore, before undertaking new initiatives, their cost analysis should be more extensive and take into account the many issues discovered during the accomplishment of previous BRAC initiatives.

Due to the significant additional costs for BOS and personnel at the 12 joint-basing locations, the resulting impact on the rest of the Services' programs, and the difficulties in mixing the cultures of the various Services, DOD should undertake serious consideration of reversing this initiative. While some of the smaller joint-basing locations may actually become effective and efficient (i.e., some of the Virginia / DC area sites), returning most of the major installations back to full control by their parent organizations would eliminate the vast majority of the \$2.7B in unanticipated additional expenses generated by Joint-basing initiative.

CONCLUSION

BRAC 2005 was more of reorganization and refinements versus reductions. Most "easy" reductions were already taken in previous BRAC rounds. Joint-Basing concept was intended to save \$2.3 billion over the 20 year period. The original BRAC COBRA report predicted reduction of over 2,000 civilian and military billets. However, no military billets were taken and civilian positions actually increased by the time the transfers were accomplished. New multi-Service requirements for Common Output Levels of Service for base support services added over 1,000 new civilian billets and additional Base Operating Support costs. New organization structures added overhead requirements. The net result was the originally predicted SAVINGS will become overall cost INCREASES. Unless the baseline criterion is changed, the Services will have to source additional manpower and funds to support the Joint-Basing initiative at the expense of other installations.

-
- ¹ DOD BRAC report, Vol 1, Part 2, dated May 05, page H&SA-43.
- ² COBRA Report Parts 1 & 2, data, 2 Jun 2005 and run on 23 March 2006.
- ³ Sorenson, *Military Base Closure*, 76.
- ⁴ Ibid, 77.
- ⁵ Ibid, 18.
- ⁶ Ibid, xii.
- ⁷ Ibid, 77.
- ⁸ Ibid, 78.
- ⁹ 2005 BRAC Commission 8 September 2005 Report, Vol 1, pg iii.
- ¹⁰ Joint Basing 101 Briefing by 15 Mission Support Group, May 2009, slide 4.
- ¹¹ Ibid slide 19.
- ¹² Ibid, slide 19.
- ¹³ DOD BRAC report, Vol 1, Part 2, dated May 05, page H&SA-43
- ¹⁴ COBRA Report Parts 1 & 2, data, 2 Jun 2005 and run on 23 March 2006
- ¹⁵ *Initial Guidance for BRAC 2005 Joint Basing Implementation*, Attachment D, pages D1-32.
- ¹⁶ *Joint Basing Variance and Deviation Process*, 14 May 2008, briefing, slide 3.
- ¹⁷ DOD Initial Guidance for BRAC 2005 Joint Basing Implementation, dated 22 Jan 08, 4.
- ¹⁸ Joint Chief of Staff Letter, "Joint Basing Implementation," 22 Sep 09.
- ¹⁹ GAO Report 05-614, *Observations on Prior and Current BRAC Rounds*, May 05, 1.
- ²⁰ GAO Report 05-556: *Defense Infrastructure, Funding Base Operations & Facilities Support*, Jun 05, 20.
- ²¹ GAO Report 07-1203R: *Observations to 2005 BRAC*, Sep 07, 7.
- ²² GAO Report 08-159, *Cost Estimates have Increased*, Dec 07, 1.
- ²³ Ibid, 18.
- ²⁴ Ibid, 39.
- ²⁵ GAO Report 09-217, *Military Base Realignments and Closures*, Jan 09, 21.
- ²⁶ Ibid, 42.
- ²⁷ GAO Report 09-336: *DOD Needs to Periodically Review Support Standards and Costs at Joint Bases and Better Inform Congress of Facility Sustainment Funding Uses*, Mar 09, Highlights page.
- ²⁸ Ibid, 19.
- ²⁹ Ibid, 20.
- ³⁰ Ibid, 21.
- ³¹ *Joint Basing Initial Guidance for 2005 BRAC Joint Basing Implementation*, 22 January 2008, 5.
- ³² GAO Report 09-336: *DOD Needs to Periodically Review Support Standards and Costs at Joint Bases and Better Inform Congress of Facility Sustainment Funding Uses*, Mar 09, 25.
- ³³ *Joint Basing Initial Guidance for 2005 BRAC Joint Basing Implementation*, 22 January 2008, 6.
- ³⁴ Issuance of the Resources Management Supplemental Guidance for Implementing and Operating Joint Base, 17 April 2008, 3.
- ³⁵ Joint Basing Standards, Facility Operations, March 2008, April 2008, 35.
- ³⁶ Ibid, 41.
- ³⁷ GAO Report 09-336: *DOD Needs to Periodically Review Support Standards and Costs at Joint Bases and Better Inform Congress of Facility Sustainment Funding Uses*, Mar 09, 19.
- ³⁸ *Joint Basing Initial Guidance for 2005 BRAC Joint Basing Implementation*, 22 January 2008, 30.
- ³⁹ 2005 BRAC Commission Sep 05 Report, Vol 1, 221.
- ⁴⁰ GAO Report 09-336: *DOD Needs to Periodically Review Support Standards and Costs at Joint Bases and Better Inform Congress of Facility Sustainment Funding Uses*, March 2009, 26.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

