OHIO BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE (BRAC) AND MILITARY AFFAIRS TASK FORCE

STRATEGIC PLAN

29 May 2018
The Ohio Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and Military Affairs Task Force is pleased to submit our final report in the form of a living strategic plan. We applaud your efforts in commissioning this task force to better understand the military installations across the State of Ohio. We would like to collectively thank you for the opportunity to serve our state and to provide advice to strengthen our military installations.

The task force was appointed on August 23, 2017 and met subsequently for the first time on September 12th to strategize a State-wide military installation visit plan. The task force met again for one more planning meeting on September 21st before embarking on multiple visits across the state.

This report includes a summary of the task force’s activities from September 2017 to February 2018, focusing on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to the federal installations. The Task Force also details a review of ongoing work in other states that is relevant to BRAC.

In addition, the task force reviewed the statewide economic impact of all the federal installations across the state. In summary, the federal installations in Ohio provide a collective payroll of more than $5 billion that supports over 60,000 federal jobs plus 50,000 support jobs. In addition, the defense industry is over one percent of Ohio’s gross domestic product.

Most importantly, the task force makes two critical recommendations in Ohio with multiple sub-recommendations for the state to strengthen support of federal installations across the state. The task force respectfully requests your support in advocating for and communicating this critical information. The time to act is now. The state of Ohio continues to get further behind in its ability to sustain and attract federal work because of our lack of action to this point. The sustainment and execution of this plan can only occur with dedicated state-level staff and resources.

Your support of the federal missions across Ohio is unprecedented and we are very proud to serve you on this important endeavor for our state.

Respectfully submitted,
Ohio Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and Military Affairs Task Force

Strategic Plan
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Executive Summary

The Speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives commissioned the Ohio Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and Military Affairs Task Force on August 23, 2017.

The mission of the task force was to study and analyze the current Ohio DOD/NASA assets, resources, and missions in anticipation of potential Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) actions, or other major mission realignment opportunities. This study would include a thorough review of all previous reports and studies. In addition, the study team would garner input from existing support organizations and/or leaders at the local, state or federal levels; such as task forces, committees, commissions, community and economic development groups, and elected officials. The task force’s goal was to understand and quantify the installations’ overall impact to the community, region and state of Ohio. Most importantly, the task force desired to develop and produce strategic recommendations to the Speaker of the House, Ohio General Assembly, the Governor, the Ohio Congressional Delegation, and the local defense communities on how to respond to threats to current missions and installations, and how to position the state to best acquire new missions and economic development opportunities.

Ohio is home to NASA Glenn Research Center, Joint Systems Manufacturing Center, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Defense Logistics Agency, Defense Information Systems Agency, Veterans Affairs Hospitals, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, and the Ohio National Guard. These organizations employ over 60,000 people with another 50,000 related private sector jobs. Ohio’s federal and military installations generate over $6 billion in annual economic benefit to the state.

Although Ohio has supported Base Realignment and Closure efforts and some research and technology commercialization efforts in the past, the state has never had a comprehensive strategy to protect, expand and fully leverage the federal economic powerhouse in the state’s economy. The recommendations in this task force report add to recommendations from several previous studies completed in Ohio regarding federal installations. The state now requires bold implementation of this strategy with dedicated resources to ensure the success of our federal installations in the future.
Background and History of Base Realignment and Closure

The Journal of Defense Communities conducted a thorough review of the BRAC process in an article in 2012. This article serves as the basis for the following review.

The history of BRAC reaches back at least six decades to when the President, as Commander in Chief acting through the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF), had unlimited authority to move military units. At the time, this was a unique constitutional prerogative of the Commander in Chief. Congress had a very limited role through providing resources for the moves. Congress could limit the Commander in Chief’s actions by adding restrictions to appropriations, but they couldn’t prevent the relocation of military forces.

During the terms of SECDEF Robert McNamara and Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, there were multiple large reorganizations and closures across the Department of Defense (DoD) to increase efficiency. There were many dislocations through these closures, which led Congress to become concerned and suspicious that perhaps the closures and reorganizations were politically motivated. Congress attempted to influence specific actions and was successful with individual appropriations, but broader restrictions were met by presidential vetoes twice.

Specifically, President Ford vetoed the Military Construction Authorization Act in FY 1977 because of the limitations it proposed on presidential power over military bases. This led to a compromise in 1977 when Congress enacted the predecessor of the existing base closure statute (10 U.S.C 2687). This law required the DoD to submit comprehensive environmental impact statements before closing a base, through the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. This enactment essentially halted base closures because of the statutory requirements and the opportunity for community challenges on environmental rulings.

