



February 2016

# MILITARY BASE REALIGNMENTS AND CLOSURES

## More Guidance and Information Needed to Take Advantage of Opportunities to Consolidate Training

Accessible Version

# GAO Highlights

Highlights of [GAO-16-45](#), a report to congressional committees

## Why GAO Did This Study

The 2005 BRAC round was the fifth round of base closures and realignments undertaken by DOD since 1988, and it was the largest, most complex, and costliest. DOD has relied on the BRAC process to reduce excess infrastructure and realign bases to meet changing force structure needs. According to the Secretary of Defense, BRAC 2005 provided opportunities to foster jointness among the military services. House Report 113-446 included a provision for GAO to review the status of BRAC 2005 recommendations to reduce infrastructure and promote opportunities for jointness. This report evaluates the extent to which DOD has (1) implemented the recommendations requiring the services to relocate select training functions to increase opportunities for jointness and (2) determined if implementing these recommendations has achieved cost savings. GAO reviewed guidance, course listings, and cost data; interviewed DOD and service officials.

## What GAO Recommends

To help improve the implementation of jointness-focused recommendations in any future BRAC rounds, GAO recommends that DOD provide additional guidance for consolidating training and reporting BRAC costs and require the development of baseline cost data. DOD partially concurred with the recommendation to clarify guidance for reporting BRAC costs but did not concur with the other recommendations, stating that GAO misunderstood its approach to joint training. GAO believes its findings and recommendations are valid and addresses these points in the report.

View [GAO-16-45](#). For more information, contact Brian J. Lepore at (202) 512-4523 or [leporeb@gao.gov](mailto:leporeb@gao.gov)

February 2016

# MILITARY BASE REALIGNMENTS AND CLOSURES

## More Guidance and Information Needed to Take Advantage of Opportunities to Consolidate Training

### What GAO Found

For each of the six recommendations GAO reviewed from the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round, the Department of Defense (DOD) implemented the recommendations by requiring military services to relocate select training functions; however, GAO found that two of the six training functions reviewed were able to take advantage of the opportunity provided by BRAC to consolidate training so that services could train jointly. In implementing the remaining four BRAC recommendations, DOD relocated similar training functions run by separate military services into one location, but the services did not consolidate training functions. For example, they do not regularly coordinate or share information on their training goals and curriculums. DOD's justification for numerous 2005 BRAC recommendations included the assumption that realigning military department activities to one location would enhance jointness—defined by DOD as activities, operations, or organizations in which elements of two or more military departments participate. For these four training functions, DOD missed the opportunity to consolidate training to increase jointness, because it provided guidance to move personnel or construct buildings but not to measure progress toward consolidated training. Without additional guidance for consolidating training, the services will not be positioned to take advantage of such an opportunity in these types of recommendations as proposed by DOD and will face challenges encouraging joint training activities and collaboration across services.

DOD cannot determine if implementing the 2005 BRAC joint training recommendations that GAO reviewed has resulted in savings in operating costs. For three of the recommendations in this review, the services did not develop baseline operating costs before implementing the BRAC recommendations, which would have enabled it to determine whether savings were achieved. Without developing baseline cost data, DOD will be unable to estimate any cost savings resulting from similar recommendations in any future BRAC rounds. Further, costs reported to DOD by the training functions business plan managers for implementation of two of the six recommendations in this review likely did not include all BRAC-related costs funded from outside the BRAC account. A DOD memo requires BRAC business plan managers to submit all BRAC-related expenditures, including those funded from both inside and outside of the BRAC account. GAO identified at least \$110 million in implementation costs that likely should have been reported to DOD in accordance with the memo but were not; therefore the \$35.1 billion total cost reported for BRAC 2005 is likely somewhat understated. A DOD official stated that it was up to the military departments to ensure that all BRAC implementation costs were accounted for and that the military departments had the flexibility to determine which costs were associated with the BRAC recommendation and which were attributed to other actions. GAO found that this flexibility in determining which costs were to be reported as BRAC costs led to inconsistencies in what kinds of projects had their costs counted as BRAC implementation costs. By clarifying in guidance what is to be included as a BRAC implementation cost, DOD can help ensure that it has an accurate accounting of the final costs for any future BRAC implementation and that DOD and Congress are able to determine how much money is spent on any future BRAC rounds.

---

# Contents

---

---

Letter	1	
	Background	7
	DOD Implemented BRAC 2005 Recommendations to Relocate Selected Training Functions but Missed Some Opportunities to Consolidate Training to Increase Jointness	9
	DOD Cannot Determine Cost Savings from Implementing BRAC 2005 Joint Training Recommendations, and It Likely Did Not Report All Implementation Costs	16
	Conclusions	26
	Recommendations for Executive Action	27
	Agency Comments and Our Evaluation	28

---

Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date	34	
Appendix II: Text of BRAC Recommendations Included in Our Review	64	
Appendix III: Comments from the Department of Defense	70	
Appendix IV: GAO Contact and Staff Acknowledgments	74	
	GAO Contact	74
	Staff Acknowledgments	74

---

Appendix V: Accessible Data	75	
	Agency Comment Letter	75

---

Related GAO Products	89
----------------------	----

---

Tables		
	Table 1: BRAC 2005 Recommendations Included in Our Review	4
	Table 2: BRAC Actions for All BRAC Rounds	8
	Table 3: Summary of BRAC 2005 Recommendations Requiring Military Services to Relocate Select Training Functions to Consolidate Training to Increase Jointness	12

---

---

Figure

Figure 1: Movements Associated with BRAC Recommendations in Our Review

10

---

**Abbreviations**

ASIP	Army Stationing Installation Plan
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
COBRA	Cost of Base Realignment Actions
DHA	Defense Health Agency
DOD	Department of Defense
HUD	Department of Housing and Urban Development
LRA	Local Redevelopment Authority
OSD	Office of the Secretary of Defense

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. The published product may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.



February 18, 2016

Congressional Committees

The 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round<sup>1</sup> was the fifth round of base closures and realignments undertaken by the Department of Defense (DOD) since 1988, and it was the largest, most complex, and costliest BRAC round of the five. DOD has relied on the BRAC process as a means of reducing excess infrastructure and realigning bases to meet changing force structure needs. However, in 2005, in a letter to the chairman of the BRAC Commission, the Secretary of Defense noted that the decade since the previous BRAC round had been a period of dramatic change involving new challenges posed by international terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, ungoverned areas, rogue states, and nonstate actors. The Secretary saw BRAC 2005 as different from previous BRAC rounds, which focused on reducing excess infrastructure. The Secretary saw it as a unique opportunity to adjust U.S. base structure to meet these new challenges and to be positioned to meet further challenges anticipated during the next two decades, such as where to locate forces returning to the United States from overseas bases. Therefore, in addition to reducing excess infrastructure and producing savings, BRAC 2005 provided opportunities for furthering transformation and fostering jointness.<sup>2</sup>

In contrast to recommendations from prior rounds, many of the recommendations that came out of the BRAC 2005 round were aimed at creating opportunities to develop jointness, such as expanding and establishing joint military medical centers, creating joint bases, pursuing opportunities to promote joint training, and consolidating all of the military

---

<sup>1</sup>Congress authorized BRAC 2005 with the passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-107, Title XXX (2001). The law reauthorized the BRAC process by amending the authority under which the 1991, 1993, and 1995 rounds had been carried out, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-510, Title XXIX (10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

<sup>2</sup>According to DOD, “joint” connotes activities, operations, organizations, etc., in which elements of two or more military departments participate. There are three military departments: the Department of the Army, the Department of the Air Force, and the Department of the Navy—which includes the Marine Corps.

---

services' medical training for enlisted personnel at one installation. BRAC 2005 included several recommendations that created new joint training centers of excellence and realigned training functions to, among other things, provide opportunities to enhance jointness.<sup>3</sup> According to DOD's justification for several of the joint training-related recommendations contained in the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report, one part of the purpose for those recommendations was to provide a "train as we fight: jointly" perspective to training.

Since 2005, we have issued over 30 reports and testimonies on BRAC 2005 planning, implementation, costs, and savings; this work highlights information DOD can use to improve the process for developing and implementing BRAC recommendations. For example, in our March 2013 report on lessons learned from the BRAC 2005 round, we found that DOD's process for providing the BRAC Commission with cost and savings estimates was hindered by underestimating recommendation-specific requirements and that DOD did not fully anticipate information technology requirements for many of the recommendations.<sup>4</sup> Our report made several recommendations designed to improve any future BRAC rounds and also suggested legislative changes that Congress should consider to enhance its oversight of any future BRAC rounds. DOD concurred with three and partially concurred with two out of the 10 recommendations in this report but has not taken any actions because, according to DOD officials, these recommendations can only be implemented if another round of BRAC is conducted. The Related GAO Products page at the end of this report provides a list of our BRAC reports and testimonies. In addition, see appendix I for findings, recommendations, and DOD's response and actions from selected BRAC-related reports.

House Report 113-446, which accompanied a proposed bill for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, included a provision for us to review the status of DOD's actions to implement the BRAC 2005 recommendations that were designed to reduce infrastructure and promote opportunities for jointness. This report

---

<sup>3</sup> DOD used the term "center of excellence" to refer to several recommendations that called for consolidating training functions across and within services.

<sup>4</sup> GAO, *Military Bases: Opportunities Exist to Improve Future Base Realignment and Closure Rounds*, [GAO-13-149](#) (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 7, 2013).

---

evaluates the extent to which DOD has (1) implemented the BRAC 2005 recommendations requiring the military services to relocate select training functions to increase opportunities for joint training and (2) determined if implementing these BRAC 2005 recommendations has achieved cost savings.

To address these objectives, we first identified the BRAC 2005 recommendations that were designed to reduce infrastructure and promote opportunities for jointness. Based on communication with your staff and language in the report provision that referred to joint centers of excellence and joint training activities, we focused our review on joint training functions created by BRAC 2005. We reviewed all 198 recommendations in the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report and identified 13 recommendations that were designed to (1) merge or consolidate a training function to make it more joint, (2) reduce infrastructure, and (3) focus on training or developing centers of excellence. From those 13 recommendations focused on training or on developing centers of excellence, we identified and selected six for this review that were directed at multiple services and called for consolidating infrastructure at one location. Specifically, we identified five recommendations that met all of our criteria:<sup>5</sup> (1) Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training, (2) Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training, (3) Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education, (4) Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site, and (5) Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training.<sup>6</sup> In addition, we chose to review the recommendation related to Ft. Bragg, North Carolina, because one part of this recommendation was to move the Army's 7th Special Forces Group to Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, to support joint training

---

<sup>5</sup>We also identified the recommendation that created the San Antonio Regional Medical Center, Texas, (recommendation #172) but excluded it from this review because we have issued reports recently covering this recommendation. See GAO, *Defense Health Care Reform: Actions Needed to Help Realize Potential Cost Savings from Medical Education and Training*, [GAO-14-630](#) (Washington, D.C.: July 31, 2014) and GAO, *Defense Health Care: Applying Key Management Practices Should Help Achieve Efficiencies within the Military Health System*, [GAO-12-224](#) (Washington, D.C.: Apr. 12, 2012). We also identified recommendation #197, Post Graduate Education, but excluded this recommendation because it was never implemented.

<sup>6</sup>For recommendation #128, Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training, we reviewed the portion of the recommendation that realigned Randolph Air Force Base, Texas by relocating undergraduate navigator training to Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida because this part of the recommendation sought to create joint training between the Air Force and the Navy. The other part of the recommendation, focused on pilot training within the Air Force only.

with the Air Force Special Operations unit located there.<sup>7</sup> We visited the locations of all six training functions, interviewed officials, and collected relevant data and information. Appendix II contains the text of the BRAC recommendations we reviewed, and table 1 shows the recommendations that we reviewed, the location of the new training function, and the services involved.

**Table 1: BRAC 2005 Recommendations Included in Our Review**

Recommendation (recommendation number)	Description of recommendation	Location of new training function	Services included
Fort Bragg, North Carolina <sup>a</sup> (#4)	Realign Fort Bragg, North Carolina, by relocating the 7th Special Forces Group to Eglin AFB, Florida, and by activating the 4th Brigade Combat Team, 82nd Airborne Division and relocating European-based forces to Fort Bragg, North Carolina.	Eglin Air Force Base, Florida	Army, Air Force
Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training (#122)	Realign Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, by relocating the Transportation Management School to Fort Lee, Virginia.	Fort Lee, Virginia	Army, Air Force
Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training (#123)	Realign Lackland Air Force Base, Texas by relocating Culinary Training to Fort Lee, Virginia, establishing it as a Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training.	Fort Lee, Virginia	Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps
Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training & Education (#124)	Realign Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama; Naval Air Station Meridian, Mississippi; and Naval Station Newport, Rhode Island, by relocating religious training and education to Fort Jackson, South Carolina, establishing a Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education.	Fort Jackson, South Carolina	Army, Air Force, Navy
Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site (#125)	Realign various military installations to stand up the Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.	Eglin Air Force Base, Florida	Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps <sup>b</sup>
Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training (#128)	Realign Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, by relocating Undergraduate Navigator Training to Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida.	Naval Air Station, Florida	Air Force, Navy

Source: GAO analysis of DOD information | GAO-16-45

Notes:

<sup>a</sup>This recommendation included multiple actions. For this review, we evaluated only the relocation of the 7th Special Forces Group to Eglin Air Force Base.

<sup>b</sup>Although the Marine Corps was included in the BRAC 2005 recommendation, and originally conducted training at Eglin Air Force Base, it has recently moved its training to Marine Corps Air

<sup>7</sup>The recommendation to move the 7th Special Forces Group to Eglin Air Force Base was included in Recommendation #4, Fort. Bragg, North Carolina, which also activated the 4th Brigade Combat Team, 82d Airborne Division and relocated European-based forces to Fort Bragg.

---

Station Beaufort, South Carolina due to environmental constraints at Eglin Air Force Base. Some Marines will continue to train with the Navy at Eglin Air Force Base on the Navy variant of the Joint Strike Fighter.

<sup>c</sup>This recommendation included multiple actions. For this review, we evaluated the Undergraduate Navigator Training only.

To evaluate the extent to which DOD has implemented the BRAC 2005 recommendations requiring the military services to relocate select training functions to increase opportunities for joint training, we reviewed the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report and implementing guidance for each recommendation. We compared this guidance to leading practices we developed in our prior work on consolidations.<sup>8</sup> We also reviewed documentary evidence, such as course listings, and interviewed DOD, service, and installation officials responsible for the implementation and oversight of these BRAC recommendations to gain a better understanding of the process used to implement each recommendation and to determine the extent to which each training function created by the BRAC recommendation was able to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the BRAC recommendation to develop more consolidated training.

To evaluate the extent to which DOD has determined whether implementing these BRAC recommendations has achieved cost savings, we spoke with relevant program and budget officials with knowledge of program budgets. We attempted to gather data on operating costs of these six training functions from before and after BRAC implementation; however, we found that these data were not consistently available, as discussed in the report. We assessed practices reported by these officials

---

<sup>8</sup>See GAO, *Streamlining Government: Questions to Consider When Evaluating Proposals to Consolidate Physical Infrastructure and Management Functions*, [GAO-12-542](#) (Washington, D.C.: May 23, 2012). This report identifies key questions that agencies should consider when evaluating whether to consolidate physical infrastructure and management functions and presents key practices that can help these consolidations. To identify these key questions and practices, we identified and reviewed relevant literature on public sector consolidations produced by academic institutions, professional associations, think tanks, news outlets, and various other organizations. This report includes leading practices such as agreeing on specific goals, basing consolidations on clearly presented business-case analysis, and identifying relevant stakeholders.

---

against practices identified in our prior work on cost baselines.<sup>9</sup> Any operating costs presented in this report are estimates included to illustrate possible cost changes or to highlight inconsistencies in the data. In addition, we gathered data from the services on the costs of implementing these six BRAC recommendations and compared it to the data the services provided to DOD in 2012. We examined the data in light of DOD's August 2010 memo requiring BRAC business plan managers to submit all BRAC-related expenditures, including those funded from both inside and outside of the BRAC account.<sup>10</sup> We discussed with relevant service officials differences in and the oversight of the available data. Specifically, we discussed the reasons for the differences and which costs were in fact implementation costs. We discuss the limitations of the data in this report.

We conducted this performance audit from September 2014 to February 2016 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

---

<sup>9</sup>See GAO, *Defense Health Care Reform: Actions Needed to Help Realize Potential Cost Savings from Medical Education and Training*, [GAO-14-630](#) (Washington, D.C.: July 31, 2014); *GPRA Performance Reports*, [GAO/GGD-96-66R](#) (Washington, D.C.: Feb. 14, 1996); and *Agency Performance Plans: Examples of Practices that Can Improve Usefulness to Decisionmakers*, [GAO/GGD/AIMD-99-69](#) (Washington, D.C.: Feb. 26, 1999). In these reports, we highlighted key practices that enhance the usefulness of performance reports from agencies under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, Pub. L. No. 103-62 (1993).

<sup>10</sup> Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, *Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 Final Business Plans and Other Reporting Requirements*, Aug. 5, 2010.

---

## Background

The BRAC 2005 Commission Report contains 198 recommendations approved by the BRAC Commission<sup>11</sup> for closing or realigning DOD installations. The text of each recommendation contains several sections with important contextual information:

- Cost and Savings Information
- Secretary of Defense Recommendation
- Secretary of Defense Justification
- Community Concerns
- Commission Findings
- Commission Recommendations

By law, DOD must implement the actions recommended by the Commission unless the President terminates the process, or Congress enacts a resolution of disapproval.

BRAC 2005 differed from prior rounds in three significant ways—the circumstances under which it took place, its scale, and its scope. Unlike prior BRAC rounds, which were implemented during times of declining defense budgets and in which the focus was on eliminating excess capacity and realizing cost savings, BRAC 2005 was conducted in a global security environment characterized by increasing defense budgets and increasing military end strengths after the events of September 11, 2001 and was conducted concurrently with overseas contingency operations in Afghanistan and Iraq.<sup>12</sup> At the same time, DOD was engaged in

---

<sup>11</sup>The BRAC statute establishes an independent commission to review the Secretary of Defense's realignment and closure recommendations, with the authority to change these recommendations in certain circumstances if it determines that the Secretary deviated substantially from the selection criteria and a DOD force structure plan. The 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission presented its list of final recommendations to the President, who approved them in their entirety. The President subsequently forwarded these BRAC recommendations to Congress, and they became effective on November 9, 2005.

<sup>12</sup>Operation Enduring Freedom began in October 2001 and Operation Iraqi Freedom began in March 2003.

an initiative to relocate thousands of personnel from overseas to the continental United States.

The scale of BRAC 2005 was much larger than the scales of the prior four rounds. BRAC 2005 generated more than twice the number of BRAC actions as all prior BRAC rounds combined. Table 2 compares the number of individual actions embedded in the BRAC 2005 recommendations with the number of individual actions needed to implement the recommendations in the prior rounds and shows that the number of individual BRAC actions was larger in BRAC 2005 (813) than in the four prior BRAC rounds combined (387).

**Table 2: BRAC Actions for All BRAC Rounds**

Round	Major base closures	Major realignments	Minor closures and realignments	Total actions
1988	16	4	23	<b>43</b>
1991	26	17	32	<b>75</b>
1993	28	12	123	<b>163</b>
1995	27	22	57	<b>106</b>
Total for four prior rounds	97	55	235	<b>387</b>
2005	24	24	765	<b>813</b>

Source: GAO analysis of DOD data | GAO-16-45

Note: For BRAC 2005, DOD defined major base closures as closures of bases that had a plant replacement value exceeding \$100 million and defined major base realignments as those in which a base had a net loss of 400 or more military and civilian personnel. In the absence of a consistent definition, we relied on DOD's characterization of which bases it considered to be major.

The scope of BRAC 2005 was broader than the scope of prior BRAC rounds. In addition to the traditional emphasis on eliminating unneeded infrastructure to achieve savings, DOD's goals for the 2005 BRAC round included transforming the military by correlating base infrastructure to the force structure and enhancing joint capabilities by improving joint utilization to meet current and future threats.<sup>13</sup> As shown in table 2, the 2005 BRAC round had the second lowest number of major closures, the largest number of major realignments, and the largest number of minor closures and realignments. Part of this transformation effort included a focus on providing opportunities to increase jointness, though many of the BRAC

<sup>13</sup>In the late 1990s, DOD embarked on a major effort to transform its business processes, human capital, and military capabilities.

