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The Twelve Joint Bases

BRAC 2005 directed 26 installations be realigned into 12 Joint Bases:

**Phase 1 – established 1 Oct 09**

1. Joint Base Andrews-Naval Air Facility Washington (AF Lead)
2. Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst (AF Lead)
3. Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek-Ft Story (Navy Lead)
4. Joint Region Marianas (Navy Lead) = Naval Base Guam + Andersen AFB
5. Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall (Army Lead)

**Phase 2 – established 1 Oct 10**

6. Joint Base Charleston (AF Lead)
7. Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (AF Lead)
8. Joint Base San Antonio (AF Lead) = Lackland AFB + Randolph AFB + Ft Sam Houston
9. Joint Base Langley-Eustis (AF Lead)
10. Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling (Navy Lead)
11. Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam (Navy Lead)
12. Joint Base Lewis-McChord (Army Lead)
JBs are both Large and Small

Pearl Harbor-Hickam’s
Plant Replacement Value
PRV = $14.3B

Myer-Henderson Hall’s
PRV = $0.7B
JBs have both Distributed and Consolidated Footprints
Why Merge Existing Bases into Joint Bases?

• Optimize the delivery of installation support (IS)
  – Consolidate IS activities of “geographically proximate” installations to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of our resources

• Military units from all Services sharing infrastructure under the leadership of a single Service
  – Army, Navy and AF all execute IS functions using similar processes
  – Creates an environment where a Service can eliminate redundant activities and unnecessary overhead … leading to long-term savings

• Joint Bases create an environment for IS innovation
  – Export the best applicable ideas to the entire DoD installations community

Joint bases are viewed as “national assets” for joint use, rather than “owned” by a single Service Component for their primary use.

- DUSD (Installations & Environment) “Stationing” memo, 13 Apr 10
How are Joint Bases Different?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Service Bases</th>
<th>Joint Bases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host-tenant relationship</td>
<td>Host provides support only if they have excess capacity and the tenant requests it</td>
<td>Providing installation support is the host’s assigned mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document describing Installation Support (IS) to tenants &amp; mission partners</td>
<td>Host-Tenant Support Agreement</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval authority for IS agreements</td>
<td>Negotiated and approved at local or regional level</td>
<td>Reviewed by OSD and signed by Vice Chiefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method for reimbursing host for IS costs</td>
<td>Temporary: Military Interdepartmental Purchase Request</td>
<td>Permanent: Top-line authority is transferred to the supporting component in perpetuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command authority of IS units and activities</td>
<td>Varies by Service: a mix of regional and local IS orgs, and local mission commanders</td>
<td>Joint Base Commander oversees all IS … local msn commanders are not in IS chain of command</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joint Basing Implementation Guidance (JBIG)

- Deputy Secretary of Defense issued January 2008
- Foundational policy:
  - Timelines for implementing the Joint Basing program
  - Defined common installation support functions & standards
  - Transfer of Funding, Personnel, Equipment & Real Property
  - Required regular reporting of joint base performance & costs
  - Established joint oversight structure

Purpose: capture and continue the most practical savings for the DoD through the consolidation of Installation Support functions while meeting mission requirements - Joint Basing Implementation Guidance
Joint Base Organization
The JB McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst Example

**87th Air Base Wing**
- Commander (USAF)
- Deputy (USA)
- Deputy (USN)

**Wing Staff Agencies**

**87th Medical Group**
- (Not a JB function)

**87th Mission Support Group**
- Civil Engineer
- Communications
- Logistics Readiness
- Security Forces
- Force Support
- Contracting

### Supported Organizations

| 99th Regional Support Command | Marine Aircraft Group 49 |
| 78th Training Div               | Naval Ops Support Center |
| 2nd Mission Cmd Training Bde / 75th Div | CERDEC |
| 174th Infantry Bde             | Army Sppt Activity – Dix |
| 72nd Field Artillery Bde        | Small Arms Ranges *     |
| 305th Air Mobility Wing Airfield Operations * |          |
| 514th Air Mobility Wing         | 621st Contingency Response Wing |

### Tenants

108th Wing
- NJ Air National Guard

NAVAIR WCF

NJ National Guard

Federal Correctional Institute

US Coast Guard

**AF**  **Army**  **Navy**  **USMC**  **Non DoD**

JBMDL’s mission partners consolidated installation support personnel (mil/civ/ktr), equipment, and facilities under the Air Base Wing

* Two JB functions are performed by supported orgs
Joint Base Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)

- Each Joint Base its own MOA describing:
  - How it operates
  - What personnel, funding, equipment and real property transferred
  - How the Lead Service will deliver installation support

The MOA is the Joint Base’s opportunity to capture the unique aspects of its facilities, mission partners, and operating environment.
Joint Management Oversight Structure (JMOS)

Structure for Policy Formulation, Performance Review, and Dispute Resolution...Fully Collaborative.
Defining Installation Support with 44 Functions

1. Airfield Ops
2. Base Support Vehicles & Equipment
3. Chaplain Ministry
4. Child & Youth Services
5. Command Management
6. Custodial Services
7. Emergency Management
8. Environmental Compliance
9. Environmental Conservation
10. Environmental Pollution Prevention
11. Environmental Restoration
12. Facilities Demolition
13. Facilities New Footprint
14. Facilities Restoration & Modernization
15. Facilities Sustainment
16. Family Housing
17. Financial Management
18. Fire Protection & Emergency Services
19. Food & Dining
20. Grounds Maintenance & Landscaping
21. Information Technology Services Mgmt
22. Installation Safety
23. Installation Movement
24. Law Enforcement Services
25. Physical Security Patrols
26. Legal Services
27. Laundry & Dry Cleaning
28. Lodging
29. Management Analysis
30. Military & Family Support
31. Military Personnel Services
32. Morale, Welfare & Recreation Programs
33. Pavement Clearance Services
34. Pest Control Services
35. Port Services
36. Procurement Operations
37. Public Affairs
38. Real Property Leases
39. Real Property Management & Engineering Services
40. Refuse Collection & Disposal
41. Small Arms Range Management
42. Supply Storage & Distribution (Non-Munitions)
43. Unaccompanied Personnel Housing Services
44. Utilities
Joint Base
Common Output Level Standards