In 1987, Congressman Dick Armey of Texas introduced a new bill that would create an independent commission to review military base structure. There was initially a lot of support for the commission since it was a bi-partisan initiative. The 1977 base closure statute was then amended to authorize a 1988 BRAC using this new independent commission, chartered by the SECDEF. There was an important all-or-nothing compromise in this new law that would shield the commission from any political pressure. The law’s language required both the President and Congress to adopt or reject the commission’s recommendations. The initial BRAC report led to the closure of 86 military installations and the realigning of 59 others.

The outbreak of peace in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s led to SECDEF Dick Cheney recommending another round of closures utilizing the cumbersome rules of the 1977 procedures. This attempt was unsuccessful for a variety of reasons and led to another amendment to the base closure law.

In 1991, in the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), Congress amended the base closure law and authorized three BRAC rounds in 1991, 1993 and 1995. This new law created an independent executive branch: the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, consisting of eight members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The law required DoD to submit the following to Congress prior to closure deliberations:
- Force structure plan for Armed Forces based on assessment by SECDEF of threats to National Security
- Publish in Federal Register and submit to Congress criteria used by DoD in making recommendations
- List of military installations inside the U.S. recommended for closure or realignment

The single most important criteria, as in the previous Base Closure Act, was Military Value – mission requirements and the impact on operational readiness, although for the new act the commission was charged with reviewing impact on the total DoD force versus the military service.

There were several refinements made to the second Base Closure Act before the 1991 BRAC round that included: timely nomination of Commission members, size limitations on Commission staff as well as limiting staffers with DoD experience, limitations on the Commission’s authority to change DoD recommendations, and certification by DoD employees that the information submitted by the Commission was accurate. The 1991, 1993 and 1995 rounds of BRAC led to 81 base closures and 51 realignments. There was more controversy introduced when President Clinton allowed for privatization of two Air Logistics Centers in San Antonio, TX and Sacramento, CA. Congress subsequently rejected any new BRAC proposals until 2001, when President Bush proposed a new round.

The NDAA of 2002 included a BRAC round to be conducted in 2005. In this round an economic analysis of the effect of closure or realignment of installations to reduce excess infrastructure was required. In this round of closures, military value was again to be the primary consideration. Military value included:

- Preservation of training areas to guarantee future availability to ensure DoD readiness
- Preservation of installations in U.S. serving as Homeland Defense staging areas
- Preservation of installations with a diverse climate and terrain in the U.S. for training purposes
- Impact on joint warfighting, training and readiness
- Contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at existing and potential locations to support operations and training

The law had additional criteria that the SECDEF was to use to make recommendations:

- the extent and timing of potential costs and savings including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs
- the economic impact on existing communities near military installations
- the ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions and personnel
- the environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities

In addition, the 2005 BRAC law added more specific considerations for the SECDEF’s recommendations:

- the anticipated continuing need for and availability of military installations outside the U.S., considering current restrictions on the use of military installations outside the U.S. and the potential for future prohibitions or restrictions on the use of such military installations
- any efficiency that may be gained from joint tenancy by more than one branch of the Armed Forces at a military installation
In the BRAC 2005 law there was a new authority that allowed the DoD to recommend that an installation be closed and placed on inactive status if the installation had future national security uses or if retention was in the best interest of the U.S.

Other differences in the law included:

- a nine-member commission
- the Commission couldn’t add an installation to the closure/realignment list unless at least two Commissioners had visited the base and had at least seven of the nine members in support of the addition
- the DoD could privatize installations activities in-place only if specified in Commission recommendation

The 2005 BRAC round closed 22 bases; and created 12 DoD Joint Bases. Most of the 2005 actions were realignments and consolidations.

Because of the National BRAC activities and statute changes, the state of Ohio has made significant investments in understanding the mission and impact of federal installations across Ohio. The commitment to understanding Ohio’s installations began with the Austria Blue Ribbon Commission in 2010 and continued with multiple phases of federal retention studies as well as the Ohio Federal Military Jobs Commission in 2015 and the Ohio Federal Facilities Commission in 2016. The BRAC Task Force recommends that these studies as well as the recommendations of this report form the baseline of any future BRAC work in the state.
Investments Across the United States

Many states around the country have made substantive progress on preparing their community for the next BRAC. The initiatives range from infrastructure investments, state level offices focused on federal installations, Public/Public and Public/Private Partnerships, and new legislation. For brevity’s sake, this report will not attempt to review every state’s initiatives but will give a few examples of what has been done in several states across the country.