Sorenson, David S., Dr. *Military Base Closures, A Reference Handbook*. Westport, Conn: Prager Security International, 2007.

Laws and BRAC Guidance:

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, 1991 Report to the President.

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, 1995 Report to the President.

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Public Law 101-510.

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Public Law 101-510. As amended FY2003.

Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Public Law 101-510. As amended FY2005.

DOD Base Closure and Realignment Report, Volume 1, Parts 1 & 2, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 13 May 2005.

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report, Volumes 1 & 2, Chairman Anthony J. Principe. Arlington, VA: Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, 8 September 2005.

BRAC 2005 COBRA Realignment Summary Report, Vol 1 & 2. Downloaded from http://www.defense.gov/brac/minutes/brac_admin_documentation.html, reports created 23 March 2006.

Department of Defense (DOD) / Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Guidance:

Army, Wayne, Under Secretary of Defense. Letter to various DOD offices, *Joint Basing Phase II Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Workshop Information Package*, 22 January 2009.

Army, Wayne, Under Secretary of Defense. Letter to various DOD offices, *Phase 2 Joint Base (JB) Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Schedule*, 23 October 2008.

Cartwright, James E., Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Letter to Services' Chairmen, *Joint basing Implementation*, 16 September 2008.

Department of Defense Document. *The Report of the Department of Defense on Fiscal Year 2006 Planned Expenditures from the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005*, 2006.

Department of Defense (DOD) Manual 4165.66-M. *Base Development and Realignment Manual*, 1 March 2006.

Department of Defense Document. *Department of Defense Base Realignment and Closure Account IV Army (BRAC 95) Fiscal Year (FY) 2008/2009 Budget Estimates*, February 2007.

Department of Defense Document. *Department of Defense (DOD) Initial Guidance for BRAC 2005 Joint Basing Implementation*, w/ cover letter from Deputy Secretary of Defense, *Transforming Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) – Joint Basing*, 22 January 2008.

DOD Office of Inspector General Report D-2005-090, *Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross- Service Group Data Integrity and Internal Control Processes for Base Realignment and Closure 2005*, 15 July 2005.

Under Secretary for Defense, Supplemental Guidance Letters to various DOD offices:

- *Nonappropriated Funds (NAF) Civilian Human Resources (HR)*, 14 Nov 2008.
- *Civilian Human Resources (HR)*, 21 April 2008.
- *Information Technologies Services Management (ITSM)*, 21 April 2008.

- *Legal Support Services*, 22 April 2008.
- *Nonappropriated Funds (NAF) Activities and Programs*, 21 April 2008.
- *Command Authorities and Responsibilities*, 16 April 2008.
- *Emergency Management (EM)*, 15 April 2008.
- *Environmental*, 15 April 2008.
- *Facilities Investment*, 15 April 2008.
- *Facilities Operations*, 15 April 2008.
- *Organizational Structure*, 15 April 2008.
- *Personal Property & Plant Equipment (PP&PE)*, 15 April 2008.
- *Procurement Operations*, 15 April 2008.
- *Real Property Management and Planning*, 15 April 2008.
- *Resources (Personnel and Financial) Management*, 17 April 2008.
- *Military Personnel*, 24 April 2008.
- *Resource Management Change 1*, 6 February 2009.
- *Real Property Change 1*, 19 February 2009.
- *Additional PB-14 Information*, 13 April 2009.
- *Real Property Change 2 and Facility Investment Change 1*, 25 March 2009.
- *Common Output Level Standards (COLS) for 47 areas*, February 2008.

