

Tri-Service Project Reliance (Fort Detrick, Maryland)

Category: Commodity

Mission: Provide facilities and services to tenant activities

One-time Cost: \$0.3 million

Savings: 1996-2001: \$4.5 million

Annual: \$0.03 million

Return on Investment: 1996 (Immediate)

FINAL ACTION: Redirect

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding Tri-Service Project Reliance. Upon disestablishment of the U.S. Army Biomedical Research Development Laboratory (USABRDL) at Fort Detrick, MD, do not collocate environmental and occupational toxicology research with the Armstrong Laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. Instead relocate the health advisories environmental fate research and military criteria research functions of the Environmental Quality Research Branch to the U.S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency (AEHA), Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD, and maintain the remaining functions of conducting non-mammalian toxicity assessment models and on-site biomonitoring research of the Research Methods Branch at Fort Detrick as part of Headquarters, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command.

Secretary of Defense Justification

There are no operational advantages that accrue by relocating this activity to Wright-Patterson AFB. Substantial resources were expended over the last 15 years to develop this unique laboratory currently used by researchers from across the DoD, other federal agencies, and the academic community. No facilities are available at Wright-Patterson to accommodate this unique aquatic research activity, which supports environmental quality R&D initiatives developing cost effective alternatives to the use of mammalian species in toxicity testing. The Commission found necessary significant new construction would be required at Wright-Patterson to duplicate facilities at Fort Detrick to continue this critical research. No construction is required at Aberdeen Proving Ground, however. Furthermore, the quality of water required for the culture of aquatic animals used in this research is not adequate at Wright-Patterson. The Commission found to maintain the water quality it would necessitate additional construction

and result in either several years of costly overlapping research in Maryland and Ohio, or the loss of over 10 years experience with the unique lab colonies used at Fort Detrick. The Navy and the Air Force agree that true research synergy is possible without executing the planned relocation.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found this recommendation would permit DoD to avoid the cost and disruption of relocating a unique facility without compromising the cross-servicing goals of the Tri-Service Project Reliance Study. Therefore, the Commission found this recommendation does not deviate from the 1991 Commission's intention to consolidate biomedical research functions

Commission Recommendation

The Commission finds the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force-structure plan and final criteria. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following change the recommendation of the 1991 Commission regarding Tri-Service Project Reliance. Upon disestablishment of the U.S. Army Biomedical Research Development Laboratory (USABRDL) at Fort Detrick, Maryland, do not collocate environmental and occupational toxicology research with the Armstrong Laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Instead relocate the health advisories environmental fate research and military criteria research functions of the Environmental Quality Research Branch to the U.S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency (AEHA), Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, and maintain the remaining functions of conducting non-mammalian toxicity assessment models and on-site biomonitoring research of the Research Methods Branch at Fort Detrick as part of Headquarters, U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command.

Hingham Cohasset, Massachusetts

Category: Minor Installation

Mission: Currently has no mission

One-time Cost: None

Savings: 1996-2001: \$0.8 million

Annual: \$0.2 million

Return on Investment: 1996 (Immediate)

FINAL ACTION: Close

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Hingham Cohasset.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Hingham Cohasset, formerly a U.S. Army Reserve Center, is essentially vacant and is excess to the Army's requirements. The site consists of approximately 125 acres and 150,000 square feet of facilities. Closing Hingham Cohasset will save base operations and maintenance funds and provide reuse opportunities.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendation

The Commission finds the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force-structure plan and final criteria. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following: close Hingham Cohasset.

Sudbury Training Annex, Massachusetts

Category: Minor Installation

Mission: Provide storage facilities for various DoD activities

One-time Cost: \$0.8 million

Savings: 1996-2001: \$-0.1 million (Cost)

Annual: \$0.1 million

Return on Investment: 2003 (5 years)

FINAL ACTION: Close

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Close Sudbury Training Annex.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Sudbury Training Annex, outside Boston, consists of approximately 2,000 acres and 200,000 square feet of facilities. The primary mission of Sudbury Training Annex is to provide storage facilities for various Department of Defense activities. Sudbury Training Annex is excess to the Army's requirements. Closing the annex will save base operations and maintenance funds and provide reuse opportunities for approximately 2,000 acres.

Community Concerns

There were no formal expressions from the community.

Commission Findings

The Commission found no reason to disagree with the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense.

Commission Recommendation

The Commission finds the Secretary of Defense did not deviate substantially from the force-structure plan and final criteria. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following: close Sudbury Training Annex.

Detroit Arsenal, Michigan

Category: Commodity

Mission: Tank Production

One-time Cost: \$1.4 million

Savings: 1996-2001: \$7.9 million

Annual: \$3.1 million

Return on Investment: 1996 (Immediate)

FINAL ACTION: Realign

Secretary of Defense Recommendation

Realign Detroit Arsenal by closing and disposing of the Detroit Army Tank Plant.

Secretary of Defense Justification

Detroit Tank Plant, located on Detroit Arsenal, is one of two Army Government-owned, contractor-operated tank production facilities. A second facility is located at Lima, Ohio, (Lima Army Tank Plant). The Detroit plant is not as technologically advanced as the Lima facility and is not configured for the latest tank production. Moreover, retaining the plant as a "rebuild" facility is not practical since Anniston Army Depot is capable of rebuilding and repairing the M1 Tank and its principal components. Accordingly, the Detroit Tank Plant is excess to Army requirements.

Community Concerns

The community expresses concern over the loss of approximately 150 civilian contractor employees. While the impact is less than one percent of the Detroit Metropolitan Statistical Area, the community argues the loss of these jobs should be included in the Army's analysis of the Detroit Arsenal recommendation. Additionally, the community challenges transfer of gun mount produc-