Alabama
The state of Alabama’s support for its military installations is evident before BRAC 2005. In 2001, the state legislature passed legislation authorizing counties and municipalities to form public corporations to provide buildings, facilities, and other property for lease and use by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States. It allows counties and municipalities to lend, donate, or contribute money and services to the public corporations and allows them to borrow money to make loans, donations, or contributions to the public corporations. The City of Huntsville utilized this authority by creating the Huntsville Federal Building Authority to construct new homes for general officers at Redstone Arsenal. Through additional funds from the state Huntsville provided three homes in 2003 for $1 million. After BRAC 2005, Huntsville constructed seven homes for $2.7 million and an additional two homes in 2013 for $1.3 million. In 2016, Huntsville used the Federal Building Authority to construct a new gate at Redstone Arsenal at a cost of $1 million. In June 2011, Alabama passed legislation creating the Alabama Jobs Creation and Military Stability Commission. The operational arm of the Commission, the Military Stability Foundation, was incorporated in September 2011. The foundation is a private non-profit that works directly with the Commission and defense installations in Alabama to develop and implement measures to retain and strengthen Alabama’s military assets and infrastructure.

Connecticut
In response to the BRAC 2005 recommendation to close SUBASE New London, which was ultimately not agreed to, the state of Connecticut created the Office of Military Affairs within the Department of Economic and Community Development. This office reports directly to the Governor and it “shall promote and coordinate state-wide activities that enhance the quality of life of all branches of military personnel and their families and to expand the military and homeland security presence in this state.” In 2007, Connecticut authorized $40 million in funding to improve aging infrastructure and enhance the military value of SUBASE New London. To date, $14 million has been spent on constructing a dive locker, an electric microgrid, a submarine bridge trainer, a culinary training center, and an energy efficient boiler. SUBASE New London has an annual economic impact of over $4 billion to the state of Connecticut.

Florida
The state of Florida passed legislation in 2012 to create the Florida Defense Support Task Force to make recommendations to preserve and protect military installations, support the state’s position in research and development related to or arising out of military missions and contracting, and improve the state’s military-friendly environment for service members, military dependents, military retirees, and businesses that bring military and base-related jobs to the state. The FDSTF can fund projects that can be leveraged to promote, preserve, or enhance military missions and installations in Florida. The state has also three direct grant programs to assist communities/military installations; 1) Encroachment mitigation through land acquisition; 2) Defense infrastructure grants; and 3) Defense reinvestment grants. $3 million in grants were provided in 2015.

Massachusetts
In 2012 Massachusetts legislatively created the Military Asset and Security Strategy Task Force to protect and expand missions, jobs and economic investments at and surrounding Massachusetts’ military installations. Housed within the Office of the Governor and supported by the Executive Office
of Housing and Economic Development and Mass Development, the task force coordinates among the state’s military facilities to maximize their efficiency. In 2014, the state passed legislation creating a $177 million bond fund authorizing funding for infrastructure projects in partnership with Massachusetts’ military installations and the Massachusetts National Guard. These projects are designed to expand public and private sector growth for the cities and towns surrounding each installation and enhance the military installation’s value in support of national and domestic security goals. In the legislation, $12 million was immediately authorized for three projects; 1) $2.9 million for energy and communications upgrades to the C4ISR Enterprise Integration Facility at Hanscom AFB; 2) $9 million for the runway infrastructure project at Westfield-Barnes Regional Airport and Barnes Air National Guard Base; and 3) $100,000 to close the National Guard’s Worcester Armory and relocate the museum to Concord.

Oklahoma
The Air Force needed a repair facility for the new KC-46A Tanker and selected Tinker AFB as the home of the depot. Additional space was necessary for the new facilities and Oklahoma City and Oklahoma County partnered with the Air Force to purchase an abandoned rail yard adjacent to Tinker for the new operations. In 2014, the city and county provided $28 million of the total $44 million acquisition cost for the 158-acre site. The Air Force obtained $111 million in military construction funds in 2015 to move forward with the project - $63 million for a two-bay maintenance hangar and $48 million for infrastructure to support the facility.