General Accountability Office (GAO) Reports:

- Government Accountability Office. GAO 04-760, *Military Base Closures, Assessment of DOD's 2004 Report on the Need for a Base Realignment and Closure Round*. Washington, DC: Office of Defense Capabilities and Management, May 2004.
- Government Accountability Office. GAO 05-614, *Military Base Closures, Observations on Prior and Current BRAC Rounds*. Washington, DC: Office of Defense Capabilities and Management, May 2005.
- Government Accountability Office. GAO 05-556, *Defense Infrastructure, Funding Base Operations & Facilities Support*. Washington, DC: Office of Defense Capabilities and Management, June 2005.
- Government Accountability Office. GAO 07-1203R, *Military Base Realignments and Closures, Observations Related to the 2005 Round*. Washington, DC: Office of Defense Capabilities and Management, September 2007.
- Government Accountability Office. GAO 08-159, *Military Base Realignments and Closures, Cost Estimates have Increased and are Likely to Continue*. Washington, DC: Office of Defense Capabilities and Management, December 2007.
- Government Accountability Office. GAO 09-217, *Military Base Realignments and Closures, DOD Faces Challenges in Implementing Recommendations on Time and Is Not Consistently Updating Savings Estimates*. Washington, DC: Office of Defense Capabilities and Management, January 2009.
- Government Accountability Office. GAO 09-336, *Defense Infrastructure, DOD Needs to Periodically Review Support Standards and Costs at Joint Bases and Better Inform Congress of Facility Sustainment Funding Uses*. Washington, DC: Office of Defense Capabilities and Management, March 2009.

BRAC / Army / Air Force Knowledge website depositories (including minutes / slides from various meeting / briefings):

DOD BRAC Website: <http://www.defenselink.mil/brac> .

BRAC Office website: <https://www.brac.gov/index.html> .

US Army BRAC Division Website: <http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/index.html> .

US Army Knowledge Now Website: <https://www.us.army.mil> .

US Navy BRAC Program Management Office Website: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil> .

US Air Force Knowledge Now Joint-base websites: <https://afkm.wpafb.af.mil> .

- Headquarters Air Force (HAF) JB.
- Air Mobility Command (AMC) JB.
- Air Education and Training Command (AETC) JB.
- Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) JB.
- JB Charleston.
- JB Lewis-McChord.
- JB McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst.
- JB Langley-Eustis.
- JB Guam-Anderson.
- JB Bolling-Andrews.
- JB Elmendorf-Richardson.

DOD Civilian Personnel Management Service Website: <http://www.cpms.osd.mil>.

Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment & Logistics, Air Force Real Property Agency (AFRPA) Website: <http://www.safie.hq.af.mil/afropa>.

Memorandums of Agreement for 12 Joint Base Locations:

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Joint Base Myer -Henderson Hall, 10 October 2008.

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Joint Base Andrews-Naval Air Facility Washington, MD, 30 October 2008.

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Joint Expeditionary Base, Little Creek-Fort Story, 7 November 2008.

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Joint Region Marianas, 23 January 2009.

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst, 10 April 2009.

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Joint Base Charleston, SC, 2 July 2009.

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, 4 August 2009.

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Joint Base Lewis-McChord, 16 August 2009.

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Joint Base, Langley-Eustis, 20 August 2009.

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, 24 August 2009.

Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Installation support activities at Lackland AFB, Fort Sam Houston, and Randolph AFB, 16 October 2009.
Installation Support Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Anacostia – Bolling, 24 November 2009.

Misc Documents / Briefings:

Department of the Army. *Base Realignment and Closure Smart Book for Commanders*, 14 May 2008.

Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment). *Joint Basing “Roll Out” Brief*, VTC PowerPoint briefing, 16 April 2008.

AF/A7CIP to the Professional Housing Management Association. *Joint Basing for PHMA Conference*, PowerPoint briefing, February 2009.

15 Mission Support Group. *Joint Basing 101*, PowerPoint briefing, May 2009.

HQAF/ILE. *Joint Basing Variance and Deviation Process*, PowerPoint briefing, 14 May 2008.

Charleston JB office. *Joint Basing 101 & Joint Base Charleston Familiarization*, PowerPoint briefing, 15 May 2009.

87 ABW/CC. *Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst*, PowerPoint briefing Town Hall meeting, 4 June 2009.

Joint Basing Program Management Office (JBPMO) monthly newsletters, December 2008 thru July 2009.