---

recommendations focused on consolidations and reorganizations within the military departments rather than across departments. However, the six recommendations we reviewed, as well as other recommendations, including creating joint bases,<sup>14</sup> focused on jointness across multiple services.

---


## DOD Implemented BRAC 2005 Recommendations to Relocate Selected Training Functions but Missed Some Opportunities to Consolidate Training to Increase Jointness

DOD implemented the BRAC 2005 recommendations we reviewed by requiring military services to relocate selected training functions; however we found that, although DOD's justifications for collocating each of the six training functions that we reviewed mentioned jointness or inter-service training as a potential benefit, two of the six training functions took advantage of the opportunity provided by BRAC to consolidate training to increase jointness. Specifically, we found that DOD implemented all six recommendations by relocating the select training functions—as recommended by the BRAC Commission—but that opportunities for joint training were realized in only two locations. Figure 1 shows the relocations associated with each recommendation.

---

<sup>14</sup>BRAC 2005 created 12 joint bases out of 26 service-specific, stand-alone installations: Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling, District of Columbia; Joint Base Andrews-Naval Air Facility Washington, District of Columbia; Joint Base Charleston, South Carolina; Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska; Joint Base Langley-Eustis, Virginia; Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington; Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst, New Jersey; Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall, District of Columbia; Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii; Joint Base San Antonio, Texas; Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek-Fort Story, Virginia; and Joint Region Marianas, Guam.

**Figure 1: Movements Associated with BRAC Recommendations in Our Review**



Source: GAO analysis of Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission recommendations. | GAO-16-45

---

Based on our meetings with officials, we found that officials implementing two of the six training functions created by those recommendations—the Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training and the 7th Special Forces Group—had found ways to take advantage of being located together to consolidate training and train jointly. For example, officials at the Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training stated that while the Air Force conducts its culinary training separately, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have successfully consolidated two of the three phases of their training and use a joint curriculum to train students. These officials stated that they were successful at consolidating the culinary training curricula for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps because the leadership involved with implementing this recommendation was supportive of finding a way to train jointly even if that meant changing their curricula. Additionally, Army and Air Force Special Operations Forces officials stated that the relocation of the 7th Special Forces Group to Eglin Air Force Base allowed for increased joint training operations with the Air Force Special Operations Forces located at Hurlburt Field, near Eglin Air Force Base. These officials stated that they were successful at consolidating training and increasing jointness because they were already conducting joint training prior to the BRAC 2005 round and that since their move, being in closer proximity has made it even easier to train jointly.

The implementation of the remaining four BRAC recommendations that we reviewed relocated—moved separate functions to one location—but did not consolidate training functions. According to officials at the locations that did not consolidate training, they do not regularly coordinate or share information on their training goals and curricula, despite the fact that part of the Secretary of Defense’s justification for the moves in the BRAC 2005 process was that they would bring a “train as we fight: jointly” perspective to the learning process or would otherwise allow for joint training. Service officials told us that after these recommendations were proposed by DOD and approved by the BRAC Commission, they compared each of their original curricula but did not identify many areas of overlap. Training function officials stated that they had received minimal guidance related to consolidating training. Therefore, we found, they did not adjust curricula to take advantage of their proximity to consolidate training and possibly be more joint and consolidate space. Training function officials also stated that their four training functions have very different missions, making consolidation of their training more difficult. For example, while both the Navy and the Air Force train their navigators at Pensacola Naval Air Station, they train them to fly in different scenarios (e.g., over land or over sea) and in different airplanes.

Although the services may have differences in their training, the 2005 BRAC Commission Report noted that the Secretary of Defense had described the 2005 BRAC round as an opportunity to promote jointness. The BRAC Commission Report stated that while the 2005 BRAC recommendations would “not move the ball across the jointness goal line, Commission decisions would help move the ball down the field” toward more jointness. Table 3 summarizes the status of each of the six BRAC recommendations that we reviewed.

**Table 3: Summary of BRAC 2005 Recommendations Requiring Military Services to Relocate Select Training Functions to Consolidate Training to Increase Jointness**

<b>BRAC 2005 Commission Recommendation (Recommendation Number)</b>	<b>Did DOD implement BRAC 2005 recommendations requiring military services to relocate select training functions?</b>	<b>Did DOD take advantage of opportunities to consolidate training to increase jointness?</b>
Fort Bragg, North Carolina (#4)	Yes – The 7th Special Forces Group relocated to Eglin Air Force Base.	Yes – According to officials, relocating the 7th Special Forces Group to Eglin Air Force Base allowed for enhanced joint training opportunities with the Air Force Special Operations Forces located at Hurlburt Field, near Eglin Air Force Base.
Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training (#122)	Yes – Transportation Management training relocated to Fort Lee, Virginia.	No – In relocating the Transportation Management training to Fort Lee, DOD may have missed the opportunity to consolidate like schools and “Train as we fight: jointly.” According to officials, while the Army and Air Force communicate more frequently on an informal basis than they did before the implementation of the BRAC recommendation, each service has its own curriculum and they conduct their training separately. Officials stated that being at the same location allows the Air Force, if available, to participate at the end of an Army training exercise in which students load cargo on to an aircraft and Air Force personnel conduct an inspection, simulating real-world situations.
Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training (#123)	Yes - Culinary Training relocated to Fort Lee, Virginia and established as a Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training.	Yes – According to officials, relocating Culinary training to one location increased jointness among the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, which successfully consolidated two phases of their training curricula. However, the Air Force did not consolidate any of its training with the other services and trains separately.

BRAC 2005 Commission Recommendation (Recommendation Number)	Did DOD implement BRAC 2005 recommendations requiring military services to relocate select training functions?	Did DOD take advantage of opportunities to consolidate training to increase jointness?
Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education (#124)	Yes – Religious training and education relocated to Fort Jackson, South Carolina.	No – In relocating the religious training and education to Fort Jackson, DOD may have missed the opportunity to consolidate training to increase jointness. Specifically, during the course of implementing this recommendation, officials said that they did not develop course curricula that would achieve the goals of both consolidating training where appropriate and providing service-unique training where necessary. However, other functions not related to training, such as the library, were merged. According to officials at the Armed Forces Chaplaincy Center, the Army, Air Force, and Navy communicate more frequently on an informal basis than they did before the implementation of the BRAC recommendation, but each service has its own curriculum and trains separately. Officials stated that they occasionally invite the other services to hear guest speakers.
Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site (#125)	Yes – A sufficient number of instructor pilots, operations support, and maintenance personnel relocated to Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, to stand up the Navy's, Marine Corps', and Air Force's portion of the Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site.	No – In relocating the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps at a Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site, DOD may have missed the opportunity to consolidate training to increase jointness. Specifically, the joint basing arrangement did not establish curricula that permit services latitude to preserve service-unique culture and a faculty and staff that bring a "Train as we fight: jointly" national perspective to the learning process. According to officials at the Joint Strike Fighter Initial Training Site, while the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps communicate more frequently on an informal basis, each service has its own curriculum and conducts its Joint Strike Fighter maintenance and pilot training separately. In addition, the Marine Corps has recently moved its Joint Strike Fighter training to Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, SC.
Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training (#128)	Yes – Undergraduate Navigator Training relocated to Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida.	No – Relocating the Air Force navigator training did not result in a consolidated primary phase of undergraduate flight training functions or enhance jointness. Specifically, the basing arrangement did not establish curricula that permit services latitude to preserve service-unique culture and a faculty and staff that bring a "Train as we fight: jointly" national perspective to the learning process. According to Air Force and Navy officials, while the Air Force and Navy communicate more frequently on an informal basis than they did before the implementation of the BRAC recommendation, each service still has its own curriculum and they train separately.

Source: GAO analysis of DOD and service information | GAO-16-45

We found that four of the six training functions in our review missed the opportunity to consolidate training to increase jointness, because DOD provided minimal guidance to direct those implementing the recommendations. Service officials stated that to direct the

---

implementation of the six recommendations we reviewed, DOD provided them with the language from the BRAC Commission report as well as guidance for developing business plans. Using the guidance provided, each of the military departments' headquarters developed a business plan. This guidance focused on movement of personnel or construction. In our previous work on consolidation of physical infrastructure and management functions, we identified key practices, including developing an implementation plan for the consolidation. Such a plan should include essential change management practices such as active, engaged leadership of executives at the highest possible levels; a dedicated implementation team that can be held accountable for change; and a strategy measuring progress toward the established goals of the consolidation.<sup>15</sup> None of the guidance given to the military departments provided this type of direction. For example, the language from the BRAC Commission report for each recommendation we selected for review is generally less than one page long and contains high level summary information on costs, the action being recommended, DOD's justification for the recommendation, community concerns, and the BRAC Commissions findings and recommendations. The business plans developed by the military departments included the text of the BRAC 2005 recommendation, a description of costs and savings for each moving organization, a list of organizations moving, a time table for the movement of organizations, details on any military construction, and environmental information.

According to a September 2005 memorandum issued by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and related to planning for BRAC 2005 implementation, the business plans were to serve as a foundation for the complex program management necessary to ensure that the recommendations were implemented efficiently and effectively. Additionally, the memorandum states that the implementation challenges

---

<sup>15</sup>GAO, *Streamlining Government: Questions to Consider When Evaluating Proposals to Consolidate Physical Infrastructure and Management Functions*, [GAO-12-542](#) (Washington, D.C.: May 23, 2012). This report identifies key questions that agencies should consider when evaluating whether to consolidate physical infrastructure and management functions and presents key practices that can help these consolidations. To identify these key questions and practices, we identified and reviewed relevant literature on public sector consolidations produced by academic institutions, professional associations, think tanks, news outlets, and various other organizations. This report includes key practices such as agreeing on specific goals, basing consolidations on clearly presented business-case analysis, and identifying relevant stakeholders.

---

presented by transformational recommendations—particularly recommendations to establish joint operations—underscore the utility and necessity of the plans. However, officials from the Basing Directorate under the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment, the group that oversaw the implementation of BRAC 2005, stated that while the business plans do not include the BRAC 2005 language containing DOD’s justification related to consolidating training to increase jointness, it is the business manager’s responsibility to implement the recommendation, taking into account the intent of the recommendation as described in the justification language. During our review, however, we found that officials responsible for certifying that these six recommendations had been implemented were not required by OSD to certify whether or not they had taken advantage of the opportunity to increase jointness. Rather, the business plan managers were focused on the completion of the construction of buildings and the movement of personnel. Further, officials at the four training functions that did not consolidate training told us that although they had initially compared each service’s curricula to identify common training, they felt that there was not enough overlap in the training for it to be consolidated. They also stated that they had not received direction from OSD or the military services on how to consolidate curricula in order to foster jointness in the event that course curricula had few similarities, prepared personnel to perform different missions, or used different equipment.

Like the BRAC 2005 recommendations that directed the relocation of several training functions in order to promote jointness or consolidate similar training, another BRAC 2005 recommendation directed the consolidation of 26 service-specific stand-alone installations into 12 joint bases to take advantage of opportunities for efficiencies and reduce duplication of similar support services. In order to implement this joint basing recommendation, the Office of the Secretary of Defense issued guidance in January 2008 designed to establish a comprehensive framework to consolidate installation-support functions while meeting mission requirements.<sup>16</sup> OSD also created an oversight structure for handling disputes and established a set of common standards for the installation support to be provided by each joint base. Furthermore, DOD issued a directive on military training that gives the Undersecretary of Defense for

---

<sup>16</sup>Deputy Secretary of Defense Memorandum, *Transforming Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005-Joint Basing* (Jan. 22, 2008), and DOD, *Initial Guidance for BRAC 2005 Joint Basing Implementation* (Jan. 22, 2008).

---

Personnel & Readiness the responsibility to oversee and provide policy for individual and functional training programs for military personnel and the collective training programs of military units and staffs.<sup>17</sup>

If DOD and the services believe that the training functions in our review can still capitalize on the opportunity to promote jointness provided by the BRAC 2005 recommendations, additional guidance will be an important first step toward being able to take advantage of this opportunity. Officials from the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel & Readiness agreed that additional guidance would potentially be helpful in providing opportunities to consolidate training to increase jointness. Further, in the event of a future BRAC round, such guidance could provide a useful framework for taking advantage of the opportunities provided by similar recommendations focused on developing joint training capabilities.

---

## DOD Cannot Determine Cost Savings from Implementing BRAC 2005 Joint Training Recommendations, and It Likely Did Not Report All Implementation Costs

DOD cannot determine if implementing the 2005 BRAC joint training recommendations that we reviewed has resulted in savings in operating costs. In addition, implementation costs reported to DOD by the training functions' business plan managers likely did not include all costs funded from outside the BRAC account—we found at least \$110 million in costs that likely should have been included based on DOD guidance requiring all BRAC-related costs to be reported, even those from outside the BRAC account. As a result, DOD may have incomplete or inaccurate cost information when trying to determine annual cost savings or total implementation costs of these BRAC recommendations.

---

<sup>17</sup>DOD Directive 1322.18, *Military Training* (Jan. 13, 2009).

---

## DOD Cannot Determine Operating Cost Savings Resulting from BRAC 2005 Joint Training Recommendations

Although we reported in 2012 that DOD had projected that four of the recommendations in our review would result in annual savings in operating costs,<sup>18</sup> we found that DOD could not determine whether implementing the 2005 BRAC joint training recommendations that we reviewed resulted in savings in operating costs. For two of the training functions in our review, DOD was able to provide complete baseline cost data; however, officials for these training functions could not determine whether cost fluctuations were due to the BRAC moves. For three of the training functions in our review, DOD was unable to provide complete baseline operating costs from before it implemented the BRAC recommendations, but officials representing these training functions indicated that implementing the recommendations may have increased some costs. The Joint Strike Fighter training program established by recommendation #125 was a new program and therefore there were no operating cost data prior to BRAC implementation.

In our prior work, we have identified the importance of developing baseline and trend data.<sup>19</sup> By developing baseline operating costs, agencies can better evaluate whether they are achieving their cost savings targets. In addition, in our 1997 report on lessons learned from the four prior BRAC rounds, we found that initial cost and savings estimates for prior BRAC rounds were not based on reliable baseline data, because they were not of budget quality, were not consistently developed, and were poorly documented.<sup>20</sup> As we also noted in our 1997 report, sound estimates of savings are important, because DOD may rely on savings from BRAC for other purposes. In 2014 we found that DOD was unable to determine whether the consolidation of training at the Medical Education and Training Campus resulted in cost savings, because it had not developed baseline cost information as part of its metrics to assess success.<sup>21</sup> We recommended

---

<sup>18</sup>The four recommendations with projected annual cost savings were Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training (#122), Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training (#123), Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education (#124), and Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training (#128). DOD projected that the Fort Bragg, NC (#4) recommendation would have additional annual operating costs.

<sup>19</sup>See [GAO-14-630](#), [GAO/GGD-96-66R](#) and [GAO/GGD/AIMD-99-69](#).

<sup>20</sup>GAO, *Military Bases: Lessons Learned From Prior Base Closure Rounds*, [GAO/NSIAD-97-151](#) (Washington, D.C.: July 25, 1997). The four BRAC rounds covered in the report occurred in 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995.

<sup>21</sup>See [GAO-14-630](#). Consolidation of training at the Medical Education and Training Campus was recommendation #172 of BRAC 2005.

---

that DOD develop baseline cost estimates as part of its metrics to assess cost savings for future consolidation efforts within the Medical Education and Training Campus, and DOD concurred with this recommendation. To date, DOD has not taken any actions to implement this recommendation, because, according to DOD officials, they cannot take action on these recommendations until another BRAC round is authorized.

Two of the training functions in our review—Undergraduate Navigator Training and Ft. Bragg, North Carolina (7th Special Forces Group move to Eglin Air Force Base)—were able to provide complete baseline cost data. However, for these two training functions, officials could not determine whether subsequent cost fluctuations were due to the BRAC moves, non-BRAC events, or some combination. For example, the budget officials from the Air Force’s Air Education and Training Command were able to provide us with detailed operating cost data for their undergraduate navigator training, going back to 1996. However, even with these detailed cost data, the budget officials we met with stated that they could not account for all of the different events that had resulted in cost fluctuations during that time. Air Force budget officials further stated that multiple events such as sequestration,<sup>22</sup> maintenance issues, and changes in how certain expenses are funded<sup>23</sup> that occurred while BRAC was being implemented made it extremely difficult to determine whether any savings in the program’s operating costs were due to the implementation of the BRAC recommendation or to these other factors.

For the remaining three training functions—Culinary training, Transportation Management training, and Religious training—the programs could not provide complete operating cost information from

---

<sup>22</sup>The Budget Control Act of 2011, Pub. L. No. 112-25 (2011), established, among other things, a congressional Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction to propose legislation that would reduce federal deficits by \$1.5 trillion over ten years (fiscal years 2012–2021), and two sequestration procedures: a sequestration procedure originally to be ordered by the President on January 1, 2013, to ensure that the level of deficit reduction would be achieved in the event that the Joint Committee failed to reach agreement to reduce the deficit by at least \$1.2 trillion, and an additional sequestration procedure that would be triggered if appropriations exceeded established discretionary spending caps in a given fiscal year between fiscal years 2012 and 2021. The sequestration in fiscal year 2013 used the former procedure, triggered because the Joint Committee did not reach agreement.

<sup>23</sup>For example, Air Force officials stated that the Air Force has changed which account funds fuel costs, making it difficult to track.

---

prior to the move.<sup>24</sup> For example, according to Army budget personnel, the Army culinary, transportation management, and chaplain training programs did not have data for various reasons, including a change in accounting systems, and because they are not required to keep data that far back. In addition, according to Air Force officials, because the Air Force culinary program is part of a larger multidisciplinary training program that includes subjects such as fitness and mortuary services, it is not possible to isolate the costs for the culinary portion of the training.

While these programs either did not have any baseline operating cost data or detailed operating cost baselines, in some instances officials were able to provide examples of where they believed operating costs have increased as a result of the respective BRAC moves. For example:

- Air Force officials estimated that they spend an additional \$300,000 annually to operate the department's Chaplain Corps College at Fort Jackson, South Carolina than they did to operate the one at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Navy officials provided operating cost data for their chaplain training program showing that they have spent an average of approximately \$182,000 more per year since relocating to Ft. Jackson. Officials with both services cited increased travel costs as the primary driver of these increases, because Ft. Jackson does not have room for the students to stay on base. Therefore, according to officials, students from both services must stay at hotels in Columbia, South Carolina, and officials have to provide transportation to and from the base.
- A Navy culinary official estimated that sending students to Ft. Lee costs the service an additional \$200,000 per year for airfare compared to what it cost when all training was at Naval Station Great Lakes, Illinois.<sup>25</sup> This official also estimated that this travel takes about three days per student, which results in about \$400,000 in lost work time per year. In

---

<sup>24</sup>Because the Joint Strike Fighter Initial Joint Training Site was a new training function created by the BRAC 2005 round, there was no cost prior to the implementation of the BRAC recommendation. The Commission approved this recommendation and reported that it was unlikely to achieve savings and would have a payback period of "never."

<sup>25</sup>The Navy conducts entry-level basic training at Naval Station Great Lakes. According to a Navy official, prior to BRAC 2005, when the Navy's culinary training program was also located at Naval Station Great Lakes, students would remain on the base and not have to travel to attend this training. The culinary training is now located at Ft. Lee as a result of the BRAC move, and students must now travel to attend this training.

---

addition, the official added that there are other costs related to getting the students to and from airports. Additionally, the Navy culinary official added that the training program has incurred additional administrative costs because the Army and Navy student tracking systems are not linked. Specifically, because the systems are not configured to exchange data, all Navy student data must be manually entered twice, once in each system. The official said that this equates to thousands of records per year and could take about \$45,000 in labor costs to accomplish.