Texas
In 2003, Texas legislatively created the Texas Military Preparedness Commission, located within the Governor’s Office of Economic Development and Tourism. The Commission’s role is to preserve, protect, expand, and attract new military missions, assets, and installations. The Commission also encourages defense-related businesses to expand or relocate in Texas. In 1997, the state created the Defense Economic Adjustment Assistance Grant (DEAAG) Program. Initially conceived to help communities negatively impacted from a BRAC, the grant program also allows for funding to be used to proactively support installations. Grant awards may range from $50,000 to $5 million and $30 million was provided in the 2015/2016 Biennium. $20 million was provided in the 2017/2018 Biennium.

Utah
To support the Air Force’s drive to execute Enhanced Use Leases (EULs), the Utah legislature created the Military Installation Defense Authority (MIDA). MIDA acts as the municipal authority in the project area (issuing and collecting taxes) and acts as the economic development authority in distributing legislative appropriations and issuing bonds. The legislature provides operational funding of $800,000 annually and it is projected that MIDA will be financially self-sustaining within 7-8 years. Its largest project is the Falcon Hill Aerospace Research Park on 500 acres of land beside and on Hill AFB. Since 2008, the Utah legislature has provided nearly $21 million to MIDA for the Falcon Hill project, resulting in the construction of new base infrastructure, a new base entrance gate, a new security forces building, and a new commercial building on base.
Impact of Federal Installations Across Ohio

The state of Ohio boasts a strong and diverse federal military presence, with all military branches represented in the state. Ohio maintains one active-duty base, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, in Dayton. The state is also a major supporter of the Army and Air National Guard, with the Army Guard comprised of six major commands and the Air Guard comprised of four wings. This large defense presence in the state can be challenging to fully understand, especially with units spread across the state with various missions.

According to the Office of Economic Adjustment within the Department of Defense, in 2015, $6.9 billion in defense funding was spent in Ohio. This amount was 1.1% of Ohio’s GDP in FY 2015 and ranks Ohio as 20th in the nation in defense spending. In terms of payroll, $2.8 billion in payroll was spent in Ohio in 2015, which accounted for 60,224 direct positions or 1.1% of the employment for the state of Ohio in 2015. This employment figure is the total direct employment number for all military installations in the state. The employment figure does not tell the entire story of defense employment in the state.

The large representation across Ohio of federal missions leads to a robust economic impact at the State level. For brevity sake, this report will not review the economic impact of every federal footprint but will give an example using the largest installation in the state – Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is the largest single site employer in the State of Ohio. The base typically conducts an economic impact analysis each year to describe its overall impact to the state. The data displayed below are from the Wright Patterson AFB 2015 Economic Impact Analysis that utilized 2013 data. An impact analysis examines direct employment, employment supported by the spending on the installation (indirect employment), and employment supported by the spending of the employees on the installation (induced employment). An economic model uses the employment data to generate these additional employment figures. A thorough economic impact analysis of Wright-Patterson was created using FY 2013 data and examined the impact of the base on the surrounding 14 county area. The following chart demonstrates the power of Wright-Patterson’s impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1-1 – Wright Patterson Economic Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct employment: federal spending on WPAFB and on contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect employment: contractor’s spending on materials, services, &amp; subcontracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced employment: economic activity generated as employees of WPAFB &amp; its contactors spend their income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis shows that in FY 2013, that Wright-Patterson supported over 55,000 jobs in the 14-county region surrounding the base and represented 7% of the regional employment. The base generated nearly $7 billion in impact from just personnel compensation, which was 1.2% of Ohio’s GDP in FY 2013. How do these defense employment numbers and economic impact compare with employment figures from private companies in Ohio? The Development Services Agency within the state of Ohio collects
employment headcount numbers on the state’s largest private employers and publishes the data quarterly. Using data from April 2017, the following comparisons can be made about the direct defense employment in Ohio compared to private industry. Ohio’s largest headquartered private sector businesses are Cleveland Clinic with 49,050 employees and Kroger with 43,850 employees. Neither company contains as many direct employees as the defense industry (60,224).

Ohio contains a strong financial sector and it is one of the largest employment sectors in the state. The four largest Ohio headquartered financial companies by employment are listed below.

Table 1-2 – Four largest Ohio Headquartered Financial Company Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide Mutual Insurance</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth-Third Bancorp</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the first example, the total employment of these important and strong companies is just over two-thirds of the employment level of Ohio’s defense industry, with a total employment in FY2015 of 60,224. The graph below compares the direct employment of these private companies with the direct employment of WPAFB. Using either the direct employment numbers or the total employment numbers of WPAFB, the base is a strong economic driver in the state.

