

## **IMCOM Sustainment Summary and Compilation**

### **Dugway Proving Grounds:**

#### **Non-concur with divestiture; retain as AFH or privatized**

1. Dugway is remote and isolated 45 miles from the nearest support services requiring housing for the small military contingent of less than 30 Service Members, but also requiring housing for Department of the Army Civilians (DAC) and Contract personnel. The DACs and Contractors provide a cadre of support services essential to the Chemical and Biological testing and training mission at Dugway. Dugway is a valuable asset to DOD Chem/Bio testing and training because of its distance from populated areas and normal municipal programs and services.
2. For the proposed divestiture initiative Dugway would request a Housing Market Analysis (HMA) to determine the actual demand for housing and discover if the housing can be privatized under the current economic circumstances. Absent ability to privatize the housing, Dugway needs help to develop a financial structure/model that permits operating the non-military demand for housing unencumbered by law that precludes recapitalization. Under AFH appropriation law, family housing excess to military family needs is not permitted to be recapitalized and has no authority for new construction. Dugway needs policy help to determine alternative way of setting rent, operating and recapitalizing housing for the non-military population demand identified in the HMA.
3. There are many compelling reasons to provide on-post housing for a workforce extremely distant from any community support. As with all installations, housing is the foundation for a community to attract/retain a viable workforce, provide community support, and create the correct balance between work and personal resilience. However, there is no compelling reason for the Army to own and operate the required housing if the housing function can be outsourced at a competitive/sustainable rate.
4. Over the last 60 years, since the construction of the Wherry Housing, the military staff has been replaced by DACs and then DACs to a large extent replaced by Contractors. Existing excess housing to the military requirement has been rented out to DACs and Contractors for years without authority for recapitalization and the housing has deteriorated to the point that the majority of the workforce that can afford the 100 plus miles-a-day commute does so each day. Support personnel have become the bulk of the housing demand. The average salary of a DAC living on-post is \$60,775 whereas the average of Dugway employees living off-post is \$77,526. Unlike most installations near a population center that rely on off-post commerce for community support and housing of the post support personnel, Dugway must house that entry level and wage grade workforce that cannot afford the long commute. Without the community club, diner, gym, shoppette, chapel, and MWR, the garrison would be an austere worksite and impact the Chem/Bio mission and testing. As housing quality deteriorates and

quality of life programs and services have diminished greatly, so has the demand for housing and overall population size on Dugway.

### **Fort AP Hill:**

#### **Non-concur with divestiture; retain as AFH**

1. Because of its isolated location, USAG Fort A.P. Hill (FAPH) should retain its twenty five (25) government-owned AFH. Currently, seventeen (17) AFH units are occupied by two military families, fifteen civilian families. Eight (8) units are unoccupied. We anticipate two additional military families to move in within the next three months based on anticipated gains.

2. FAPH wants to continue housing assigned military Families and those members of our Civilian workforce that pay rent to live in our AFH. The two primary reasons for retaining AFH at FPAH are as follows:

a. The management and administration of FAPH AFH is self-sustaining due to the rent paid by the members of our Civilian workforce. FAPH collected following amounts in rents from our Civilian tenants over the past five years: FY17 - \$112.4K; FY16 - \$80.6K; FY15 - \$83.0K; FY14 - \$75.6K; FY13 - \$77.8K. FAPH is collecting enough rents to justify a request for reimbursable over-hire authority to hire a part-time, term civilian employee (approximately 24-30 hours per week) to administer and manage our AFH units. Additionally, we anticipate raising rental rates in FY19 based on a recent Housing Market Analysis conducted by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers which strengthens our ability to fund the reimbursable position.

b. The military and Civilians residing in AFH provide FAPH with the capability for non-duty response to unanticipated events during nights or weekends. Presently, most FAPH employees live 30 or more minutes away from the installation inhibiting timely response to unforeseen training requirements, emergency response, weather related property damage, security incidents, and other time-sensitive events. The residents of FAPH's AFH represent a wide range of the installation workforce and are more readily available to respond to unforeseen events where a delayed response may inhibit FAPH's ability to conduct unit training, garrison operations and quickly mitigate property damage.

### **Natick Soldier Systems Center:**

**Non-concur with divesture; retain as AFH or privatized.**

1. US Army Garrison Natick's Army Family Housing (AFH) inventory consists of 76 aged and outdated units, many in outlying locations. A multi-phased Housing initiative is underway which will construct 28 new units in Natick and divest through sale the three outlying housing areas. The new construction will bring all units to a Q1 status, while the divesture will eliminate excess.
2. While the most recent Housing Market Analysis (HMA) (2 March 2015) projected requirement was determined to be 48, the installation's military population influenced a further determination that 28 new units will be sufficient.
3. The newly constructed housing should retain the planned function as housing, owned and operated by the Army. Numerous avenues have been explored to combine Natick's housing requirements with privatized initiatives, and have not been proven viable. Privatizing can be revisited in the future if the function can be outsourced at a competitive/sustainable rate.

### **Joint Base Meyers – Henderson Hall:**

**Non-concur with full divesture; additional study / analysis needed.**

1. JBM-HH believes full divesture is not an option but it is unknown at present time whether partial divesture or privatization are viable.
2. JBM-HH is in the middle of a Housing Market Analysis (HMA) and comprehensive housing analysis on our existing 87 sets of quarters. JBM-HH reviewed a draft HMA last month; final HMA is expected in Sep/Oct 2018 timeframe. Concurrent to that, JBM-HH expects to be engaged in a courses of action (COAs) workshop in Oct/Nov timeframe with garrison, IMCOM, and HQDA Facility representatives, the outcome of which will identify the long term plan for each Housing unit at JBM-HH. The purpose of the COA workshop is to evaluate the structural and facility fix findings for each Housing unit, apply costs to those findings, and make a determination (privatize, keep as Army Family Housing, work thru cultural resources to divest or demolish, etc). It is because of the current HMA and housing analyses being done for JBM-HH that we cannot currently select one of the three presented COAs and need to consider all housing options.

**Rock Island Arsenal:**

**Non-concur with divestiture; retain as AFH or privatized.**

The COE is completing construction of 71 new family housing units at Rock Island Arsenal (RIA). When completed RIA will have an inventory of 80 homes at Q1. RIA is receptive to divestiture of AFH through privatization. Previous inquiries to privatize housing at RIA showed no interest. However, with more and new homes, privatization may be viable. Privatization of RIA housing was the plan of the previous Garrison Commander. If privatization isn't feasible then RIA would want to retain as Army family housing. A Housing Market Analysis (HMA) is currently ongoing but we haven't heard any results at this time. The previous HMA was used as the justification for the family housing construction projects currently being completed. We were unable to build the total need identified in the previous HMA based on construction cost limitations.