For training functions we reviewed, Navy Joint Strike Fighter officials were able to identify a cost avoidance as a result of implementing the BRAC recommendation. As part of implementing this recommendation, the Air Force built a \$59 million Academic Training Center at Eglin Air Force Base to serve the Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps. The Navy Joint Strike Fighter officials stated that if they had not colocated their program with the Air Force, the Navy would have had to pay to build and operate its own Academic Training Center.<sup>26</sup>

It is now likely not possible to determine baseline costs for implementing the recommendations in our review in order to determine the extent to which the implementation of these recommendations resulted in cost savings. Also, subsequent changes to the programs make it difficult to determine the effect of implementing the BRAC recommendations. Although it can sometimes be difficult to attribute costs and savings to a specific event, such as a BRAC change, DOD will not be able to estimate whether it has achieved annual savings in operating costs if it does not collect complete baseline cost data with which to measure progress.

---

<sup>26</sup>The Marine Corps initially located its Joint Strike Fighter training squadron at Eglin Air Force Base in April 2010. However, in February 2014 the Marine Corps moved this training squadron to Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, South Carolina.

---

## Final Implementation Costs Reported to DOD for Some Joint Training Recommendations Likely Did Not Include All Implementation Costs

In 2012, we reported on DOD's estimates of its final implementation costs for the BRAC 2005 recommendations;<sup>27</sup> however, for two of the six recommendations in this review—the Joint Strike Fighter Initial Training Site and the 7th Special Forces Group move to Eglin Air Force Base—we found that at least \$110 million in implementation costs funded from outside of the BRAC account that likely should have been included were not reported to DOD by the business plan managers. Thus DOD's previously reported total cost of \$35.1 billion to implement BRAC 2005 is likely somewhat understated. The statute authorizing BRAC 2005 established a special treasury account for purposes related to implementing the BRAC 2005 recommendations.<sup>28</sup> During the lifetime of this account, DOD could also fund certain BRAC-related costs from outside the BRAC 2005 account to complete actions needed to implement the recommendations. For example, the services could use money obtained through their military construction process to renovate existing space or build new facilities. In 2010, we recommended that DOD take steps to capture and appropriately report to Congress any BRAC-related implementation costs that were funded from outside the BRAC account.<sup>29</sup> DOD concurred with the recommendation, and in August 2010 the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) issued a memo requiring BRAC business plan managers to submit all BRAC-related expenditures, including those funded from both inside and outside of the BRAC account.<sup>30</sup> We reviewed the business plans for all six recommendations in our review, as well as data reported by the services to DOD, and found that none of them contained projects funded from outside of the BRAC account. Army and Air Force officials that we spoke with stated that there were general criteria for what could be included as a BRAC cost in the BRAC 2005 round.

---

<sup>27</sup>GAO, *Military Base Realignments and Closures: Updated Costs and Savings Estimates from BRAC 2005*, [GAO-12-709R](#) (Washington, D.C.: June 29, 2012).

<sup>28</sup>The statutory section authorizing the account has since been repealed following the conclusion of the BRAC 2005 implementation period. See former section 2906A of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-510, Title XXIX (10 U.S.C. 2687 note) (repealed by Pub. L. No. 112-239, Div. B, Title XXVII, § 2711(a) (2013)).

<sup>29</sup>GAO, *Military Base Realignments and Closures: DOD Is Taking Steps to Mitigate Challenges but Is Not Fully Reporting Some Additional Costs*, [GAO-10-725R](#) (Washington, D.C.: July 21, 2010).

<sup>30</sup>Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, *Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 Final Business Plans and Other Reporting Requirements*, Aug. 5, 2010.

---

According to former business plan managers for some of the training functions in our review, and Army and Air Force service headquarters officials, some of these criteria included that the project be related to the physical move, the cost be for moves within the continental United States, the project not be related to addressing a deficiency that existed at the time of the BRAC recommendation, and the project be needed in order to comply with the original BRAC recommendation and not be used to accommodate personnel or mission expansion that happened after the BRAC decision. However, neither service nor OSD officials could provide us with any written guidance to this effect. Air Force officials also stated that language in the Form 1391—the DOD document to submit requirements and justification to Congress for funding for military construction projects—would indicate whether the project was BRAC-related.

For three of the recommendations we reviewed, the military construction implementation costs reported to us were approximately the same as those reported to DOD in 2012. Business plan managers for recommendation 124—Joint Center for Excellence for Religious Training and Education—reported military construction implementation costs of approximately \$11.6 million to DOD in 2012 and approximately \$11.8 million to us in the course of this review. For recommendations 122—Joint Center for Consolidated Transportation Management Training—and 123—Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training—business plan managers reported combined military construction implementation costs of approximately \$87.6 million to DOD in 2012, and approximately \$89.4 million to us in the course of this review.<sup>31</sup> For a fourth recommendation—Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training, recommendation #128—we could not determine what the total military construction implementation costs reported to DOD in 2012 were, because this was a bundled recommendation that contained projects on multiple bases, not just at Pensacola Naval Air Station, Florida. However, the final Pensacola military construction costs

---

<sup>31</sup>We combined the military construction implementation costs for recommendations 122 and 123 because the culinary and transportation students share some facilities on Ft. Lee, specifically the dining facility and the dormitory.

---

reported to us—\$90.1 million—were close to the preliminary military construction estimates of \$89.5 million for those projects.<sup>32</sup>

In the case of the Joint Strike Fighter and the Ft. Bragg, North Carolina recommendations, some projects that appear to be related to the BRAC move and were funded with non-BRAC money were not included in what was reported to DOD as required by DOD's August 2010 memo. Examples of some of these projects that were not reported as BRAC implementation costs are

- **Joint Strike Fighter (F-35) Parking Apron.** In the official Form 1391 proposing this project and the need for the parking apron, the title of the project is "BRAC F-35 A/C Parking Apron." Further, in the "Requirement" section of the document, the justification provided by the Air Force states that the build-up for Joint Strike Fighter operations includes relocating joint military instructor pilots and operations support personnel from Luke Air Force Base; Sheppard Air Force Base; Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California; Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia;; and the Naval Air Station at Pensacola, the moves required by this BRAC recommendation. Air Force headquarters officials stated that they did not include this as a BRAC implementation cost because they and the Navy headquarters officials agreed this cost was not related to the move. However, Air Force officials at Eglin Air Force Base as well as the Navy Business Plan Manager indicated that the Parking Apron was a necessary implementation cost. Furthermore, the cost for every other Air Force project that cited "BRAC" in the Form 1391 project title was counted as an implementation cost. By including this reference to BRAC in the 1391, this project was presented to Congress as a BRAC-related cost. The preliminary estimate for this project was \$29 million dollars.
- **Other Joint Strike Fighter Support Projects.** This includes four projects related to the establishment of the Joint Strike Fighter training program.<sup>33</sup> Three of these projects have language identical to that in the

---

<sup>32</sup>The projects at Pensacola Naval Air Station, Florida, to implement the Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training recommendation included a dormitory, a hangar, a training center, and other supporting infrastructure.

<sup>33</sup>These support projects include the first phase of an F-35 Hydrant Refueling System, F-35 JP8 Flightline Fillstands, the F-35 JP8 West Side Bulk Tank Upgrades, and the F-35 POL Operations and Refueler Maintenance Facility.

---

BRAC Joint Strike Fighter (F-35) A/C Parking Apron in the Requirement section of their Form 1391, which states that the build-up for Joint Strike Fighter operations includes relocating joint military instructor pilots and operations support personnel from Luke Air Force Base, Sheppard Air Force Base, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, Ca., Naval Air Station Oceana, VA and the Naval Air Station at Pensacola. The Form 1391 for the fourth project cites the impending overcrowding as a result of establishing the Joint Strike Fighter training program as the justification for the project. Air Force headquarters officials stated that, for these projects, Air Education and Training Command or Air Force Materiel Command did not submit the project to the Air Force BRAC office to determine if it was a BRAC requirement. However, given the requirement language that cites the BRAC moves and the impending overcrowding, it is not clear to us that these were not BRAC implementation costs. Furthermore, Air Force documentation and headquarters officials acknowledged that one of these projects—the first phase of the Hydrant Refueling System Station—was a companion project to the BRAC F-35 A/C Parking Apron. The combined final cost for these projects was approximately \$20.6 million.

- **Housing.** Neither the Joint Strike Fighter nor the Ft. Bragg business plan managers included the housing they built for Joint Strike Fighter pilot trainees or Special Forces Group soldiers as BRAC implementation costs. Air Force headquarters officials stated that there was a disagreement between the Air Force and the Navy about who should pay for the Joint Strike Fighter housing and how it should be paid for. In order to complete the housing prior to the arrival of students, the Air Force agreed to pay for the first housing unit and the Navy agreed to pay for the second unit.<sup>34</sup> Regarding the barracks for the 7th Special Forces Group, at least one of these housing units was originally scheduled to be built with BRAC funding. However, Army headquarters and Special Operations Command officials stated that, due to construction delays,<sup>35</sup> the Army reconsidered which funding source to use for some projects. As a result, all of the housing units

---

<sup>34</sup>The Joint Strike Fighter dorm was completed in December 2010. At the time of our site visit, a second Joint Strike Fighter dormitory had not been built at Eglin Air Force Base.

<sup>35</sup>The Air Force had to conduct an Environmental Impact Study prior to establishing the Joint Strike Fighter training program at Eglin Air Force Base. Army officials stated that they did not want to begin construction until the study was finished so that they knew for sure where 7th Special Forces Group would be located on the base.

---

ended up being built with regular military construction money as part of a larger project<sup>36</sup> and no part of that project was counted as BRAC implementation costs. The decisions not to count the Joint Strike Fighter housing unit and the 7th Special Forces Group housing unit as BRAC implementation costs is inconsistent with the fact that housing for the culinary and transportation students at Ft. Lee, as well as the housing for navigator students at Pensacola Naval Air Station, were counted as BRAC implementation costs. The Joint Strike Fighter housing unit cost was \$17.6 million and the cost of the three Army housing units ranged from \$6.5 to 6.7 million each.

- **7th Special Forces Group Training Ranges.** The Army built several training ranges on Eglin Air Force Base to support the move of 7th Special Forces Group from Ft. Bragg to Eglin Air Force Base.<sup>37</sup> Army headquarters officials told us that the cost of the ranges was initially to be considered part of the BRAC implementation cost, and documentation shows that the Army planned to use BRAC funds to construct these ranges. However, due to the previously mentioned construction delays and changes to the funding source of projects, the ranges ended up being funded with Army military construction funds. When implementation costs were reported to DOD in the final business plan, the business plan managers did not indicate that there were any implementation costs funded from outside the BRAC account. The reasons for not including the ranges as a BRAC implementation cost are unclear. Both Army and Air Force headquarters officials stated that this may have been because the Air Force already had ranges at Eglin Air Force Base that the Army could have used. Air Force headquarters officials added that it may have been because the 7th Special Forces Group did not have these ranges at Ft. Bragg. However, officials with the Army Special Operations Command and the 7th Special Forces Group stated that the existing Air Force ranges at Eglin Air Force Base were insufficient for their training needs, and that they had all of the ranges in question when they were at Ft. Bragg. Not including the ranges as a BRAC implementation cost was also inconsistent with the other implementations of BRAC

---

<sup>36</sup> This larger project included facilities such as a fire station, an access control facility, a tactical communications center, and various storage facilities.

<sup>37</sup> There were 11 ranges built to support the needs of 7th Special Forces Group. Those ranges are the Breaching Facility, Hand Grenade Qualification Course, Shotgun Range, Shoothouse, Urban Assault Course, Grenade Launcher Range, Anti-Armor Tracking, Qualification Training Range, Light Demolition Range, 25 Meter Zero Range, and an Indoor Baffle Range.

---

recommendations we reviewed, where the training facilities were counted as BRAC implementation costs. Construction of the ranges at Eglin Air Force Base cost a combined \$39.3 million.

An official with the Basing Directorate under the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment—the group that oversaw the implementation of BRAC 2005—stated that the business plan managers were expected to include costs that were funded from outside the BRAC account in their final business plans and that, along with OSD General Counsel, they reviewed and provided comments on the cost submissions. However, the Basing Directorate official further stated that it was up to the military departments to ensure that all BRAC implementation costs were accounted for, and that the military departments had the flexibility to determine which costs would be associated with the BRAC recommendation and which would be attributed to other actions. We found that this flexibility in determining which costs were to be reported as BRAC costs led to inconsistencies in what kinds of projects were counted as BRAC implementation costs. By clarifying in guidance what is to be included as a BRAC implementation cost, DOD can help ensure that it has an accurate accounting of the final costs for any future BRAC implementation and that DOD and Congress are able to determine how much money is actually spent on any future BRAC rounds.

---

## Conclusions

BRAC 2005 provided DOD with the opportunity to consolidate infrastructure and also to become more efficient and effective in its operations. To that end, the recommendations for consolidating and developing joint training programs provided DOD with new opportunities for furthering transformation and promoting jointness to meet the new challenges DOD faces. However, two of the six recommendations focused on training have led to joint training rather than colocation, despite the opportunity to jointly train the force as it fights. All six recommendations were implemented as approved, but without additional guidance, DOD cannot ensure that it takes advantage of the opportunities provided by BRAC. If Congress approves a future BRAC round, DOD will have another opportunity to promote jointness should the department choose to propose such recommendations to a future BRAC Commission. However, without specific guidance that the military services can use in implementing jointness-focused recommendations—for instance on responsibility for monitoring implementation and measuring progress—the department may again face challenges in moving beyond colocation of functions.

---

In implementing the training-focused jointness recommendations we examined, DOD did not collect baseline cost data for all of the recommendations as part of its implementation process, and without these data it could not determine the actual savings, if any, of implementing the recommendations. Unless DOD develops baseline cost data for the recommendations in any future BRAC rounds, it will be unable to determine the budgetary effect of its actions. Given that we found some implementation costs were paid for from other than the BRAC 2005-specific accounts, if DOD does not clarify in guidance the types of costs that are to be included as BRAC implementation costs, decision makers will lack reasonable assurance that the department's cost data for any future BRAC round recommendations are fully reliable.

---

## Recommendations for Executive Action

To make further progress toward taking full advantage of the opportunity of consolidating training in order to increase jointness following the implementation of the BRAC 2005 recommendations, for the training functions that did not consolidate training beyond colocation, we recommend that the Secretary of Defense direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Secretaries of the military departments to provide guidance to the program managers on consolidating training, if DOD decides that taking advantage of an opportunity to increase jointness is still appropriate.

To improve the ability of the military departments to take advantage of any opportunities provided by recommendations to develop joint training capabilities in a future BRAC round, we recommend that the Secretary of Defense direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness—in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment—to develop and provide specific guidance for the military departments to use in implementing recommendations designed to consolidate training to increase jointness.

To improve DOD's ability to estimate savings, if any, from future consolidation of training—including any consolidation resulting from a future BRAC round—we recommend that the Secretary of Defense direct the military departments to develop baseline cost data.

To improve the accounting of any future BRAC rounds, we recommend that the Secretary of Defense direct the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment to issue guidance clarifying what costs should be included in final BRAC accounting.

---

---

## Agency Comments and Our Evaluation

We provided a draft of this report to DOD for review and comment. In response, DOD non-concurred with three recommendations and partially concurred with one recommendation.

In its letter, DOD stated that our report misunderstands DOD's approach to joint and common training and does not completely recognize the unique circumstances of BRAC recommendation development and implementation. We recognize that there is a difference between joint and common training; however, these BRAC recommendations, which DOD proposed and the BRAC Commission approved, emphasized jointness, not just common training. In fact, for several of these recommendations, the Secretary of Defense's justification included "enhancing jointness" as part of the rationale, or proposed that the recommendation would allow DOD to "train as we fight; jointly."

DOD further stated that our report undervalues the importance of providing DOD components flexibility to determine BRAC costs and has a misplaced emphasis on estimating savings for transformational recommendations. We recognize the importance of flexibility among DOD components for most military decisions; however, as our report notes, flexibility in reporting BRAC costs led to inconsistencies in reporting of these costs across the department. In addition, cost and savings estimates are a part of the BRAC process. Both DOD and the Commission develop such estimates for each recommendation and did so for these six recommendations. Moreover, DOD emphasized savings in some of the six recommendations in its justification to the Commission. Specifically, DOD's justification for the Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training reads in part "It is the military judgement of the JCSG that consolidation at the location with the largest amount of culinary training produces the greatest overall military value to the Department through increased training efficiency at lower cost." Similarly, for the Joint Center of Excellence for Religious Training and Education, DOD's justification to the Commission reads in part "Consolidation at Fort Jackson, SC creates a synergistic benefit by having each Service's officer and enlisted programs conducted in close proximity to operational forces. Realized savings result from consolidation and alignment of similar officer and enlisted educational activities and the merging of common support functions." Saving money in implementation of any federal program is an important goal. We continue to believe that it is important for DOD's goals to include saving money where possible.

DOD did not concur with our first recommendation, to provide guidance to the program managers of the training functions created under BRAC

---

2005 on consolidating training. In its response, DOD stated that our report misunderstands the definition of joint training and that DOD and the services are constantly seeking ways to improve training opportunities by either consolidating or collocating individual skills training. DOD further stated that the Interservice Training Review Organization would be the proper entity to address the issues identified in our report. In our report, we noted that the training functions were reviewed and these reviews did not find much overlap in training between services. Several of these reviews were conducted by the Interservice Training Review Organization. Further, one of the purposes of several of these transformational recommendations was to create opportunities to enhance jointness, as stated by DOD in proposing them to the Commission. Enhancing jointness would be going a step further than collocating services and aspiring to consolidate common training. DOD also states in its comments that the Interservice Training Review Organization was involved in implementing the Chaplain recommendation. Still, we found that, even with this involvement, DOD did not take advantage of opportunities to consolidate training to increase jointness in the Chaplain recommendation. We also noted that, in the absence of guidance from DOD, four of the training functions in our review did not make any further effort to consolidate training. We continue to believe that if DOD believes the training functions in this review would benefit from more consolidation of training, it should issue guidance.

DOD did not concur with our second recommendation to develop and provide specific guidance for the military departments to use in implementing recommendations designed to consolidate training to increase jointness in the event of future BRAC rounds. DOD stated that while consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment would be required within a future BRAC round, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness already has the authority to develop this guidance. We recognize that the Under Secretary has the authority but as our report points out, it has not exercised it in this instance, and that guidance is needed to ensure that DOD takes advantage of the opportunities provided by BRAC.

DOD did not concur with our third recommendation to develop baseline cost data in the event of any future consolidation of training. DOD stated that data calls for BRAC must ensure that the questions asked do not provide the personnel answering the questions insight into the various scenarios being considered and that all installations must be treated equally. Moreover, DOD stated that this is critical to maintaining the fairness and objectivity of the analysis by preventing the supplied data from being influenced by gaining and losing locations. During BRAC

---

2005, DOD estimated that it had collected over 25 million pieces of data from hundreds of defense installations and presumably was able to do so in a way that maintained fairness and objectivity without inappropriately disclosing to personnel providing the information something to which they should not be privy. DOD further stated that collecting baseline cost data for training activities in advance of an authorized BRAC process is not effective because the department will not be able to use previously supplied uncertified data. Nothing in our recommendation requires DOD to collect data prior to the implementation of a future, authorized BRAC round. Finally, DOD stated that it is not clear that a future BRAC round would include joint training. However, baseline cost data is needed for measuring either increased costs or savings for changes to any program, not just joint training. Thus, we continue to believe that without sufficient baseline cost information, DOD will be unable to determine the budgetary effect of its actions, including demonstrating cost savings.

DOD partially concurred with our fourth recommendation, to issue clarifying guidance regarding what costs should be included in final BRAC accounting. DOD stated that micromanaging every cost decision across such a vast program would have been unreasonable and that ultimately, whether or not to fund various requirements from the BRAC account was a judgment call made by military headquarters officials. However, DOD agreed that it would be reasonable to consider placing additional emphasis on accounting for BRAC costs. We agree that managing a program as large as BRAC is difficult and that guidance on what costs should be included in the final BRAC accounting would help DOD to more accurately report the costs of implementing BRAC.

---

We are sending copies of this report to the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment. In addition, the report is available at no charge on our website at <http://www.gao.gov>.

If you or your staff have any questions about this report, please contact me at (202) 512-4523 or [leporeb@gao.gov](mailto:leporeb@gao.gov). Contact points for our Offices of Congressional Relations and Public Affairs may be found on the last

---

page of this report. GAO staff who made key contributions to this report are listed in appendix IV.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Brian Lepore". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "B" and a long, sweeping tail on the "L".