- JBIG defined 44 different installation support functions
  - These functions are further delineated into 247 Joint Base Common Output Level Standards (JB-COLS)
  - JB-COLS define common performance stds (as agreed to by the Services)

- Joint Bases report performance semi-annually, fiscal performance annually
  - Functional experts review
  - Trends / Analysis briefed to Service and OSD leadership

- JB-COLS serve two purposes
  - Provide an objective assessment of cost and performance
  - Establish boundaries for delivery of services and resourcing
Example:

**Grounds Maintenance (Improved and Semi-Improved Grounds)**

- 1 of 26 JB-COLS under the “Facilities Operations” function
- Definition: “Maintain improved grass height at 2-4” and semi-improved grass height at 4-10”. Accomplish necessary trimming, edging, pruning, landscaping, etc. to maintain healthy vegetation and professional appearance”.

% of JBs Meeting this JB-COLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY12 Q1</th>
<th>FY12 Q2</th>
<th>FY12 Q4</th>
<th>FY13 Q1</th>
<th>FY13 Q3</th>
<th>FY13 Q4</th>
<th>FY14 Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“But have the joint bases been a success?”
Operating Joint Bases

• **Services’ “culture” = a real source of friction**
  – Can turn Inclusive programs into Exclusive ones
  – Not just within the fence line: community & retirees too

• **Common understanding of common standards crucial**
  – “Secure the building” … same vocabulary, different meaning

• **The DoD bureaucracy … where change can be hard**
  – JBs are poised to be “Innovation Engines” for DoD
  – Their best solutions are often those that bridge Service lines
  – Service HQs tend to default to “our way” … not the “best way”

• **Education**
  – The twelve JBs remain unique entities within the DoD
  – Winning the support of Senior Leaders remains vital
  – Can never be too much messaging … savings & effectiveness
Measuring Costs & Performance

Cost & Performance Visibility Framework (CPVF)

- Captures performance compared to standards and approved deviations documented in MOA
- Captures annual expenditures for comparison to baseline (pre-JB) costs
- Allows JB personnel to provide Subjective Performance Assessments (SPAs) to provide additional information on JB performance
  - Critical in austere fiscal environment to communicate impacts of risks taken in installation support
  - Allows multiple perspectives to be provided on how a JB’s performance impacts various missions & units
- Document JBPC agreement to not meet a JB-COLS

Joint Base leadership owns the data, but ... it is reviewed and analyzed by all JMOS stakeholders
## What CPVF tells us: JBs are Delivering Effective Installation Support

### Percentage of the 247 JB-COLS Standards Being “Met”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint Base</th>
<th>FY12 Q4</th>
<th>FY13 Q1</th>
<th>FY13 Q2</th>
<th>FY13 Q3</th>
<th>FY13 Q4</th>
<th>FY14 Q1</th>
<th>FY14 Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anacostia-Bolling</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews-NAFW</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmendorf-Richardson</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley-Eustis</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis-McChord</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myer-Henderson Hall</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Harbor-Hickam</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Creek-Ft Story</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianas</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- FY13’s downward trend appears to have ended
  - 6 JBs improved performance, 3 declined
  - All 4 Navy JBs improved … JBAB significantly w/ targeted get-well plan
- We measure 13 fewer COLS in FY14 than FY13 (e.g., environmental went from 15 to 8 COLS), but the change in scores was inconsistent across JBs
What CPVF tells us: JBs are Costing Less to Operate

Substantial savings from consolidations and efficiencies!

- Baseline: cost to operate the 26 installations separately
- Plus-ups: increased cost of meeting JB-COLS standards
- Actual costs as reported
Examples: Better Operations that Saved Costs

Joint Base Charleston

- Consolidated installation support contracts – saving $2.2M/year
- Transferred key Weapons Station circuits to DoD-owned fiber optic network reducing DISA lease costs $2.4M/year
- USAF adopted the Navy’s standard for shorter controlled burning setback distances in munition areas – saving $1M/year

Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst

- Consolidated recycling operations – negating need for $1M facility & equipment at Ft Dix; reducing overall contract cost $200K/year
- Consolidated MWR management – reducing personnel costs $1.1M/yr
- Established a single JB MDL Fire Chief – eliminating need for two redundant fire chief positions

Joint Base San Antonio

- Reorganized all support functions by replacing units organized by geography (i.e., Randolph’s civil engineer) with units organized by function…the new units have JBSA-wide responsibilities and resources. Eliminated duplicate overhead = ~100 personnel positions
Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (Sept 28, 2013): One of the last remaining vestiges of formerly divided bases disappeared into rubble. In-house crews demolish a guard house that had been the entry point for transitioning between Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson before the bases combined in 2010.
Eric Turner, Col, USAF
Deputy Director of Basing
Office of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Installations & Environment
703-693-6170
eric.s.turner16.mil@mail.mil

Joint Basing information (requires DoD CAC):
https://www.milsuite.mil/wiki/Joint_Basing