Figure 1-1 – Direct Employment Comparisons Between Financial Institutions and WPAFB

The defense industry in Ohio is a strong economic driver, and a strong partner to many local communities. The sheer diversity of missions and locations in Ohio can make it difficult to understand and appreciate the economic size of the defense industry. In FY2015, the defense industry was 1.1% of the state’s GDP and could be larger now. As demonstrated by the economic impact analysis of WPAFB, a more complete understanding of the defense industry could be achieved through the execution of an impact analysis of Ohio’s installations. Such information could be beneficial to the state in tracking the health and activities of its military installations.
Task Force Activities

The Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and Military Affairs Task Force traveled the state from October 2017 to February 2018 visiting several active, reserve, and guard installations. Each installation provided a briefing of their assigned units, missions, and personnel, and concluded with a tour of their facilities.

Site visits included:

- Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base 03 October 2017
- Mansfield Air National Guard Base 05 October 2017
- Toledo Express Air National Guard Base 16 October 2017
- Springfield Air National Guard Base 25 October 2017
- Coast Guard Ninth District 13 November 2017
- Defense Finance and Accounting Services – Cleveland 13 November 2017
- NASA Glenn Research Center – Lewis Field 13 November 2017
- Wright Patterson Air Force Base 17 November 2017
- Youngstown Air Reserve Station 20 November 2017
- Camp Ravenna Joint Military Training Center 20 November 2017
- Joint Systems Manufacturing Center - Lima 11 December 2017
- Piqua Armory 12 February 2018
- Delaware Armory 12 February 2018

The following are details on the task force’s activities concerning non-National Guard installations. The National Guard installations will be included as an amendment to this report later.
Ninth Coast Guard District
Cleveland, OH
U.S. Coast Guard Atlantic Area

- Mission: Headquartered in Cleveland, Ohio, Coast District 9 is responsible for all Coast Guard operations throughout the five Great Lakes, the Saint Lawrence Seaway, and parts of the surrounding states including 6,700 miles of shoreline and 1,500 miles of the international border with Canada. The Ninth District deliver multi-mission services in search and rescue, maritime safety and security, environmental protection, maritime law enforcement, aids to navigation, and icebreaking.

- History: The U.S. Lighthouse Service was the first of the four agencies that would eventually make up the U.S. Coast Guard on the Great Lakes. The service traces its roots to 1716 with the establishment of a lighthouse on Little Brewster Island, at the entrance to Boston Harbor. By 1789 there were 12 lights located within the new United States. At the outbreak of World War II, some cutters were transferred from the Great Lakes to help in the Battle of the Atlantic.

In the early 19th century, units of the modern day U.S. Coast Guard began their service to the maritime community of the Great Lakes region. Nearing the 200th birthday of the U.S. Coast Guard, the dangers to modern day sailors on the lakes are still as strong as ever.

- Economic Impact: The Coast Guard has a total economic impact of over $105 million to the northeast Ohio region.

- Numbers: The base is a regional command that provides logistics, engineering, administrative, financial, purchasing, and healthcare services to Coast Guard units throughout the entire eight state Great Lakes region. The 6,000 active duty, reserve, civilian, and auxiliary men and women who make up the Ninth District perform their work on a Coast Guard Cutter, a Small Boat Station, a Marine Safety Unit, the District Office, Base Operations with administration, logistics, finance and maintenance, Naval Engineering, an Electronics Engineering Unit, a Civil Engineering Unit, Surface Forces Detachment, Coast Guard Investigation Service, Recruiting Offices, the Recruit Processing Center, Operational Performance Consultants, and a Civil Rights Detachment.

- Opportunities for growth: The Ninth District has the ability to recruit and maintain high levels of military readiness. All Coast Guard-owned facilities on the base are being modernized, and efforts are underway to achieve Homeland Security renewable energy goals.

- Hindrances: Declining federal budgets could negatively impact high levels of readiness for the Ninth Coast Guard District. The Coast Guard may be asked to reduce its strength resulting from declining federal budget dollars for new construction, current maintenance, and modernization requirements.
Defense Finance and Accounting Services
Cleveland, OH
U.S. Department of Defense

- Mission: The Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) provides payment services for the U.S. Department of Defense. DFAS Cleveland is one of 10 total locations in the world. It handles all payments to active duty and reserve Marines and Navy personnel, all Armed Forces retirees, all Armed Forces annuities, and garnishments for all branches of the military. All functions of DFAS Cleveland are on site, including all accounting, payroll processing, administrative functions, and information technology support.