Brian J. Lepore, Director  
Defense Capabilities and Management

---

---

*List of Committees*

The Honorable John McCain  
Chairman  
The Honorable Jack Reed  
Ranking Member  
Committee on Armed Services  
United States Senate

The Honorable Thad Cochran  
Chairman  
The Honorable Richard J. Durbin  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Defense  
Committee on Appropriations  
United States Senate

The Honorable Mark Kirk  
Chairman  
The Honorable Jon Tester  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs and Related  
Agencies  
Committee on Appropriations  
United States Senate

The Honorable Mac Thornberry  
Chairman  
The Honorable Adam Smith  
Ranking Member  
Committee on Armed Services  
House of Representatives

The Honorable Rodney Frelinghuysen  
Chairman  
The Honorable Pete Visclosky  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Defense  
Committee on Appropriations  
House of Representatives

The Honorable Charlie Dent

---

Chairman  
The Honorable Sanford Bishop  
Ranking Member  
Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related  
Agencies  
Committee on Appropriations  
House of Representatives

# Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date

The following table lists selected prior GAO reports on the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 round, our recommendations in those reports, the Department of Defense's (DOD) response, and DOD's actions to date in response to the recommendations. The 24 reports listed contained 69 recommendations. DOD concurred or partially concurred with 57 of these recommendations and has implemented 37 of them. According to DOD officials, DOD will be unable to take actions on many of these recommendations until another BRAC round is authorized.<sup>1</sup>

*GAO-15-274—Military Base Realignments and Closures: Process for Reusing Property for Homeless Assistance Needs Improvements* (Mar. 16, 2015).

GAO recommendation	Original DOD response	DOD actions
<p>Update the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) homeless assistance regulations to require that conveyance statuses be tracked. These regulatory updates could include requiring the Department of Defense (DOD) to track and share disposal actions with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and requiring HUD to track the status following disposal, such as type of assistance received by providers and potential withdrawals by providers.</p>	<p><b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that while it concurs with the value of tracking homeless assistance and other conveyances, it can do so without any change to existing regulations. DOD did not identify any actions it will take on how to track the homeless assistance conveyances in the absence of a regulatory update and did not indicate that it would work with HUD to update the regulations. Moreover, DOD did not explain how program staff would know to track the conveyance status in the absence of guidance requiring them to do so.</p>	<p><b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round.</p>
<p>Update the BRAC homeless assistance regulations; establish information-sharing mechanisms, such as a website or informational pamphlets; or develop templates to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific guidance that clearly identifies the information that should be provided to homeless assistance providers during tours of on-base property, such as the condition of the property.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that while it already provides generic information about the property, the Local Redevelopment Authorities (LRA) and interested homeless assistance providers can undertake facility assessments following the tours. However, DOD did not provide additional detail or explanation about how it would provide information about the condition of the property or access to it.</p>	<p><b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information for homeless assistance providers to use in preparing their notices of interest;</li> </ul>	<p><b>Non-concur.</b> DOD stated that the existing regulatory guidance is adequate for providers' expressions of interest given that these expressions evolve as the redevelopment planning effort proceeds and they learn more about the property.</p>	<p><b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round.</p>

<sup>1</sup>We categorize DOD actions pending if DOD had described actions underway that had not been completed or DOD had not yet identified action it would take in response to a recommendation that it concurred or partially concurred with.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Guidance for legally binding agreements and clarification on the implications of unsigned agreements; and	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD did not commit to taking any actions to provide this information and instead noted that any action should ensure that a legally binding agreement does not bind DOD to disposal actions it is unable to carry out. DOD further noted that the purpose of the legally binding agreement is to provide remedies and recourse for the LRA and provider in carrying out an accommodation following property disposal.	<b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round.
Specific information on legal alternatives to providing on-base property, including acceptable alternative options such as financial assistance or off-base property in lieu of on-base property, information about rules of sale for on-base property conveyed to homeless assistance providers, and under what circumstances it is permissible to sell property for affordable housing alongside the no-cost homeless assistance conveyance.	<b>Non-concur.</b> DOD stated that providers may be considered only through specific expressions of interest in surplus BRAC property, and these suggested alternatives may be considered only within the context of what is legally permissible given the specific circumstances at each installation.	<b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round.

[GAO-14-577](#)—*DOD Joint Bases: Implementation Challenges Demonstrate Need to Reevaluate the Program* (Sept. 19, 2014).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Evaluate the 44 support functions identified in DOD's guidance for joint base implementation to determine which functions are still suitable for consolidation. Subsequently, identify and make any changes that are appropriate to address limitations reported by the joint bases in consolidating installation-support functions, such as limitations related to workforces and geography.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that it had already removed some installation-support functions from joint basing because they were not compelled for inclusion as part of the BRAC recommendation and otherwise did not offer opportunities for savings or consolidation. It further stated that in April 2014, the Senior Joint Base Working Group principals tasked their staffs to identify which installation support functions and performance standards were not providing value to the joint bases' various military missions and to explore whether these functions and standards should continue to be included in joint basing. DOD did not provide time frames for completing such actions.	<b>Pending.</b> In July 2015, an OSD official stated that DOD will not revise the 12 memorandums of agreement for the existing joint bases to show that some of the functions should not be consolidated but are using an abbreviated list of functions—excluding the functions we identified as poor candidates for consolidation—in evaluating the viability of new joint bases.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

GAO recommendation	Original DOD response	DOD actions
<p>Take policy actions, as appropriate—such as issuing additional guidance—to address any challenges resulting in inefficiencies and inequities regarding efforts to consolidate installation-support functions—including, at a minimum, those identified in this report.</p>	<p><b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that it is mindful of challenges in implementing and operating joint bases and agreed that policy actions can address some challenges. However, DOD stated that it does not agree that these challenges require Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) level policies, citing instead the existing responsibilities and authorities already assigned to the military departments and the Joint Management Oversight Structure.</p>	<p><b>Pending.</b> In July 2015, an OSD official told us that DOD is taking action on our recommendation to address any challenges resulting in inefficiencies and inequities regarding efforts to consolidate installation-support functions. DOD has drafted a joint basing handbook, which has been signed by the Air Force and the Navy, to address inconsistent service-level guidance. In addition, the Senior Installation Management Group now meets quarterly to handle conflicts and disputes between service policies and to address any challenges resulting in inefficiencies and inequities regarding efforts to consolidate installation-support functions.</p>
<p>Evaluate the purpose of the program and determine whether DOD’s current goals of achieving greater efficiencies and generating cost savings for the joint basing program, as stated in the 2005 BRAC Commission recommendation, are still appropriate or whether goals should be revised, and communicate these goals to the military services and joint bases and then adjust program activities accordingly.</p>	<p><b>Non-concur.</b> DOD stated that the goal of joint basing remains to increase the efficiency of delivering installation support at the 12 joint bases as described in the BRAC Commission’s recommendation number 146.</p>	<p><b>None planned.</b> As of November 2015, DOD stated that no action is expected.</p>
<p>Subsequent to the evaluation above, provide direction to joint bases on their requirements for meeting the joint base program’s goals. DOD’s leadership should work with the military services to determine what reporting requirements and milestones should be put in place to increase support and commitment for the program’s goals.</p>	<p><b>Non-concur.</b> DOD stated that the joint bases have been fully operational since October 2010 and have proven that they can deliver measurable and tangible savings across the installation-support portfolio. Therefore, DOD stated that it does not believe OSD should establish program milestones.</p>	<p><b>None planned.</b> As of November 2015, DOD stated that no action is expected.</p>

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

GAO recommendation	Original DOD response	DOD actions
<p>The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs should direct the Director of the Defense Health Agency (DHA) to conduct a fully developed business case analysis for the Education and Training Directorate’s reform effort. In this analysis the Director should identify the cost-related problem that it seeks to address by establishing the Education and Training Directorate,</p> <p>Explain how the processes it has identified will address the cost-related problem, and</p> <p>Conduct and document an analysis of benefits, costs, and risks.</p>	<p><b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that Medical Education and Training is the only shared service that has never had any type of oversight by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs or the pre-DHA TRICARE Management Activity.</p>	<p><b>Pending.</b> In a September 2014 letter, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs stated that baseline costing would be a key component of the Medical Education and Training Directorate’s strategic plan and would be presented in the form of a “deliverable” in moving forward to the Directorate’s final operating capability. The letter also noted that an inventory of all education and training products and services within the Military Health System will be undertaken shortly, and that this had never been accomplished before. However, the letter did not specifically address the development of metrics to assess achievement of any cost savings as we recommended. As of September 2015, no further actions have been taken.</p>
<p>Develop baseline cost information as part of DHA’s metrics to assess achievement of cost savings.</p>	<p><b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that Medical Education and Training is the only shared service that has never had any type of oversight by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs or the pre-DHA TRICARE Management Activity.</p>	<p><b>Pending.</b> According to a September 2014 letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, the completion of a business case analysis will be a key component of the Directorate’s strategic plan and will be presented in the form of a “deliverable” to achieve its final operating capability. The letter did not specifically identify the cost-related problem that DOD seeks to address by establishing the Directorate nor did it specifically state if this would be addressed in its business case analysis under development as we recommended. As of September 2015, no further actions have been taken.</p>

GAO-14-538—Defense Infrastructure: DOD Needs to Improve Its Efforts to Identify Unutilized and Underutilized Facilities (Sept. 8, 2014).

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
<p>Establish a strategic plan as part of a results-oriented management framework that includes, among other things, long-term goals, strategies to achieve the goals, and use of metrics to gauge progress to manage DOD's real property and to facilitate DOD's ability to identify all unutilized or underutilized facilities for potential consolidation opportunities.</p>	<p><b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that a strategy review is currently under way with initial guidance and initiatives.</p>	<p><b>Pending.</b> In response to a requirement under the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Reduce the Footprint policy, DOD officials told us in July 2015 that they had developed a draft DOD Real Property Efficiency Plan that describes DOD's strategic and tactical approach to managing its real property effectively and efficiently. Officials stated that this draft plan would also address our recommendation in September 2014 that DOD establish a strategic plan to manage its real property and to facilitate its ability to identify potential consolidation and disposal opportunities. This plan has not been finalized and implemented. As of October 2015, an official from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment stated that the plan is still under review and has not been provided to OMB. The official did not have an estimate for when the plan will be finalized and implemented. Officials also stated that a recently developed draft guide for calculating facility utilization should complement the draft plan in improving utilization data to better identify excess facilities.</p>

[GAO-13-436](#)—*Defense Infrastructure: Communities Need Additional Guidance and Information to Improve Their Ability to Adjust to DOD Installation Closure or Growth* (May 14, 2013).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
<p>Direct the Secretary of the Army to issue guidance, consistent with DOD guidance, on specific levels of maintenance to be followed in the event of a base closure, based on the probable reuse of the facilities.</p>	<p><b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that the Army agrees to publish property maintenance guidance prior to closing installations in the event of future base closures.</p>	<p><b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round. In July 2015, DOD stated that the Army has agreed to publish property maintenance guidance prior to closing installations in the event of future base closures. There have been no additional base closures since the date of the report.</p>

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Direct the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to consider developing a procedure for collecting service members' physical addresses while stationed at an installation, annually updating this information, and sharing aggregate information with community representatives relevant for local planning decisions, such as additional population per zip code, consistent with privacy and force protection concerns.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that it agrees that information pertaining to the physical location of installation personnel helps affected communities plan for housing, schools, transportation and other off-post requirements and that existing policy requires the military departments to share planning information with states and communities. DOD also stated that in the event of future basing decisions affecting local communities, it will work with the military departments to assess and determine the best means to obtain, aggregate, and distribute this information to help ensure that adequate planning information is made available.	<b>None planned.</b> In July 2015, DOD stated that there is no immediate need to undertake these efforts.
Direct the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force to consider creating or designating a civilian position at the installation level to be the focal point and provide continuity for community interaction for future growth installations and to consider establishing such a position at all installations.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that it agrees with the need for a designated position at the installation level and will ensure that each military department is meeting this need through current practices. DOD also stated that many growth installation officials already serve as "ex-officio members" of the community's growth management organizations and community officials agree that this has been quite valuable for both the department and affected growth communities.	<b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round. In July 2015, DOD stated that in the event the Department of Defense proceeds with future realignments that could result in a reduced footprint, there are provisions for Base Transition Coordinators to be designated as liaisons with affected communities. In the event these future realignments result in an expanded footprint or personnel growth, the department would consider this recommendation at that time.

[GAO-13-149](#)—*Military Bases: Opportunities Exist to Improve Future Base Realignment and Closure Rounds* (Mar. 7, 2013).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Work with the military services, defense agencies, and other appropriate stakeholders to improve the process for fully identifying recommendation-specific military construction requirements and ensuring that those requirements are entered into the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) model and not under stated in implementation cost estimates prior to submitting recommendations to the BRAC Commission.	<b>Non-concur.</b> DOD stated that the primary advantage of COBRA is to provide real-time comparison of scenarios to aid analysis and decision making, not to develop budget-quality estimates.	<b>None planned.</b> As of November 2015, DOD stated that no action is expected.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Establish a process for ensuring that information technology requirements associated with candidate recommendations that are heavily reliant on such technology have been identified to the extent required to accomplish the associated mission, before recommendations and cost estimates are submitted to the BRAC Commission.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD acknowledged that information technology costs should be better estimated but added that a separate process is not necessary and stated that it can improve cost estimating by reevaluating the standard factors used in COBRA and by providing additional guidance as appropriate.	<b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round.
Ensure that, during the development and comparison of BRAC scenarios, all anticipated BRAC implementation costs—such as relocating personnel and equipment—are considered and included in the COBRA model when comparing alternatives and generating cost estimates.	<b>Non-concur.</b> DOD reiterated that COBRA is not designed to develop budget quality estimates, nor can it reflect future implementation investment decisions made after BRAC recommendations become binding legal obligations for DOD.	<b>None planned.</b> As of November 2015, DOD stated that no action is expected.
Take steps to ensure that COBRA’s standard factor for information technology is updated and based on technological developments since the most recent COBRA update.	<b>Concur.</b>	<b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round.
Update COBRA guidance to require users to provide a narrative explaining the process, sources, and methods used to develop the data entered into COBRA to develop military personnel position-elimination savings.	<b>Concur.</b>	<b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round.
Identify appropriate measures of effectiveness and develop a plan to demonstrate the extent to which the department achieved the results intended from the implementation of the BRAC round.	<b>Non-concur.</b> DOD stated that military value based on force structure and mission needs should continue to be the key driver for BRAC. DOD also stated that its business plan process is the best way to measure effectiveness.	<b>None planned.</b> As of November 2015, DOD stated that no action is expected.
Establish a target for eliminating excess capacity in its initiating guidance to high-level department-wide leadership, consistent with the BRAC selection criteria chosen for a future BRAC round.	<b>Non-concur.</b> DOD stated that goals or overarching capacity targets would subvert the intent of the BRAC statute to develop recommendations based on military value and would preclude examination of a full array of closure and realignment options.	<b>None planned.</b> As of November 2015, DOD stated that no action is expected.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Limit the practice of bundling many potential stand-alone realignments or closures into single recommendations.	<b>Non-concur.</b> DOD does not believe that bundling is problematic and stated that the examples we cited had been bundled because they shared a common mission and purpose, and bundling maximized military value. The practice of bundling can limit visibility into the estimated costs and savings for individual closures or realignments that are elements of the bundle and can make the Commission's review more difficult, although DOD disputed this latter point. The 2005 BRAC Commission's executive staff told us that bundling made their review more difficult because they needed to deconstruct the bundle to assess whether any changes were necessary. In some cases bundling is warranted, and it is for this reason that we recommended limiting the practice, not prohibiting it.	<b>None planned.</b> As of November 2015, DOD stated that no action is expected.
If DOD determines that bundling multiple realignments or closures into one recommendation is appropriate, itemize the costs and savings associated with each major discrete action in its report to the BRAC Commission.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that where appropriate, the department could highlight cost and savings associated with major actions, and that action would meet the intent of our recommendation.	<b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round.
Develop a process to ensure that any data-security issues are resolved in time to provide all information to the BRAC Commission in a timely manner by conducting a security review of all BRAC data during DOD's recommendation development process, to include a review of the aggregation of unclassified data for potential security concerns and possible classification, if necessary.	<b>Concur.</b>	<b>Pending.</b> Awaiting authorization of a future BRAC round.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

GAO recommendation	Original DOD response	DOD actions
<p>Develop and implement a plan that provides measurable goals linked to achieving savings and efficiencies at the joint bases and provide guidance to the joint bases that directs them to identify opportunities for cost savings and efficiencies. DOD should at a minimum consider the items identified in its recommendation to the 2005 BRAC Commission as areas for possible savings and efficiencies, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• paring unnecessary management personnel,</li> <li>• consolidating and optimizing contract requirements,</li> <li>• establishing a single space management authority to achieve greater utilization of facilities, and</li> <li>• reducing the number of base support vehicles and equipment.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Non-concur.</b> DOD said that such targets would burden and restrict the authority of local commanders to manage the merger of the formerly stand-alone bases into joint bases while implementing new organizational structures, which would unnecessarily risk negative effects to mission support when operational effectiveness of the bases is paramount. DOD stated that the department should continue its patient approach to obtaining savings and efficiencies at joint bases, because it is working. All of the Air Force-led joint bases reduced civilian positions, and the Navy chose not to fill all of its civilian vacancies. Finally, the creation of the joint bases is equivalent to the mergers of corporations with very different financial systems, management structures, operating procedures, and cultural differences. DOD stated the importance of empowering joint base commanders to design, implement, and adapt cost efficient and effective approaches to their unique situations while adopting new and cross-cutting business practices, as incubators of innovation. DOD decided to allow for an extended transition period and to defer near-term savings.</p>	<p><b>None planned.</b> As of November 2015, DOD stated that no action is expected.</p>

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

GAO recommendation	Original DOD response	DOD actions
<p>Continue to develop and refine the Cost Performance and Visibility Framework in order to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• eliminate data reliability problems,</li> <li>• facilitate comparisons of joint basing costs with the cost of operating the separate installations prior to implementing joint basing, and</li> <li>• identify and isolate the costs and savings resulting from actions and initiatives specifically resulting from joint basing and excluding DOD- or service-wide actions and initiatives.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that its Cost Performance and Visibility Framework already provides a method to collect quarterly data on performance toward the Common Output Level Standards, annual data on personnel assigned, and funds obligated for each joint base. However, DOD is addressing inconsistencies in the current data captured in the Framework and is improving its data reliability with considerable investment and the expectation to begin assessing joint base efficiencies by the end of fiscal year 2012. DOD stated that it would be able to make several comparisons—such as comparing the current fiscal year financial and performance data with the baseline and previous year’s obligations and the joint base’s baseline data with the costs of operating the separate installations—prior to implementing joint basing. DOD acknowledged that the comparison of the costs of operating separate installations would not identify cost savings resulting solely from joint basing and asserted the impracticality of isolating and distinguishing joint basing cost savings from the savings that result from DOD- or service-wide actions using the data contained in DOD’s Framework. Further, DOD pointed out that it did not believe that accounting systems were designed to track savings but to track expenses and disbursements.</p>	<p><b>Complete.</b> DOD provided guidance to the joint bases that resulted in improved quality of the data obtained for fiscal year 2012. Subsequently, DOD performed an analysis comparing this improved operating cost data with what it had projected would be the costs of operating the separate installations if the joint bases had not been created. This analysis showed that the joint bases were saving money relative to the costs of operating the separate installations. Together these actions met the intent of our recommendation and provided DOD with an improved picture of the cost of operating the joint bases as well as a comparison of the cost of operating the joint bases with the cost of operating the separate installations.</p>
<p>Direct the joint bases to compile a list of those common standards in all functional areas needing clarification and the reasons why they need to be clarified, including those standards still being provided or reported on according to service-specific standards rather than the common standard.</p>	<p><b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that a quarterly feedback process on the joint base common standards and an annual review process that incorporates input from the joint bases already exist. Further, standards may need changing as priorities change and missions evolve, but the current process strikes an appropriate balance between the analytical burden of repeated reviews and the need for clarity and refinement. DOD also stated that it believes that reviewing all the standards simultaneously does not allow for the depth of analysis required to make sound decisions, and suggested that GAO conduct a qualitative assessment of the standards, because the findings appear to be based on an anecdotal assessment.</p>	<p><b>None planned.</b> As of November 2015, DOD stated that no action is expected.</p>

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Amend the OSD joint standards review process to prioritize review and revision of those standards most in need of clarification within this list.	<b>Partial concur.</b> See above.	<b>None planned.</b> As of November 2015, DOD stated that no action is expected.
Develop a common strategy to expand routine communication between the joint bases, and between the joint bases and OSD, to encourage joint resolution of common challenges and sharing of best practices and lessons learned.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that it believed there were already mechanisms in place to facilitate routine communication between the joint bases, as well as between OSD and the joint bases, and that it is increasing those opportunities. DOD listed the various opportunities it has for sharing joint basing information, including yearly joint base site visits and an annual management review meeting with the joint base commanders.	<b>Complete.</b> DOD added an annual meeting beginning in February 2013 for Joint Base commanders to discuss issues the bases are facing, and in August 2013 distributed contact information for all Joint Base commanders and Deputy Joint Base commanders to each of the joint bases. As a result, joint bases have had expanded opportunities to share information on best practices and lessons learned and to resolve common challenges. In part because the annual Joint Base commander's meeting takes place as part of an annual program review meeting with OSD, together these actions address the intent of this recommendation.
Develop guidance to ensure that all the joint bases develop and provide training materials to incoming personnel on how installation services are provided on joint bases.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that it would ensure that each of the services is providing training materials to incoming personnel; however, joint base commanders need flexibility to tailor training to the needs of their installations.	<b>Pending.</b> In July 2015, an OSD official told us that OSD is taking action on our recommendation to develop and provide training materials to incoming joint base personnel. DOD has drafted a joint basing handbook, which has been signed off on by the Air Force and the Navy, to address inconsistent service level guidance. In addition, the Senior Installation Management Group now meets quarterly to handle conflicts between service policies and to address any challenges that have resulted in inefficiencies and inequities regarding efforts to consolidate installation-support functions.

[GAO-11-814](#)—*Excess Facilities: DOD Needs More Complete Information and a Strategy to Guide Its Future Disposal Efforts* (Sept. 19, 2011).

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

GAO recommendation	Original DOD response	DOD actions
Develop and implement a methodology for calculating and recording utilization data for all types of facilities, and modify processes to update and verify the accuracy of reported utilization data to reflect a facility's true status.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD has already begun some efforts to improve its utilization data and will to develop and implement appropriate procedures. DOD did not specify what actions it has completed to date or its time frames for completion.	<b>Complete.</b> In January 2014, the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) issued an update to DOD's policy on inventory and accountability of real property assets. It includes procedures for inventory data requirements such as including accurate data submission in real-time or near real-time, and the creation of a Real Property Accountable Officer who is responsible for property inventory at the installation level. DOD's corrective action plan and updated policy address our concerns with calculating, recording, updating, and verifying the accuracy of utilization data.
Develop strategies and measures to enhance the management of DOD's excess facilities after the current demolition program ends, taking into account external factors that may affect future disposal efforts.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that it will work with the military departments to continue to develop and implement the most effective and efficient methods to eliminate excess facilities and excess capacity, but it did not provide any details or specific time frames for these efforts.	<b>Complete.</b> The services have incorporated demolition into their installation planning and other facility space management programs. For example, the Air Force has incorporated demolition as a key feature in its ongoing initiative to consolidate space and personnel, and to achieve a 20 percent reduction in its property inventory by 2020. Also, DOD is more proactively managing its processes to meet historic preservation requirements, to address environmental preservation concerns, and to expedite completion of required environmental mitigation. Further, the services have begun implementing a policy in line with a January 2014 update to DOD's policy on inventory and accountability of real property assets, which clarified the roles and responsibilities of the officer responsible for managing property inventory at the installation level, including the requirement to ensure that all disposal records are accurately recorded.

*GAO-11-165—Defense Infrastructure: High Level Federal Interagency Coordination Is Warranted to Address Transportation Needs Beyond the Scope of the Defense Access Roads Program (Jan. 26, 2011).*

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
<p>Update regulations and clarify guidance for the Defense Access Roads certification and funding process; develop working-level guidance for potential program users; and effectively communicate the regulations and working-level guidance to all federal, state, and local stakeholders.</p>	<p><b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that although it will work with the Department of Transportation to update Defense Access Roads regulations and clarify guidance, it believes that sufficient guidance for and awareness of the program exists.</p>	<p><b>Complete.</b> In response to our recommendation, in August 2012 DOD and the Department of Transportation agreed to more closely coordinate approaches to transportation issues. Additionally, in March 2013, DOD officials stated that, based on the results of coordinating a potential change to the Defense Access Roads eligibility criteria, leadership determined that the best approach would be to direct the Defense Access Roads program to update its guidance to ensure that the existing criteria are applied flexibly, as has been the case for urban areas during the implementation of BRAC 2005. Lastly, in June 2013, the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) issued a memo directing the Defense Access Roads Program to update its guidance. In addition, the Military Surface Deployment and Distribution Command Defense Access Roads Program office has begun communicating directly with the commanders of each growth installation to address previously reported issues regarding unawareness of the Defense Access Roads Program. These actions will allow program guidance to be updated to include the program's procedures and will ensure that the guidance is effectively communicated to all stakeholders so that the program can be used to its fullest extent.</p>

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Routinely coordinate with the Secretary of Transportation to meet regularly, identify all existing federal transportation funding resources, and develop a strategy for affording priority consideration for the use of those funds and other resources for the benefit of communities most severely affected by DOD.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that the department would continue to work closely with the department of Transportation to assist communities affected by DOD actions but that the Department of Transportation does not have discretionary funds that it can use to target communities affected by DOD, and instead, state and local communities must advance defense-related transportation projects.	<b>Complete.</b> In response to this recommendation, DOD hosted a meeting of the Economic Adjustment Committee in August 2012 to examine Defense Access Roads funding and coordination issues. An outcome of that meeting was consensus that, as DOD develops future re-stationing decisions, greater coordination with local planning entities is essential to assessing effects on transportation. In June 2013, the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) issued a letter to the congressional defense committees detailing the proposed plan for improving the Defense Access Roads Program. As stated in the plan, DOD's goal is to improve the assessment of effects on transportation; enhance collaboration with planning entities; expand the range of mitigation measures, including joint funding opportunities; and promote additional measures for managing transportation demand. These actions will allow for the effective interagency and intergovernmental coordination that is needed to help address the unmet transportation needs of defense-affected communities.

[GAO-10-725R](#)—*Military Base Realignments and Closures: DOD Is Taking Steps to Mitigate Challenges but Is Not Fully Reporting Some Additional Costs* (July 21, 2010).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Take steps to capture and appropriately report to Congress any BRAC-related implementation costs that are funded from outside the BRAC process.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD noted that it is in the process of drafting new BRAC guidance, which will direct the services and defense agencies to provide a final accounting for all BRAC costs (both inside and outside of the account), among other items,.	<b>Complete.</b> On August 5, 2010, the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) issued a guidance memo to the military services and DOD agencies requiring all BRAC business plan managers to fully capture the costs and savings of BRAC 2005 by submitting a final BRAC financial display that captures all BRAC related expenditures (both inside and outside the BRAC account), which will give Congress more visibility over all BRAC implementation costs.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

**GAO-10-602**—*Defense Infrastructure: Army Needs to Improve Its Facility Planning Systems to Better Support Installations Experiencing Significant Growth* (June 24, 2010).

GAO recommendation	Original DOD response	DOD actions
Develop and implement guidance that requires the Army Criteria Tracking System to be updated as changes to facility design and criteria are made.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that the Army has already taken action to enhance the accuracy of its planning systems to better respond to changing requirements.	<b>Complete.</b> In May 2010 the Army incorporated the functionality of the Army Criteria Tracking System into its web-based Real Property Planning and Analysis System, thereby linking the two systems and ensuring that as one is reviewed the other is reviewed and as one is updated the other is updated. The Real Property Planning and Analysis System is web based and changes can be made in real time. Similarly, because the Army Criteria Tracking System is now incorporated into the Real Property Planning and Analysis System, the Army Criteria Tracking System is now web based and changes to it can be made in real time.
Develop and implement policies and procedures for linking other systems, such as the Army Range Requirements Model and the Army Health Planning Agency's system, to the Real Property Planning and Analysis System in order to eliminate any potential confusion as to the correct range and medical facility requirements.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that it plans to partly address our recommendation by fielding a comprehensive range planning tool.	<b>Complete.</b> The Army stated that as of June 2010, the Army Range Requirements Model was being used to generate the range requirements in the Real Property Planning and Analysis System and that because the Army Health Facility Planning Agency does not have an automated system to generate requirements, the Army was manually obtaining hospital requirements and inputting them into the Real Property Planning and Analysis System. These actions eliminated two sets of requirements for ranges and hospitals, reducing any potential confusion.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Develop a streamlined mechanism to expedite the flow of stationing information to installations.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that the Army has already initiated improvements in its process and is evaluating additional streamlining measures.	<b>Complete.</b> In January 2012, DOD reported that the Army continues to enhance the flow of stationing information. All unit moves are now combined by installation and by fiscal year, significantly reducing the number of actions being processed. In August 2010, the Army staff issued guidance to the field (Installation Management Command) that clarified formal lines of communication and established protocol to differentiate between official and unofficial taskings, enabling installation commanders to focus on approved official actions. All stakeholders are better involved in the early stages of force structure actions, force design updates, concept plans, and leadership direction. In April 2012, DOD reported that a copy of the August 2010 Army staff guidance that clarified formal lines of communication was provided to the field (Installation Management Command).
Modify existing guidance to enhance communication between decision makers and installations so that installation facility planners are notified when stationing actions are changed.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that the Army has already initiated improvements in its communication process and that the department is evaluating additional measures to ensure that data integrity and transparency are achieved.	<b>Complete.</b> In August 2010 the Army issued guidance to better synchronize installations' participation in stationing efforts. Specifically, the guidance (1) clarified formal lines of communication to ensure that all stakeholders are better involved in the early stages of force structure actions and force design updates and (2) established protocols to enable communication between staff at installations and Army Headquarters during stationing action implementation to ensure efficient completion of stationing actions. As a result, we believe the Army's actions met the intent of our recommendation.
<b>GAO-09-703—Military Base Realignments and Closures: DOD Needs to Update Savings Estimates and Continue to Address Challenges in Consolidating Supply-Related Functions at Depot Maintenance Locations (July 9, 2009).</b>		
<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Remove savings estimates that are not clearly the direct result of 2005 BRAC actions (including savings sometimes referred to as "BRAC enabled").	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that such savings estimates will be removed from savings estimates reported in the August 2009 business plan submission.	<b>Complete.</b> In DOD's 2009 biannual Business Plan, the Defense Logistics Agency had removed those savings from its estimates.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Update its 4-year-old data to reflect the most recent estimate of inventory levels available for consolidation.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that it will use the most recent estimate of inventory levels available and update the savings calculations for inventory reductions in its August 2009 business plan.	<b>Complete.</b> In DOD's 2009 biannual Business Plan, the Defense Logistics Agency used updated inventory levels in its current estimate for savings related to this BRAC recommendation.
Apply current information on the timing of inventory consolidations (specifically, when they will begin and how long they will take) and exclude projected savings for consolidating Army and Marine Corps inventories with the Defense Logistics Agency.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that savings calculations for projected inventory reductions will reflect the current schedule of consolidating materiel and will be updated in the August 2009 business plan. Moreover, DOD stated that the update will show that no Army or Marine Corps inventory is available for consolidation.	<b>Complete.</b> In DOD's August 2009 biannual Business Plan, The Defense Logistics Agency used current information regarding a later timetable for inventory consolidations and eliminated any savings from the Army and Marine Corps inventories since there will not be any available to consolidate. The resulting savings estimate will provide better information for congressional oversight and help maintain public confidence in the BRAC process.
Revise and finalize an approved methodology which implements these steps and can be consistently followed by all the services and the Defense Logistics Agency over time.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that the new calculations would be documented in the August 2009 business plan and updates and revisions would be incorporated and staffed by the end of calendar year 2009.	<b>Complete.</b> According to DOD, in 2010 and 2011, the department documented updates and revisions to the methodologies for projecting or tracking, or both, BRAC savings associated with the supply, storage, and distribution functions and inventories in the Cost and Savings Tracking Plan, which was in its second coordination cycle.

**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* (March 30, 2009).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Periodically review the installation support standards as experience is gained with delivering installation support at the joint bases and make adjustments, if needed, to ensure that each standard reflects the level of service necessary to meet installation requirements as economically as possible.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that further action to implement the recommendation was not necessary because the joint base memorandum of agreement template already requires periodic reviews to ensure that installation support is delivered in accordance with appropriate, common, output level standards.	<b>Complete.</b> In January 2011, DOD stated that the department now reviews the installation support standards annually for appropriateness, applicability, and performance. In addition to the annual review, the department implemented a cost and performance visibility framework under which the joint bases report how well the standards are being met. DOD stated that the reported information can assist in determining whether any adjustments need to be made to the standards.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Periodically review administrative costs as joint basing is implemented to minimize any additional costs and prevent the loss of existing installation support efficiencies.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that further action to implement the recommendation was not necessary because it had already established a process to periodically review joint basing costs as part of its planning, program, budget and execution system and that the joint base memorandum of agreement template requires periodic reviews of effects on missions and resources.	<b>None planned.</b>
Complete a detailed analysis of the estimated installation support costs from the initial joint bases and report the results of the analysis to Congress in the department's documents supporting the administration's annual budget submission or other documents deemed appropriate.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that it is collecting estimated installation support cost information at the joint bases and that the information will be provided if Congress requests it.	<b>Complete.</b> In July 2011, DOD stated that it had established procedures for collecting installation support costs at the 12 joint bases and, by using a cost and performance visibility framework, the joint bases report cost and manpower annually six weeks after the end of the fiscal year. According to DOD, the information is analyzed in conjunction with performance data reported quarterly, to get an overall assessment of how well the standards for installation support are being met and the costs associated with those standards. DOD stated that it will continue to respond to requests for information from Congress with regard to the joint basing initiative.
Increase the attention given to facility sustainment spending by summarizing and reporting to Congress the amount of budgeted sustainment funds spent on other purposes in the department's documents supporting the administration's annual budget submission or other documents deemed appropriate.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that it would collect and summarize the amount of budgeted sustainment funds spent on other purposes and that the information would be provided if Congress requested it.	<b>Complete.</b> In July 2011, DOD stated that the department was monitoring the budgeting and execution of facilities sustainment in order to determine how much of the funding budgeted for sustainment is diverted to other purposes. DOD also stated that the department was currently collecting information at a sampling of installations across DOD on the sustainment tasks that are deferred in a given year and that the information would help inform decision-making with regard to facilities sustainment funding. Finally, DOD previously stated that it would provide Congress with information on the amount of budgeted sustainment funds spent on other purposes, if Congress requests it.

**GAO-09-217**—*Military Base Realignments and Closures: DOD Faces Challenges in Implementing Recommendations on Time and Is Not Consistently Updating Savings Estimates* (Jan. 30, 2009).

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
<p>Modify the recently issued guidance on the status of BRAC implementation to establish a briefing schedule with briefings as frequently as OSD deems necessary to manage the risk that a particular recommendation may not meet the statutory deadline but at a minimum at 6-month intervals through the rest of the BRAC 2005 implementation period, a schedule that would enable DOD to continually assess and respond to the challenges identified by the services and defense agencies that could prevent DOD from completing the implementation of a recommendation by September 15, 2011.</p>	<p><b>Concur.</b> DOD noted that BRAC business managers had and would continue to provide briefings on the status of implementation actions associated with recommendations exceeding \$100 million, and that these briefings provide a forum for BRAC business managers to explain their actions to mitigate challenges.</p>	<p><b>Complete.</b> The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) issued a memo in November 2008 requiring the military services and defense agencies to provide the OSD BRAC Office status briefings. According to OSD, the briefings were needed to ensure senior leadership was apprised of significant issues affecting BRAC implementation by the statutory deadline. The first round of status briefings took place in December 2008.</p>
<p>Modify the recently issued guidance on the status of BRAC implementation to require the services and defense agencies to provide information on possible mitigation measures to reduce the effects of those challenges.</p>	<p><b>Concur.</b> DOD noted that BRAC business managers had and would continue to provide briefings on the status of implementation actions associated with recommendations exceeding \$100 million, and that these briefings provide a forum for BRAC business managers to explain their actions to mitigate challenges.</p>	<p><b>Complete.</b> According to DOD, in 2009 and 2010, the department required business managers to identify specific mitigation measures for BRAC recommendations that have construction projects that are scheduled to complete within 3 months of the statutory deadline. The purpose of these mitigation measures is to reduce the risk of not completing implementation of a recommendation by the BRAC deadline. These mitigation measures are identified and monitored in a tracking tool to help ensure they are implemented and the risk is reduced. As appropriate, the DOD basing office conducts additional follow-up meetings with business managers for specific issues or follows up via other contacts that occur between the routine 6 month briefing intervals. This helps to ensure DOD is making progress and implementation of recommendations is on track. As part of this process, six recommendations were identified as having particular risk. DOD briefed these six recommendations to key Senate and House staff in March 2010.</p>

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Take steps to improve compliance with DOD's regulation requiring updated BRAC savings estimates.	<b>Concur.</b> The department stated that it is emphasizing savings updates during its briefings and in all future business plan approval documentation.	<b>Complete.</b> On August 5, 2010, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) issued a guidance memo to the military services and DOD agencies regarding BRAC 2005 Final Business Plans and Other Reporting Requirements. Among other things, this guidance emphasized to the military services and defense agencies that it is imperative that the final financial displays for BRAC 2005 contain updated projections of recurring savings.

[GAO-08-665](#)—*Defense Infrastructure: High-Level Leadership Needed to Help Communities Address Challenges Caused by DOD-Related Growth* (June 17, 2008).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Develop and implement guidance—no later than the end of fiscal year 2008—that is consistent with DOD Directive 5410.12 for the timely, complete, and consistent dissemination of DOD planning information such as estimated time lines and numbers of personnel relocating, as well as demographic data such as numbers of school-aged children, and update this information quarterly.	<b>Concur.</b> Although DOD indicated it would continue to work with the cognizant DOD components to ensure compliance with the directive, actions taken to date have not resulted in the military services' development and implementation of guidance that we believe is necessary for providing more complete and consistent personnel relocation planning data to affected communities. Moreover, DOD did not explicitly say what steps it intends to take to ensure that the military services have implemented such guidance by the end of fiscal year 2008. With respect to our recommended action to provide information updates on a quarterly basis, DOD indicated that not all situations are conducive to quarterly updates.	<b>Complete.</b> From January through March 2011, the military services and the head of the Defense Logistics Agency issued guidance for the timely, complete, and consistent dissemination of DOD planning information, such as military and civilian personnel changes and school-age children increases and decreases in accordance with DOD Directive 5410.12. Although DOD missed the deadline for implementing our recommendation, issuing this guidance facilitates the preparation of effective plans to minimize the economic impacts on communities resulting from changes in defense programs.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
<p>Implement Executive Order 12788 by holding regular meetings of the full executive-level Economic Adjustment Committee and by serving as a clearinghouse of information for identifying expected community effects and problems, as well as identifying existing resources for providing economic assistance to communities affected by DOD activities. In addition, this information should be updated at least quarterly and made easily available to all interested stakeholders at the local, state, and federal levels.</p>	<p><b>Concur.</b> DOD stated that it will develop an information clearinghouse that will identify federal programs and resources to affected communities, present successful state and local responses, and provide the Economic Adjustment Committee members with a basis to resource their assistance programs. Based on DOD's comments, it is unclear as to whether DOD, as chair of the Economic Adjustment Committee, intends to call and periodically hold meetings of the full executive-level committee to provide the high-level federal leadership that we believe is necessary to more effectively coordinate federal agency assistance to impacted communities.</p>	<p><b>Complete.</b> DOD regularly reconvened the full executive level Economic Adjustment Committee meetings from February 25, 2009 to September 2, 2010 and completed actions that met the intent of our recommendation by establishing a clearinghouse website in December 2009 to support states and communities undertaking local economic adjustment activity and federal agencies working to support such activities. By reconvening the full executive level Economic Adjustment Committee and setting up the clearinghouse website, DOD increased its ability to engage other federal agencies at a high level to promote interagency and intergovernmental cooperation and share information on a continual basis. DOD activated a publicly accessible website in December 2008 (<a href="http://www.eaclearinghouse.gov">www.eaclearinghouse.gov</a>), managed by the Office of Economic Adjustment, which contains information such as service migration information, information on federal agency assistance programs, community profiles, and community redevelopment plans.</p>

**GAO-08-315—Military Base Realignment and Closures: Higher Costs and Lower Savings Projected for Implementing Two Key Supply-Related BRAC Recommendations** (March 5, 2008).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
<p>Revise its business plans to exclude all expected savings that are not the direct result of BRAC actions.</p>	<p><b>Non-concur.</b> DOD stated that while the \$172 million in potential savings for implementing the supply, storage, and distribution recommendation and the \$71 million in potential savings for implementing the depot-level reparable recommendation were not directly the result of BRAC actions, the estimated savings were enabled by BRAC actions and should be attributable to the recommendations. According to DOD, enabled savings are savings initiatives that were enhanced in some way by the BRAC implementation actions (e.g. increased scope, more aggressively pursued, or moved in new directions).</p>	<p><b>None planned.</b></p>

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

GAO recommendation	Original DOD response	DOD actions
<p>Implement methodologies for periodically monitoring and updating net savings for the supply, storage, and distribution and depot-level reparable recommendations throughout the implementation period. Such methodologies, at a minimum, should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clear metrics for measuring the magnitude of actual costs and savings,</li> <li>• a comparison of the actual costs and savings to the prior estimates to coincide with the required semiannual business plan updates, and</li> <li>• explanations for actual cost and savings variances from estimates presented in the business plans.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Concur.</b></p>	<p><b>Complete.</b> According to DOD, in 2009, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) established a standard DOD format for measuring the magnitude of actual costs and savings, and required DOD components to submit business plans in February and August that compared current costs and savings with prior estimates and justify any changes, by funding category. The Defense Logistics Agency has since updated cost and savings for BRAC recommendations on a semi-annual basis synchronized with the programming and budget cycles and compared actual costs and savings to prior year estimates. The magnitude of actual costs and savings are collected in a relational data base that was developed to compare actual costs and savings to prior year estimates. The data base has data on BRAC Recommendation 176-Depot Level Repairable Management and BRAC Recommendation 177-Supply, Storage, and Distribution Reconfiguration. For example, in the February 2009 business plans for BRAC Recommendation 176 and BRAC Recommendation 177, the Defense Logistics Agency compared costs and savings to prior estimates for each funding category and when there was a variance in a funding category, it included an explanation for the change in cost and savings.</p>

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Ensure that necessary funding to meet implementation milestones is reflected in all service and Defense Logistics Agency budget submissions for the remainder of the implementation period ending in fiscal year 2011.	<b>Concur.</b>	<b>Complete.</b> According to DOD, the BRAC decision memorandums provide the resources to fully fund implementation during the 6-year BRAC implementation statutory period. Annually the DOD BRAC office goes through an extensive analysis to compare each business plan requirement to program funding (Program Review). If funding shortfalls are identified, the components are directed via a Program Decision Memorandum to fully fund requirements. The office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) issued a June 22, 2007 memorandum directing DOD Components to fully fund BRAC implementation during the 6-year statutory period.

[GAO-08-159](#)—*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Cost Estimates Have Increased and Are Likely to Continue to Evolve* (Dec. 11, 2007).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Explain, in DOD's BRAC budget submission to Congress, the difference between annual recurring savings attributable to military personnel entitlements and annual recurring savings that will readily result in funds available for other defense priorities.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD noted that military personnel reductions attributable to a BRAC recommendation as savings are as real as savings generated through end strength reductions. DOD also stated that while it may not reduce overall end strength, its reductions in military personnel for each recommendation at a specific location are real and these personnel reductions allow the department to reapply these military personnel to support new capabilities and improve operational efficiencies.	<b>Complete.</b> The fiscal year 2009 DOD budget estimates for BRAC 2005 included language that stated, "To the extent that savings generated from military personnel reductions at closing or realigning installations are immediately used to fund military personnel priorities, these resources are not available to fund other Defense priorities." Such language was not included in the prior year (fiscal year 2008) budget submittal to Congress. The Office of the Secretary of Defense stated that the insertion of this language would provide a better explanation to Congress of its estimated annual recurring savings resulting from BRAC.

[GAO-07-1040](#)—*Military Base Realignments and Closures: Plan Needed to Monitor Challenges for Completing More Than 100 Armed Forces Reserve Centers* (Sept. 13, 2007).

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Develop a plan for routinely bringing together the various stakeholders as a group, to include the state Army National Guard when appropriate, to monitor for and develop steps to mitigate implementation challenges should they occur. These steps should include ways to monitor and mitigate the effects of potential challenges on BRAC completion time frames, project cost and scope, construction quality, and capacity of the facility to meet changing mission requirements.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD believes that GAO overlooked the various groups, forums, or plans that the Army has in place to assist with BRAC execution and management. DOD stated that the Army already has a plan in place to bring the various stakeholders together, however Army BRAC headquarters officials acknowledged that they could be more proactive in outreaching and communicating with the stakeholders on how to deal with and mitigate particular challenges associated with constructing 125 AFRCs. DOD also stated that the Army BRAC office will begin quarterly BRAC program reviews with the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment, which will further provide a forum for discussing and vetting issues affecting the BRAC program.	<b>Complete.</b> The Army BRAC Office has taken several steps to implement the recommendation. In March 2009, the Army BRAC Office provided a BRAC 2005 program update to the Army Vice Chief of Staff, with representation from the Army National Guard and Reserves. In addition, the Army BRAC Division Reserve Component Branch, the Army Reserve Division, and the full time Army National Guard and Army Reserve liaisons assigned to the Army BRAC Office collaborated at BRAC summits in October 2009 and April 2010 where issues affecting US Army Reserve Command were discussed with Army National Guard and Army Reserve Command presenting their concerns.

[GAO-07-1007](#)—*Defense Infrastructure: Challenges Increase Risks for Providing Timely Infrastructure Support for Army Installations Expecting Substantial Personnel Growth* (Sept. 13, 2007).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Determine why there are data differences between headquarters and gaining bases with respect to the number of arriving and departing personnel.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that the Army had determined the cause of the differences and taken corrective action by establishing the Army Stationing Installation Plan (ASIP) as the single, unified source of installation planning population data to be used Army-wide.	<b>Complete.</b> In January 2007 the Army designated the ASIP as the single, unified source of installation planning population data to be used Army-wide. In May 2008, the Army issued guidance that helped reduce the differences between the populations reported by Headquarters and the installations by ensuring that ASIP population data be used for reporting external to the Army and allowing pre-decisional unit moves to be used for internal planning. Lastly, in a memorandum of agreement signed in May 2009, the Army established an ASIP quarterly edit cycle to resolve discrepancies between Army official force structure data and “on the ground” situation.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Ensure that Army headquarters and base officials are collaborating to agree on Army personnel movement plans so that base commanders and surrounding communities can effectively plan for expected growth. This collaboration to reach agreement should continue as expected personnel movement actions are revised over time.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated that the Army had already taken corrective action. The Army stated that in May 2007 it issued guidance that allowed installations to plan for anticipated unit moves that may not be reflected in the ASIP and to discuss these plans with local communities as long as they are appropriately identified as pre-decisional and subject to change. Army officials also stated that, in June 2007, they would ensure that installations forward all population and stationing issues to the Department of the Army headquarters for resolution.	<b>Complete.</b> In May 2007, the Army issued guidance that allowed installations to plan for anticipated moves that may not be reflected in the ASIP and to discuss these plans with local communities as long as they are appropriately identified as pre-decisional and subject to change. In addition, in May 2009 the Army issued a memorandum of agreement between the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management and the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff G-3/5/7 to close information gaps and improve timely reconciliation of disparate data among installation planners, force planners, and headquarters. The memorandum established an ASIP quarterly edit cycle to resolve discrepancies between Army official force structure data and the “on the ground” situation.

[GAO-07-641](#)—*Military Base Closures: Management Strategy Needed to Mitigate Challenges and Improve Communication to Help Ensure Timely Implementation of Air National Guard Recommendations* (May 16, 2007).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Develop a mitigation strategy to be shared with key stakeholders that anticipates, identifies, and addresses related implementation challenges. At a minimum, this strategy should include time frames for actions and responsibilities for each challenge, and facilitate the ability of Air National Guard headquarters officials to act to mitigate potential delays in interim milestones.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD suggested a modification to the recommendation to clarify that the director, Air National Guard, is normally tasked by the Chief, National Guard Bureau. DOD also stated that mitigation plans cannot be released until they have been thoroughly vetted with all of the key stakeholders.	<b>Complete.</b> The National Guard Bureau implemented a Strategic Communication Plan that provides affected units with the information they need to successfully complete BRAC actions and develop opportunities for follow-on missions at BRAC-affected locations. The Air National Guard Strategic Planning process, which is based on state involvement at all levels of the planning process, is the cornerstone and allows states to provide input to the Air National Guard Strategic Plan and ensures that states have the necessary information to implement those plans. The National Guard Bureau Strategic Communication Plan also incorporates Air Force communications.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

GAO recommendation	Original DOD response	DOD actions
Expand the Strategic Communication Plan to include how the Air National Guard headquarters will provide the affected Air National Guard units with the information needed to implement the BRAC-related actions.	<b>Partial concur.</b> DOD stated it is incumbent upon the Air National Guard and all effected units to maximize established chains of leadership and communication to effectively manage and execute BRAC actions. The Director, Air National Guard, acknowledges that there are challenges in communicating with the units and that some unit commanders may not have the information that they feel they need to implement the BRAC recommendation and their new missions.	<b>Complete.</b> The National Guard Bureau, an oversight organization over Air National Guard, is providing key stakeholders with access to detailed BRAC implementation action timelines and programming plans, including BRAC contacts at each Air National Guard-affected base. Further, the Air National Guard Strategic Communication Playbook, which was updated in 2009, now focuses leadership attention to various strategic priorities including the implementation of Air National Guard BRAC recommendations. In addition, the Air National Guard Strategic Planning Process includes both Air Force level and National Guard Bureau level communication with various state-level Adjutants Generals about BRAC implementation. As such, the Air Force Chief of Staff and Air National Guard Director have hosted a meeting for all state-level Adjutants Generals to discuss BRAC actions. As a result of implementing our recommendation, Air National Guard headquarters' ability to identify strategies and determine resources needed to effectively meet BRAC goals has improved.
Report in the Air Force annual BRAC budget submission the costs and source of funding required to establish replacement missions for the Air National Guard units that will lose their flying missions as a result of BRAC 2005.	<b>Non-concur.</b> DOD does not believe these costs are BRAC-related, because establishment of replacement missions was not part of the recommendations. DOD stated that BRAC funds cannot be used to establish these missions and that the costs in question have been appropriately programmed and budgeted in the Air Force's regular military construction account.	<b>None planned.</b>

[GAO-07-304](#)—*Military Base Closures: Projected Savings from Fleet Readiness Centers Are Likely Overstated and Actions Needed to Track Actual Savings and Overcome Certain Challenges* (June 29, 2007).

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Update the business plan for the fleet readiness centers (1) to reflect only savings that are directly related to implementing the recommendation, and (2) update projected onetime savings when data are available.	<b>Concur.</b> DOD stated it considers military personnel reductions attributable to BRAC recommendations as savings that are just as real as savings generated through end-strength reductions. While the department may not reduce overall end-strength, it believes that the reductions in military personnel for each recommendation at a specific location are real.	<b>Complete.</b> The Commander, Fleet Readiness Centers, updated the business plan in August 2009 to reflect savings directly related to the BRAC action to establish fleet readiness centers. The Navy updated projected savings directly related to implementing the recommendation, showing that overall savings projections of \$1.151 billion from the August 2007 version of the business plan should not change, since changes to projected savings targets in some of the six Fleet Readiness Center locations that exceeded savings targets in some years were offset by the inability to meet savings targets at other locations or in other years. The Navy updated projected one-time savings when data became available by changing some savings projected in the 2009 version of the business plan (from our recommendation to re-categorize approximately \$25 million per year from recurring savings) to one-time savings.

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Monitor implementation of the recommendation to determine the extent to which savings already taken from the Navy budget are actually achieved.	<b>Concur.</b>	<b>Complete.</b> The Navy has demonstrated sustained leadership devoted to implementing the BRAC recommendation for establishing Fleet Readiness Centers, as evidenced by successive leaders who have developed implementation plans and completed each phase of implementation over time. In addition, the Navy's implementation guidance for Fleet Readiness Centers specifies that key measures include, in part, achieving savings targets. As a result, the Navy's monthly report to the Fleet Readiness Center Commanders includes an analysis of the variance between savings projected and those actually achieved at the six Fleet Readiness Centers. These reports provide objective, outcome-oriented metrics for improving readiness and detailing six separate savings categories. Commanding Officers or Officers-in-Charge of specific centers are evaluated for their results and held accountable for achieving savings targets. Management tools developed by the implementation team for Fleet Readiness Centers have supported the identification of additional opportunities to realize savings. Continuing efforts to monitor implementation and develop mechanisms to improve performance and accountability have allowed the Navy to determine the extent to which savings already taken from the Navy budget for aircraft maintenance are actually achieved.

[GAO-07-166](#)—*Military Base Closures: Opportunities Exist to Improve Environmental Cleanup Cost Reporting and to Expedite Transfer of Unneeded Property* (Jan. 30, 2007).

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

GAO recommendation	Original DOD response	DOD actions
<p>Report all costs (Defense Environmental Restoration Program and non- Defense Environmental Restoration Program)—past and future—required to complete environmental cleanup at each BRAC installation and to fully explain the scope and limitations of all the environmental cleanup costs DOD reports to Congress. We suggest including this information in the annual BRAC budget justification documentation, since it would accompany information Congress considers when making resource allocation decisions.</p>	<p><b>Concur.</b> DOD concurred with our basic recommendation; however DOD’s comments reflect only a partial concurrence, because DOD did not agree with our suggestion to include this information in the annual BRAC budget justification documentation. DOD stated its belief that this would be counterproductive and that Congress has prescribed the types of environmental information it wants presented in the budget documentation, which DOD complies with.</p>	<p><b>Complete.</b> DOD stated that in October 2008, the Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for the Environment, Safety, and Occupational Health determined that the Annual Report to Congress is the appropriate and best format to provide Congress with cleanup information on the DOD BRAC environmental programs. The annual report data is updated annually, via the electronic reporting system from the DOD components to the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment. The 2007 annual report provided BRAC site cost data through FY2007 and the estimated cost to complete for FY2008. The annual report is a comprehensive document designed to answer the many stakeholder questions that have developed over the many years of executing BRAC cleanup. The cost and budget data that appears in the annual report are also in the annual budget justification submitted to Congress in support of the President’s Budget Request.</p>
<p>Require that the military services periodically report to OSD on the status and proposed strategy for transferring unneeded BRAC properties and include an assessment of the usefulness of all tools at their disposal. We suggest placing this information in an easily shared location, such as a website, so that each service, and even the local communities and private sector, can share and benefit from lessons learned.</p>	<p><b>Concur.</b> DOD concurred with our recommendation to require the military services to periodically report to the Office of the Secretary of Defense on the status and proposed strategy for transferring BRAC properties and to include an assessment of the usefulness of all tools at their disposal. Although DOD did not comment on our suggestion to accomplish this through a shared website in order to maximize the sharing of lessons learned, DOD officials embraced the idea as something easily to do in comments they made during our exit interview with the department.</p>	<p><b>Complete.</b> According to DOD, military departments are required to report on the status of all excess real property and to include the available acreages and the authority under which the land was transferred, conveyed, or otherwise disposed of. In June 2011, we contacted the responsible OSD office and were provided sufficient evidence that all four of the military services are now (within the last two years) reporting the status of excess real property to OSD. In addition, the DOD Inspector General’s written response of February 25, 2011, in closing out our recommendation, stated that the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations and Environment) continually reviews the need for new authorities and changes to existing authorities.</p>

*GAO-05-785—Military Bases: Analysis of DOD’s 2005 Selection Process and Recommendations for Base Closures and Realignments (July 1, 2005).*

**Appendix I: List of Prior GAO Reviews Related to BRAC 2005, Related Recommendations, and DOD Actions to Date**

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Establish mechanisms for tracking and periodically updating savings estimates in implementing individual recommendations, with emphasis on both savings related to the more traditional realignment and closure actions and those related more to business process reengineering.	<b>Concur.</b> No written comments provided. In providing oral comments on a draft of this report, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment concurred with our recommendation.	<b>Complete.</b> The Joint Action Scenario Team, a joint team DOD set up to develop and propose various joint reserve component recommended actions, incorporated our suggestions to include specific information in its summary reports and supporting documentation in order to withstand scrutiny and provide a clear understanding to outside parties—including us and the military service audit agencies—of the process leading to the ultimate decisions regarding recommended BRAC actions.

[GAO-04-760](#)—*Military Base Closures: Assessment of DOD’s 2004 Report on the Need for a Base Realignment and Closure Round* (May 17, 2004).

<b>GAO recommendation</b>	<b>Original DOD response</b>	<b>DOD actions</b>
Include in the Secretary of Defense’s May 2005 report on recommendations for base closures and realignments a full discussion of relevant assumptions, and allowances made for potential future force structure requirements and changes, including the potential for future surge requirements.	<b>Concur.</b>	<b>Complete.</b> The Secretary of Defense’s May 2005 report to the BRAC Commission addressed several of these factors. For example, the report contained a discussion about current and future national security threats the department considered during its deliberations. In addition, the report included a copy of the Secretary of Defense’s January 2005 “Policy Memoranda Seven – Surge,” which outlined five steps DOD would take to meet the statutory requirements to consider a surge in the development of BRAC recommendations. Further, some of the military departments and joint cross service groups discussed during their analyses the steps they took to incorporate the possibility of future surge requirements.

Source: GAO summary of GAO and DOD information | GAO-16-45

# Appendix II: Text of BRAC Recommendations Included in Our Review

<b>FORT BRAGG, NORTH CAROLINA</b>	
RECOMMENDATION # 4 (ARMY 10)	
ONE-TIME COST:	\$334.8M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	\$23.8M
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	\$639.2M
PAYBACK PERIOD:	NEVER
<b>SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION</b>	
Realign Fort Bragg, NC, by relocating the 7th Special Forces Group (SFG) to Eglin AFB, FL, and by activating the 4th Brigade Combat Team (BCT), 82d Airborne Division and relocating European-based forces to Fort Bragg, NC.	
<b>SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION</b>	
<p>This recommendation co-locates Army Special Operation Forces with Air Force Special Operations Forces at Eglin AFB, activates the 4th BCT of the 82nd Airborne Division, and relocates Combat Service Support units to Fort Bragg from Europe to support the Army modular force transformation. This realignment and activation of forces enhances military value and training capabilities by locating Special Operations Forces (SOF) in locations that best support Joint specialized training needs, and by creating needed space for the additional brigade at Fort Bragg. This recommendation is consistent with and supports the Army's Force Structure Plan submitted with the FY 06 budget, and provides the necessary capacity and capability, including surge, to support the units affected by this action.</p> <p>This recommendation never pays back. However, the benefits of enhancing Joint training opportunities coupled with the positive impact of freeing up needed training space and reducing cost of the new BCT by approximately \$54-\$148M (with family housing) at Fort Bragg for the Army's Modular Force transformation, justify the additional costs to the Department.</p>	
<b>COMMUNITY CONCERNS</b>	
There were no formal expressions from the community.	
<b>COMMISSION FINDINGS</b>	
The Commission found that this recommendation was consistent with DoD's justification. Specifically, the Commission views that the relocation of the 7 <sup>th</sup> Special Forces Group to Eglin AFB, FL, provides this unit an opportunity to achieve outstanding joint training through its collocation with the Air Force Special Operations Command. Also, the Commission found that this relocation enables the activation of the 4 <sup>th</sup> Brigade Combat Team, 82D Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, NC, and it is consistent with the Army's transformation efforts and the Force Structure Plan.	
<b>COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.	

**Appendix II: Text of BRAC Recommendations  
Included in Our Review**

**JOINT CENTER FOR CONSOLIDATED TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT TRAINING**

RECOMMENDATION # 122 (E&T 7)

ONE-TIME COST:	\$1.5M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	(\$1.3M)
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	(\$18.0M)
PAYBACK PERIOD:	1 YEAR

**SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION**

Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating the Transportation Management training to Fort Lee, VA.

**SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION**

Eliminates redundancy. "Train as we fight: jointly." Consolidates like schools while preserving service-unique culture. Although Lackland Air Force Base, TX, has a higher military value than Fort Lee, VA, it is the military judgment of the JCSCG that consolidation at the location with the largest amount of transportation training produces the greatest overall military value to the Department. Uses Interservice Training Review Organization (ITRO) as the baseline.

**COMMUNITY CONCERNS**

There were no formal expressions from the community.

**COMMISSION FINDINGS**

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission believes that locating all transportation management training at one location will provide significant joint benefits, enhance intra-service procedures, and reduce training duplication. The Commission also believes that course curriculums can be developed to provide service-unique training where necessary. In sum, the proposal was found to increase military value without posing undue risks of mission disruption.

**COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

**Appendix II: Text of BRAC Recommendations  
Included in Our Review**

<b>JOINT CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR CULINARY TRAINING</b>	
RECOMMENDATION # 123 (E&T 8)	
ONE-TIME COST:	\$5.4M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	(\$1.0M)
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	(\$15.7M)
PAYBACK PERIOD:	2 YEARS
<b>SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION</b>	
Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating Culinary Training to Fort Lee, VA, establishing it as a Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training.	
<b>SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION</b>	
Consolidates Culinary Training at the installation with the largest Service requirement. Eliminates redundancy and costs. Provides the Services with culinary training under Inter-service Training Review Organization. It is the military judgment of the JCSCG that consolidation at the location with the largest amount of culinary training produces the greatest overall military value to the Department through increased training efficiency at a lower cost.	
<b>COMMUNITY CONCERNS</b>	
There were no formal expressions from the community.	
<b>COMMISSION FINDINGS</b>	
The Commission's review and analysis confirmed the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission's approval of this recommendation endorses the concept of centers of excellence as a means of enhancing jointness and promoting transformation.	
The Commission found, however, that the ultimate cost of this recommendation is still unclear.	
The Commission also found that after many years of previous consolidation with the Air Force, the Navy had begun making plans, prior to BRAC, to move its culinary training program from Lackland Air Force Base to Great Lakes Naval Base. The Navy cited differences in service-unique and cultural issues as the reason for deconsolidating culinary training. While the Commission's approval of DoD's recommendation will move the Navy's program to Fort Lee, the Commission cautions DoD to carefully implement the program to accommodate service-specific needs.	
<b>COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	
The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.	

---

**Appendix II: Text of BRAC Recommendations  
Included in Our Review**

---

**JOINT CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR RELIGIOUS TRAINING & EDUCATION**

RECOMMENDATION # 124 (E&T 9)

ONE-TIME COST:	\$1.0M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	(\$0.9M)
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	(\$11.9M)
PAYBACK PERIOD:	1 YEAR

**SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION**

Realign Maxwell Air Force Base, AL; Naval Air Station Meridian, MS; and Naval Station Newport, RI; by relocating religious training and education to Fort Jackson, SC, establishing a Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education.

**SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION**

Consolidation at Fort Jackson, SC, creates a synergistic benefit by having each Service's officer and enlisted programs conducted in close proximity to operational forces. Realized savings result from consolidation and alignment of similar officer and enlisted educational activities and the merging of common support functions. This recommendation supports the following DoD transformational options: (1) establish center of excellence for joint education and training by combining like schools and (2) establish joint officer and enlisted specialized skills training.

**COMMUNITY CONCERNS**

There were no formal expressions from the community.

**COMMISSION FINDINGS**

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission believes a Joint Center for Religious Education and Training at Fort Jackson will provide significant jointness benefits to the Chaplain Corps, and better prepare chaplains to comfortably minister to members of all service branches. The Commission also believes that during DoD implementation, course curricula can be developed to achieve both goals of consolidating training where appropriate, and providing service-unique training where necessary.

**COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

**Appendix II: Text of BRAC Recommendations  
Included in Our Review**

**JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER INITIAL JOINT TRAINING SITE**

RECOMMENDATION # 125 (E&T 10)

ONE-TIME COST:	\$199.1M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	\$3.3M
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	\$226.3M
PAYBACK PERIOD:	NEVER

**SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION**

Realign Luke Air Force Base, AZ, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots and operations support personnel to stand up the Air Force's portion of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots and operations support personnel to stand up the Marine Corps' portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, VA, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots, operations, and maintenance support personnel to stand up the Navy's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of frontline and instructor-qualified maintenance technicians and logistics support personnel to stand up the Air Force's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of frontline and instructor-qualified maintenance technicians and logistics support personnel to stand up the Department of the Navy's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

**SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION**

This recommendation establishes Eglin Air Force Base, FL, as an Initial Joint Training Site that teaches entry-level aviators and maintenance technicians how to safely operate and maintain the new Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) (F-35) aircraft. The Department is scheduled to take delivery of the F-35 beginning in 2008. This joint basing arrangement will allow the Interservice Training Review Organization process to establish a DoD baseline program in a consolidated/joint school with curricula that permit services latitude to preserve service-unique culture and a faculty and staff that brings a "Train as we fight: jointly" national perspective to the learning process.

**COMMUNITY CONCERNS**

The Sheppard AFB, TX, community endorsed the concept of establishing a single test site for the JSF program and did not voice concerns over its being located at Eglin Air Force Base. The community did request, however, that Sheppard Air Force Base be considered as a candidate installation for JSF maintenance training after the initial JSF proof-of-concept is completed.

The Pensacola, FL, community acknowledged that locating the planned JSF test center at Eglin Air Force Base was good for the Florida Gulf region, which includes the Pensacola area.

**COMMISSION FINDINGS**

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission understands that establishing an initial training site for the Joint Strike Fighter at Eglin Air Force Base will support the learning process for this new-generation aircraft. Careful implementation should enable DoD to harness the best aspects of each service branch while still meeting service-unique requirements.

**COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

**Appendix II: Text of BRAC Recommendations  
Included in Our Review**

**UNDERGRADUATE PILOT AND NAVIGATOR TRAINING**

RECOMMENDATION # 128 (E&T 14)

ONE-TIME COST:	\$71.7M
ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS):	(\$18.3M)
20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE:	(\$174.2M)
PAYBACK PERIOD:	4 YEARS

**SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION**

Realign Moody Air Force Base, GA, as follows: Relocate the Primary Phase of Fixed-wing Pilot Training to Columbus Air Force Base, MS; Laughlin Air Force Base, TX; and Vance Air Force Base, OK. Relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots to Columbus Air Force Base, MS; Laughlin Air Force Base, TX; Randolph Air Force Base, TX; Sheppard Air Force Base, TX; and Vance Air Force Base, OK. Relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers to Columbus Air Force Base, MS; Laughlin Air Force Base, TX; Sheppard Air Force Base, TX; and Vance Air Force Base, OK. Relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Instructor Pilots to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.

Realign Randolph Air Force Base, TX, by relocating Undergraduate Navigator Training to Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL.

**SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION**

This recommendation will realign and consolidate the Air Force's primary phase of undergraduate flight training functions to reduce excess/unused basing capacity, eliminate redundancy, enhance jointness for Undergraduate Navigator Training/Naval Flight Officer (NFO) training, reduce excess capacity, and improve military value.

The basing arrangement that flows from this recommendation will allow the Inter-service Training Review Organization process to establish a DoD baseline program in Undergraduate Navigator Training/NFO with curricula that permit services latitude to preserve service-unique culture and a faculty and staff that brings a "Train as we fight: jointly" national perspective to the learning process.

**COMMUNITY CONCERNS**

No concerns were formally expressed by elected officials or organized civic organizations; however, individual citizens near Moody Air Force Base expressed concerns about the loss of contractor jobs.

**COMMISSION FINDINGS**

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation or justification. The Commission understands the proposal will realign training to other installations where the same mission already exists, maintenance facilities are established, and capacity to absorb the mission is adequate. As a result, the Commission finds the recommendation appropriately enhances military value at reasonable cost.

**COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

# Appendix III: Comments from the Department of Defense



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
3400 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3400

FEB 1 2016

Mr. Brian Lepore  
Director, Defense Capabilities and Management  
U.S. Government Accountability Office  
441 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20548

Dear Mr. Lepore:

This is the Department of Defense (DoD) response to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) Draft Report, GAO-16-45 "MILITARY BASE REALIGNMENTS AND CLOSURES (BRAC): More Guidance and Information Needed to Take Advantage of Opportunities to Consolidate Training" dated December 4, 2015 (GAO Code 351984).

We appreciate GAO's review of BRAC recommendations involving joint training. While portions of the report are informative and some aspects of the recommendations are sound, we believe the report misunderstands DoD's approach to joint and common training and does not completely recognize the unique circumstances of BRAC recommendation development and implementation. In particular, the report does not consider the role of existing organizations like the Interservice Training Review Organization which is empowered to provide policy guidance to increase effectiveness of interservice training. In addition, the report undervalues the importance of providing the DoD Components flexibility to determine BRAC costs and has a misplaced emphasis on estimating savings for transformational recommendations. The six recommendations that were transformational focused on increasing military value not savings. Of these, two (7<sup>th</sup> Special Forces and Joint Strike Fighter) were never intended to save money and the other four yielded low annual savings. The enclosed comments on the recommendations detail these concerns.

We look forward to continuing to work with the GAO on these important issues related to BRAC.

Daniel P.C. Feehan,  
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of  
Defense for Readiness  
Performing the Duties of the Assistant  
Secretary of Defense  
(Readiness)

Peter J. Potodiney  
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Basing  
Performing the Duties of the Assistant  
Secretary of Defense  
(Energy, Installations and Environment)

Enclosure:  
As stated

GAO DRAFT REPORT DATED DECEMBER 4, 2015  
GAO-16-45 (GAO CODE 351984)

“MILITARY BASE REALIGNMENTS AND CLOSURES: MORE GUIDANCE  
AND INFORMATION NEEDED TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF OPPORTUNITIES  
TO CONSOLIDATE TRAINING”

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMMENTS  
TO THE GAO RECOMMENDATION

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** The GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Secretaries of the Military Departments to provide guidance to the program managers on consolidating training, if DOD decides that the opportunity to increase jointness is still appropriate

**DoD RESPONSE:** Non-concur. There appears to be a misunderstanding of the definition of joint and common training. DoD Directive 1322.18, Military Training, defines joint training as “...using joint doctrine or tactics, techniques, and procedures to prepare joint forces or joint staffs to respond to strategic, operational, or tactical requirements that the Combatant Commanders consider necessary...” Common training is defined as “Training that is not unique to a particular DoD Component; training that has no special distinction or quality to an individual DoD Component...” Two or more Military Services (including Coast Guard) training together on individual skills to meet individual Service requirements is not joint training.

The Department and Services are constantly seeking ways to improve training opportunities by either consolidating or collocating individual skills training. To facilitate this process, the Services established the Interservice Training Review Organization (ITRO). The purpose of ITRO is to provide policy guidance for interservice training and to review training and related activities to increase effectiveness and efficiency. ITRO reviewed the GAO’s report and affirmed that ITRO is the proper forum to address the issues identified. For example, ITRO was involved in the Chaplain recommendation implementation process. Every year ITRO acts on dozens of requests from the Services for consolidation or collocation of like training. For example, in FY 14, more than 40,000 Service members from other Services attended 372 Army TRADOC courses.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** The GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment to develop and provide specific guidance for the Military Departments to use in implementing recommendations designed to consolidate training to increase jointness.

**DoD RESPONSE:** Non-concur. DoD Directive 1322.18, Military Training, specifically states that the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)) is responsible for oversight and policy for individual, functional, common, and collective

training programs. While consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment (ASD(EI&E)) would be required within a future BRAC round (if authorized by Congress), USD(P&R) already has the authority to develop guidance that would enable DoD to consolidate training and increase jointness.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** The GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Military Departments to develop baseline cost data.

**DoD RESPONSE:** Non-Concur. The unique circumstances of the BRAC process dictate that the Department use standardized data calls (to obtain certified data) to develop recommendations. In order to treat all installations equally and allow senior officials to make decisions within that process, data calls for BRAC must ensure that the questions asked do not provide the personnel answering the questions insight into the various scenarios being considered. This is critical to maintaining the fairness and objectivity of the analysis by preventing the supplied data from being influenced by gaining and losing locations. As such, gathering detailed baseline data on candidate recommendations during the deliberative process could unnecessarily disclose information to lower echelons or installation advocates prematurely.

In the latter stages of BRAC, analytical teams supporting decision makers must judiciously balance the need for detailed information to flesh out a scenario with the need to give senior leaders the freedom to exercise their experience and military judgment in a deliberative process without concern that their discussions will be disclosed prematurely. Moreover, collecting baseline cost data for training activities in advance of an authorized BRAC process is not effective because the Department will not be able to use previously supplied uncertified data and it is not clear that a future round will involve joint training. For these reasons, we believe it is not practical or appropriate to obtain the level of baseline cost data that the GAO report suggests.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:** The GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment to issue guidance clarifying what costs should be included in final BRAC accounting.

**DoD RESPONSE:** Partially concur. The key to an effective implementation process is to provide oversight without creating a reporting process that could diminish the authority of the DoD Components leadership and chain of command to make numerous detailed cost decisions. The BRAC 2005 business plan process properly balanced oversight and flexibility. GAO's report implies that this flexibility was the cause of the inconsistency in reporting costs. Micro-managing every cost decision would have been unreasonable across such a vast program that affected hundreds of installations and thousands of people working in the three Military Departments and various Defense Agencies. Ultimately, whether or not to fund various requirements from the BRAC account was a judgment call made by Military Headquarters officials. They made these decisions after internal and external deliberations and coordination within and between DoD Components during the six-year implementation period, business plan approval cycle, and in parallel with numerous other initiatives occurred (e.g., Grow the Army, world-

class medical care standards imposed by Congress, significant fluctuations in construction costs, etc.).

That said, if Congress authorizes the Department to conduct a BRAC round, and the Department elects to institute an oversight process similar to BRAC 2005, it would be reasonable for the Department to consider providing additional emphasis on accounting for BRAC costs.

---

# Appendix IV: GAO Contact and Staff Acknowledgments

---

## GAO Contact

Brian J. Lepore, (202) 512-4523 or [leporeb@gao.gov](mailto:leporeb@gao.gov)

---

## Staff Acknowledgments

In addition to the contact named above, Gina Hoffman (Assistant Director), Leslie Bharadwaja, Michele Fejfar, Joanne Landesman, Amie Lesser, Stephanie Moriarty, Carol Petersen, Matthew Spiers, and Michael Willems made key contributions to this report.

---

# Appendix V: Accessible Data

---

## Agency Comment Letter

---

### Text of Appendix III: Comments from the Department of Defense

---

Page 1

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3400 DEFENSE PENTAGON

WASHINGTON, DC 2030 1-3400

FEB 1 2016

Mr. Brian Lepore

Director, Defense Capabilities and Management

U.S. Government Accountability Office

441 G Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20548

Dear Mr. Lepore:

This is the Department of Defense (DoD) response to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) Draft Report, GAO-16-45 "MILITARY BASE REALIGNMENTS AND CLOSURES (BRAC): More Guidance and Information Needed to Take Advantage of Opportunities to Consolidate Training" dated December 4, 2015 (GAO Code 351984).

We appreciate GAO's review of BRAC recommendations involving joint training. While portions of the report are informative and some aspects of the recommendations are sound, we believe the report misunderstands DoD's approach to joint and common training and does not completely recognize the unique circumstances of BRAC recommendation development and implementation. In particular, the report does not consider the role of existing organizations like the Interservice Training

Review Organization which is empowered to provide policy guidance to increase effectiveness of interservice training. In addition, the report undervalues the importance of providing the DoD Components flexibility to determine BRAC costs and has a misplaced emphasis on estimating savings for transformational recommendations. The six recommendations that were transformational focused on increasing military value not savings. Of these, two (7<sup>th</sup> Special Forces and Joint Strike Fighter) were never intended to save money and the other four yielded low annual savings. The enclosed comments on the recommendations detail these concerns.

We look forward to continuing to work with the GAO on these important issues related to BRAC.

Daniel P.C. Feehan,

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Readiness

Performing the Duties of the Assistant Secretary of Defense

(Readiness)

Peter J. Potochney

Deputy Assistant Secretary of defense for Basing

Performing the Duties of the Assistant

Secretary of Defense

(Energy, Installations and Environment)

Enclosure: As stated

---

Page 2

GAO DRAFT REPORT DATED DECEMBER 4, 2015 GA0-16-45 (GAO CODE 351984)

"MILITARY BASE REALIGNMENTS AND CLOSURES: MORE GUIDANCE AND INFORMATION NEEDED TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF OPPORTUNITIES TO CONSOLIDATE TRAINING"

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COMMENTS TO THE GAO RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION 1: The GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Secretaries of the Military Departments to provide guidance to the program managers on consolidating training, if DOD decides that the opportunity to increase jointness is still appropriate

DoD RESPONSE: Non-concur. There appears to be a misunderstanding of the definition of joint and common training. DoD Directive 1322.18, Military Training, defines joint training as "...using joint doctrine or tactics, techniques, and procedures to prepare joint forces or joint staffs to respond to strategic, operational, or tactical requirements that the Combatant Commanders consider necessary ..." Common training is defined as "Training that is not unique to a particular DoD Component; training that has no special distinction or quality to an individual DoD Component..." Two or more Military Services (including Coast Guard) training together on individual skills to meet individual Service requirements is not joint training.

The Department and Services are constantly seeking ways to improve training opportunities by either consolidating or collocating individual skills training. To facilitate this process, the Services established the Interservice Training Review Organization (ITRO). The purpose of ITRO is to provide policy guidance for interservice training and to review training and related activities to increase effectiveness and efficiency. ITRO reviewed the GAO's report and affirmed that ITRO is the proper forum to address the issues identified. For example, ITRO was involved in the Chaplain recommendation implementation process. Every year ITRO acts on dozens of requests from the Services for consolidation or collocation of like training. For example, in FY 14, more than 40,000 Service members from other Services attended 372 Army TRADOC courses.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment to develop and provide specific guidance for the Military Departments to use in implementing recommendations designed to consolidate training to increase jointness.

DoD RESPONSE: Non-concur. DoD Directive 1322.18, Military Training, specifically states that the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)) is responsible for oversight and policy for individual, functional, common, and collective

training programs. While consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment (ASD(EI&E)) would be required within a future BRAC round (if authorized by Congress), USD(P&R) already has the authority to develop guidance that would enable DoD to consolidate training and increase jointness.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** The GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Military Departments to develop baseline cost data.

**DoD RESPONSE:** Non-Concur. The unique circumstances of the BRAC process dictate that the Department use standardized data calls (to obtain certified data) to develop recommendations. In order to treat all installations equally and allow senior officials to make decisions within that process, data calls for BRAC must ensure that the questions asked do not provide the personnel answering the questions insight into the various scenarios being considered. This is critical to maintaining the fairness and objectivity of the analysis by preventing the supplied data from being influenced by gaining and losing locations. As such, gathering detailed baseline data on candidate recommendations during the deliberative process could unnecessarily disclose information to lower echelons or installation advocates prematurely.

In the latter stages of BRAC, analytical teams supporting decision makers must judiciously balance the need for detailed information to flesh out a scenario with the need to give senior leaders the freedom to exercise their experience and military judgment in a deliberative process without concern that their discussions will be disclosed prematurely. Moreover, collecting baseline cost data for training activities in advance of an authorized BRAC process is not effective because the Department will not be able to use previously supplied uncertified data and it is not clear that a future round will involve joint training. For these reasons, we believe it is not practical or appropriate to obtain the level of baseline cost data that the GAO report suggests.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:** The GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment to issue guidance clarifying what costs should be included in final BRAC accounting.

**DoD RESPONSE:** Partially concur. The key to an effective implementation process is to provide oversight without creating a reporting process that could diminish the authority of the DoD Components leadership and chain of command to make numerous

---

detailed cost decisions. The BRAC 2005 business plan process properly balanced oversight and flexibility. GAO's report implies that this flexibility was the cause of the inconsistency in reporting costs. Micro-managing every cost decision would have been unreasonable across such a vast program that affected hundreds of installations and thousands of people working in the three Military Departments and various Defense Agencies. Ultimately, whether or not to fund various requirements from the BRAC account was a judgment call made by Military Headquarters officials. They made these decisions after internal and external deliberations and coordination within and between DoD Components during the six-year implementation period, business plan approval cycle, and in parallel with numerous other initiatives occurred (e.g., Grow the Army, world-

---

Page 5

class medical care standards imposed by Congress, significant fluctuations in construction costs, etc.).

That said, if Congress authorizes the Department to conduct a BRAC round, and the Department elects to institute an oversight process similar to BRAC 2005, it would be reasonable for the Department to consider providing additional emphasis on accounting for BRAC costs.

---

Text of Appendix II: Text of  
BRAC Recommendations  
Included in Our Review

---

Page 1

FORT BRAGG, NORTH CAROLINA

RECOMMENDATION # 4 (ARMY I0)

ONE-TIME COST: \$334.BM

ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS): \$23.BM

20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE: \$639.2M

PAYBACK PERIOD: NEVER

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Fort Bragg, NC, by relocating the 7th Special Forces Group (SFG) to Eglin AFB, FL, and by activating the 4th Brigade Combat Team

(BCT), 82d Airborne Division and relocating European-based forces to Fort Bragg, NC.

#### SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation co-locates Army Special Operation Forces with Air Force Special Operations Forces at Eglin AFB, activates the 4th BCT of the 82nd Airborne Division, and relocates Combat Service Support units to Fort Bragg from Europe to support the Army modular force transformation. This realignment and activation of forces enhances military value and training capabilities by locating Special Operations Forces (SOF) in locations that best support Joint specialized training needs, and by creating needed space for the additional brigade at Fort Bragg. This recommendation is consistent with and supports the Army's Force Structure Plan submitted with the FY 06 budget, and provides the necessary capacity and capability, including surge, to support the units affected by this action.

This recommendation never pays back. However, the benefits of enhancing Joint training opportunities coupled with the positive impact of freeing up needed training space and reducing cost of the new BCT by approximately \$54-\$148M (with family housing) at Fort Bragg for the Army's Modular Force transformation, justify the additional costs to the Department.

#### COMMUNITY CONCERNS

There were no formal expressions from the community.

#### COMMISSION FINDINGS

The Commission found that this recommendation was consistent with DoD's justification. Specifically, the Commission views that the relocation of the 7th Special Forces Group to Eglin AFB, FL, provides this unit an opportunity to achieve outstanding joint training through its collocation with the Air Force Special Operations Command. Also, the Commission found that this relocation enables the activation of the 4th Brigade Combat Team, 82D Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, NC, and it is consistent with the Army's transformation efforts and the Force Structure Plan.

#### COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The Commission found the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan. Therefore, the Commission approved the recommendation of the Secretary.

Page 2

---

JOINT CENTER FOR CONSOLIDATED TRANSPORTATION  
MANAGEMENT TRAINING

RECOMMENDATION # 122 (E&T 7)

ONE-TIME COST: \$1.5M

ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS): (\$1.3M)

20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE: (\$18.0M)

PAYBACK PERIOD: 1 YEAR

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating the Transportation Management training to Fort Lee, VA

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

Eliminates redundancy. "Train as we fight: jointly." Consolidates like schools while preserving service-unique culture. Although Lackland Air Force Base, TX, has a higher military value than Fort Lee, VA, it is the military judgment of the JCSG that consolidation at the location with the largest amount of transportation training produces the greatest overall military value to the Department. Uses Inter-service Training Review Organization (ITRO) as the baseline.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

There were no formal expressions from the community.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission believes that locating all transportation management training at one location will provide significant joint benefits, enhance intra-service procedures, and reduce training duplication. The Commission also believes that course

---

curriculums can be developed to provide service-unique training where necessary. In sum, the proposal was found to increase military value without posing undue risks of mission disruption.

#### COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

---

Page 3

#### JOINT CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR CULINARY TRAINING

RECOMMENDATION # 123 (E&T 8)

ONE-TIME COST: \$5.4M

ANNUAL RECURRING (OSTS)/(SAVINGS): (\$1.0M)

20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE: (\$15.7M)

PAYBACK PERIOD: 2YEARS

#### SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating Culinary Training to Fort Lee, VA, establishing it as a Joint Center of Excellence for Culinary Training.

#### SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

Consolidates Culinary Training at the installation with the largest Service requirement. Eliminates redundancy and costs. Provides the Services with culinary training under Inter-service Training Review Organization. It is the military judgment of the JCSG that consolidation at the location with the largest amount of culinary training produces the greatest overall military value to the Department through increased training efficiency at a lower cost.

#### COMMUNITY CONCERNS

There were no formal expressions from the community.

#### COMMISSION FINDINGS

The Commission's review and analysis confirmed the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission's approval of this recommendation endorses the concept of centers of excellence as a means of enhancing jointness and promoting transformation.

The Commission found, however, that the ultimate cost of this recommendation is still unclear.

The Commission also found that after many years of previous consolidation with the Air Force, the Navy had begun making plans, prior to BRAC, to move its culinary training program from Lackland Air Force Base to Great Lakes Naval Air Station. The Navy cited differences in service-unique and cultural issues as the reason for de-consolidating culinary training. While the Commission's approval of DoD's recommendation will move the Navy's program to Fort Lee, the Commission cautions DoD to carefully implement the program to accommodate service-specific needs.

#### COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

---

Page 4

#### JOINT CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR RELIGIOUS TRAINING & EDUCATION

RECOMMENDATION # 124 (E&T 9)

ONE-TIME COST: \$1.0M

ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS): (\$0.9M)

20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE: (\$11.9M)

PAYBACK PERIOD: 1 YEAR

#### SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Maxwell Air Force Base, AL; Naval Air Station Meridian, MS; and Naval Station Newport, RI; by relocating religious training and education to Fort Jackson, SC, establishing a Joint Center of Excellence for religious training and education.

---

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

Consolidation at Fort Jackson, SC, creates a synergistic benefit by having each Service's officer and enlisted programs conducted in close proximity to operational forces. Realized savings result from consolidation and alignment of similar officer and enlisted educational activities and the merging of common support functions. This recommendation supports the following DoD transformational options: (1) establish center of excellence for joint education and training by combining like schools and (2) establish joint officer and enlisted specialized skills training.

COMMUNITY (ONCERNS)

There were no formal expressions from the community.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission believes a Joint Center for Religious Education and Training at Fort Jackson will provide significant jointness benefits to the Chaplain Corps, and better prepare chaplains to comfortably minister to members of all service branches. The Commission also believes that during DoD implementation, course curricula can be developed to achieve both goals of consolidating training where appropriate, and providing service-unique training where necessary.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore<sup>1</sup> the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER INITIAL JOINT TRAINING SITE

RECOMMENDATION # 125 (E&T 10)

ONE-TIME COST: \$199.1M

ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS): \$3.3M

20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE: \$226.3M

PAYBACK PERIOD: NEVER

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Luke Air Force Base, AZ, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots and operations support personnel to stand up the Air Force's portion of the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, CA, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots and operations support personnel to stand up the Marine Corps' portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, VA, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of instructor pilots, operations, and maintenance support personnel to stand up the Navy's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of frontline and instructor-qualified maintenance technicians and logistics support personnel to stand up the Air Force's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site, hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL. Realign Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL, by relocating to Eglin Air Force Base, FL, a sufficient number of frontline and instructor-qualified maintenance technicians and logistics support personnel to stand up the Department of the Navy's portion of the JSF Initial Joint Training Site hereby established at Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation establishes Eglin Air Force Base, FL, as an Initial Joint Training Site that teaches entry-level aviators and maintenance technicians how to safely operate and maintain in the new Joint Strike Fighter (OSF) (F-35) aircraft. The Department is scheduled to take delivery of the F-35 beginning in 2008. This joint basing arrangement will allow the Interservice Training Review Organization process to establish a DoD baseline program in a consolidated/joint school with curricula that permit services latitude to preserve service-unique culture and a faculty and staff that brings a "Train as we fight: jointly" national perspective to the learning process.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

---

The Sheppard AFB, TX, community endorsed the concept of establishing a single test site for the JSF program and did not voice concerns over its being located at Eglin Air Force Base. The community did request, however, that Sheppard Air Force Base be considered as a candidate installation for JSF maintenance training after the initial JSF proof-of-concept is completed.

The Pensacola, FL, community acknowledged that locating the planned JSF test center at Eglin Air Force Base was good for the Florida Gulf region, which includes the Pensacola area.

#### COMMISSION FINDINGS

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation and justification. The Commission understands that establishing an initial training site for the Joint Strike Fighter at Eglin Air Force Base will support the learning process for this new-generation aircraft. Careful implementation should enable DoD to harness the best aspects of each service branch while still meeting service-unique requirements.

#### COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

#### UNDERGRADUATE PILOT AND NAVIGATOR TRAINING

RECOMMENDATION # 128 (E&T 14)

ONE-TIME COST: \$71.7M

ANNUAL RECURRING COSTS/(SAVINGS): (\$18.3M)

20-YEAR NET PRESENT VALUE: (\$174.2M)

PAYBACK PERIOD: 4YEARS

#### SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RECOMMENDATION

Realign Moody Air Force Base, GA, as follows: Relocate the Primary Phase of Fixed-wing Pilot Training to Columbus Air Force Base, MS;

Laughlin Air Force Base, TX; and Vance Air Force Base, OK. Relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Pilots to Columbus Air Force Base, MS; Laughlin Air Force Base, TX; Randolph Air Force Base, TX; Sheppard Air Force Base, TX; and Vance Air Force Base, OK. Relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Weapons Systems Officers to Columbus Air Force Base, MS; Laughlin Air Force Base, TX; Sheppard Air Force Base, TX; and Vance Air Force Base, OK. Relocate Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals Training for Instructor Pilots to Randolph Air Force Base, TX.

Realign Randolph Air Force Base, TX, by relocating Undergraduate Navigator Training to Naval Air Station Pensacola, FL.

#### SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JUSTIFICATION

This recommendation will realign and consolidate the Air Force's primary phase of undergraduate flight training functions to reduce excess/unused basing capacity, eliminate redundancy, enhance jointness for Undergraduate Navigator Training/Naval Flight Officer (NFO) training, reduce excess capacity, and improve military value.

The basing arrangement that flows from this recommendation will allow the Inter-service Training Review Organization process to establish a DoD baseline program in Undergraduate Navigator Training. INFO with curricula that permit services latitude to preserve service unique culture and a faculty and staff that brings a "Train as we fight: jointly" national perspective to the learning process.

#### COMMUNITY CONCERNS

No concerns were formally expressed by elected officials or organized civic organizations; however, individual citizens near Moody Air Force Base expressed concerns about the loss of contractor jobs.

#### COMMISSION FINDINGS

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the Secretary's recommendation or justification. The Commission understands the proposal will realign training to other installations where the same mission already exists, maintenance facilities are established, and capacity to absorb the mission is adequate. As a result, the Commission finds the recommendation appropriately enhances military value at reasonable cost.

---

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission finds the Secretary's recommendation consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Therefore, the Commission approves the recommendation of the Secretary.

---

# Related GAO Products

---

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Process for Reusing Property for Homeless Assistance Needs Improvements.* [GAO-15-274](#). Washington, D.C.: March 16, 2015.

*DOD Joint Bases: Implementation Challenges Demonstrate Need to Reevaluate the Program.* [GAO-14-577](#). Washington, D.C.: September 19, 2014.

*Defense Health Care Reform: Actions Needed to Help Realize Potential Cost Savings from Medical Education and Training.* [GAO-14-630](#). Washington, D.C.: July 31, 2014.

*Defense Infrastructure: Communities Need Additional Guidance and Information to Improve Their Ability to Adjust to DOD Installation Closure or Growth.* [GAO-13-436](#). Washington, D.C.: May 14, 2013.

*Military Bases: Opportunities Exist to Improve Future Base Realignment and Closure Rounds.* [GAO-13-149](#). Washington, D.C.: March 7, 2013.

*DOD Joint Bases: Management Improvements Needed to Achieve Greater Efficiencies.* [GAO-13-134](#). Washington, D.C.: November 15, 2012.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency's Technology Center Construction Project.* [GAO-12-770R](#). Washington, D.C.: June 29, 2012.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Updated Costs and Savings Estimates from BRAC 2005.* [GAO-12-709R](#). Washington, D.C.: June 29, 2012.

*Defense Health Care: Applying Key Management Practices Should Help Achieve Efficiencies within the Military Health System.* [GAO-12-224](#). Washington, D.C.: April 12, 2012.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Key Factors Contributing to BRAC 2005 Results.* [GAO-12-513T](#). Washington, D.C.: March 8, 2012.

*Excess Facilities: DOD Needs More Complete Information and a Strategy to Guide Its Future Disposal Efforts.* [GAO-11-814](#). Washington, D.C.: September 19, 2011.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Review of the Iowa and Milan Army Ammunition Plants.* [GAO-11-488R](#). Washington, D.C.: April 1, 2011.

*GAO's 2011 High-Risk Series: An Update.* [GAO-11-394T](#). Washington, D.C.: February 17, 2011.

*Defense Infrastructure: High-Level Federal Interagency Coordination Is Warranted to Address Transportation Needs beyond the Scope of the Defense Access Roads Program.* [GAO-11-165](#). Washington, D.C.: January 26, 2011.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: DOD Is Taking Steps to Mitigate Challenges but Is Not Fully Reporting Some Additional Costs.* [GAO-10-725R](#). Washington, D.C.: July 21, 2010.

*Defense Infrastructure: Army Needs to Improve Its Facility Planning Systems to Better Support Installations Experiencing Significant Growth.* [GAO-10-602](#). Washington, D.C.: June 24, 2010.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Estimated Costs Have Increased While Savings Estimates Have Decreased Since Fiscal Year 2009.* [GAO-10-98R](#). Washington, D.C.: November 13, 2009.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Transportation Impact of Personnel Increases Will Be Significant, but Long-Term Costs Are Uncertain and Direct Federal Support Is Limited.* [GAO-09-750](#). Washington, D.C.: September 9, 2009.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: DOD Needs to Update Savings Estimates and Continue to Address Challenges in Consolidating Supply-Related Functions at Depot Maintenance Locations.* [GAO-09-703](#). Washington, D.C.: July 9, 2009.

*Defense Infrastructure: DOD Needs to Periodically Review Support Standards and Costs at Joint Bases and Better Inform Congress of Facility Sustainment Funding Uses.* [GAO-09-336](#). Washington, D.C.: March 30, 2009.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: DOD Faces Challenges in Implementing Recommendations on Time and Is Not Consistently Updating Savings Estimates.* [GAO-09-217](#). Washington, D.C.: January 30, 2009.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Army Is Developing Plans to Transfer Functions from Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, to Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, but Challenges Remain.* [GAO-08-1010R](#). Washington, D.C.: August 13, 2008.

*Defense Infrastructure: High-Level Leadership Needed to Help Communities Address Challenges Caused by DOD-Related Growth.* [GAO-08-665](#). Washington, D.C.: June 17, 2008.

*Defense Infrastructure: DOD Funding for Infrastructure and Road Improvements Surrounding Growth Installations.* [GAO-08-602R](#). Washington, D.C.: April 1, 2008.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Higher Costs and Lower Savings Projected for Implementing Two Key Supply-Related BRAC Recommendations.* [GAO-08-315](#). Washington, D.C.: March 5, 2008.

*Defense Infrastructure: Realignment of Air Force Special Operations Command Units to Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico.* [GAO-08-244R](#). Washington, D.C.: January 18, 2008.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Estimated Costs Have Increased and Estimated Savings Have Decreased.* [GAO-08-341T](#). Washington, D.C.: December 12, 2007.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Cost Estimates Have Increased and Are Likely to Continue to Evolve.* [GAO-08-159](#). Washington, D.C.: December 11, 2007.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Impact of Terminating, Relocating, or Outsourcing the Services of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology.* [GAO-08-20](#). Washington, D.C.: November 9, 2007.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Transfer of Supply, Storage, and Distribution Functions from Military Services to Defense Logistics Agency.* [GAO-08-121R](#). Washington, D.C.: October 26, 2007.

*Defense Infrastructure: Challenges Increase Risks for Providing Timely Infrastructure Support for Army Installations Expecting Substantial Personnel Growth.* [GAO-07-1007](#). Washington, D.C.: September 13, 2007.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Plan Needed to Monitor Challenges for Completing More Than 100 Armed Forces Reserve Centers.* [GAO-07-1040](#). Washington, D.C.: September 13, 2007.

*Military Base Realignment and Closures: Observations Related to the 2005 Round.* [GAO-07-1203R](#). Washington, D.C.: September 6, 2007.

*Military Base Closures: Projected Savings from Fleet Readiness Centers Likely Overstated and Actions Needed to Track Actual Savings and Overcome Certain Challenges.* [GAO-07-304](#). Washington, D.C.: June 29, 2007.

*Military Base Closures: Management Strategy Needed to Mitigate Challenges and Improve Communication to Help Ensure Timely Implementation of Air National Guard Recommendations.* [GAO-07-641](#). Washington, D.C.: May 16, 2007.

*Military Base Closures: Opportunities Exist to Improve Environmental Cleanup Cost Reporting and to Expedite Transfer of Unneeded Property.* [GAO-07-166](#). Washington, D.C.: January 30, 2007.

*Military Bases: Observations on DOD's 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Selection Process and Recommendations.* [GAO-05-905](#). Washington, D.C.: July 18, 2005.

*Military Bases: Analysis of DOD's 2005 Selection Process and Recommendations for Base Closures and Realignments.* [GAO-05-785](#). Washington, D.C.: July 1, 2005.

*Military Base Closures: Observations on Prior and Current BRAC Rounds.* [GAO-05-614](#). Washington, D.C.: May 3, 2005.

*Military Base Closures: Assessment of DOD's 2004 Report on the Need for a Base Realignment and Closure Round.* [GAO-04-760](#). Washington, D.C.: May 17, 2004.

---

---

## GAO's Mission

The Government Accountability Office, the audit, evaluation, and investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

---

## Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents at no cost is through GAO's website (<http://www.gao.gov>). Each weekday afternoon, GAO posts on its website newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence. To have GAO e-mail you a list of newly posted products, go to <http://www.gao.gov> and select "E-mail Updates."

---

## Order by Phone

The price of each GAO publication reflects GAO's actual cost of production and distribution and depends on the number of pages in the publication and whether the publication is printed in color or black and white. Pricing and ordering information is posted on GAO's website, <http://www.gao.gov/ordering.htm>.

Place orders by calling (202) 512-6000, toll free (866) 801-7077, or TDD (202) 512-2537.

Orders may be paid for using American Express, Discover Card, MasterCard, Visa, check, or money order. Call for additional information.

---

## Connect with GAO

Connect with GAO on [Facebook](#), [Flickr](#), [Twitter](#), and [YouTube](#).  
Subscribe to our [RSS Feeds](#) or [E-mail Updates](#).  
Listen to our [Podcasts](#) and read [The Watchblog](#).  
Visit GAO on the web at [www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov).

---

## To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact:

Website: <http://www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm>

E-mail: [fraudnet@gao.gov](mailto:fraudnet@gao.gov)

Automated answering system: (800) 424-5454 or (202) 512-7470

---

## Congressional Relations

Katherine Siggerud, Managing Director, [siggerudk@gao.gov](mailto:siggerudk@gao.gov), (202) 512-4400, U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7125, Washington, DC 20548

---

## Public Affairs

Chuck Young, Managing Director, [youngc1@gao.gov](mailto:youngc1@gao.gov), (202) 512-4800  
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7149  
Washington, DC 20548