- History: DFAS Cleveland was originally founded in 1942 as the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts and renamed the Navy Finance Center in 1955. It has become the world center for Navy pay operations and personnel data management. The center moved from Navy to DFAS control in January 1991 and is involved in streamlining accounting and finance systems and procedures to lower costs, benefiting the taxpayers. In the 2005 BRAC, DFAS was reduced from nearly 300 locations to just 10.

- Economic Impact: On a national scale, DFAS Cleveland processed a portion of the $122.4 million pay transactions to military personnel, as well as a significant share of the $899 billion used to pay military retirees and heath benefits.

- Numbers: DFAS Cleveland employs between 2550-2580 employees in a fiscal year. Employment includes a variety of positions in financial management, technician jobs, and analytical support. Support grows and shrinks in accordance with the size of the DoD. As troop levels increase and decrease, DFAS employees match the trends to provide support within two years of the change.

The majority of services can be done online or over the phone. Staff is on hand to handle paper and mail filings and communications. Cyber security support staff defend the systems employed by DFAS from nearly 700 million phishing attempts per year.

- Opportunities for growth: 20% of DFAS Cleveland’s employees are set to retire within the next five years. DFAS relies heavily on college recruiting and interns to replace its workforce. The location would benefit significantly from outreach assistance within the higher education community.

The DFAS system has been reduced to 10 standing locations across the globe. It is highly unlikely that any more reductions in size will take place, given that each DFAS location has a vastly different mission.
- Mission: NASA Glenn’s mission is to drive research, technology, and systems to advance aviation, enable exploration of the universe, and improve life on Earth. Furthermore, NASA reaches for new heights to reveal the unknown for the benefit of humankind. They drive advances in science, technology, and space exploration to enhance knowledge, education, innovation, economic vitality, and environmental stewardship of the Earth.

- History: The NASA John H. Glenn Research Center at Lewis Field originated in 1941 as the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA). It was later renamed the Lewis Research Center in honor of the late George Lewis, NACA’s Director of Aeronautical Research. The name was changed to its present form in 1999 in honor of Ohio Senator John H. Glenn, the first American to orbit Earth.

The laboratory was conceived as a national resource capable of providing innovations in aircraft engine technology and transitioning these innovations to U.S. industry for use in future propulsion system designs for commercial and military applications. In the early 1960s, Glenn pioneered the use of liquid hydrogen for rocker and aircraft propulsion, allowing the United States to win the race to the moon.

Over the past 60 plus years, NASA Glenn scientists and engineers have made major technology contributions that have expanded horizons and opened frontiers for both aviation and space exploration. These innovations have enabled the United States industry to assume a leadership position in the world aerospace marketplace and have contributed to the nation’s safety and security.

- Numbers: Lewis Field commands 350 acres in northeast Ohio. It employs 1,514 civil servants, 1,528 contractors, and 84 interns. 71% of employees are scientists and engineers, 22% are administrative professionals, 5.5% are skilled craftsmen, and 1.5% are clerical staff.

Among other facilities, NASA Glenn is home to the largest space simulation vacuum chamber in the world, the highest capacity Mechanical Vibration Facility (MVF) in the world. Glenn’s physical plant includes more than 150 buildings that contain a unique collection of world-class test facilities. Since the groundbreaking for the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (forerunner to NASA) on January 23, 1941, more than $433 million has been invested in Glenn’s physical plant.

- Economic Impact: The NASA Glenn Research Center has a total economic impact of more than $1.3 billion. Employees of NASA Glenn contribute $9 million in state and local income taxes.
- Opportunities for growth: The Glenn Research Center increased their budget for space technology, exploration, construction, and environmental compliance in recent years. Some facilities are in need of repair and present opportunities for new construction projects.

- Hindrances: The NASA Glenn Research Center may be threatened by a declining national commitment to space exploration, a lack of consistent NASA policies from elected officials, a declining budget, congressional pressure to consolidate aging infrastructure, and an inability to replenish an aging workforce. Additionally, aging facilities need to be upgraded and the community generally lacks knowledge of NASA Glenn’s resources and capabilities.

Wright-Patterson AFB
WPAFB, OH
88th Air Base Wing

- Mission: As the host unit at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, the 88th Air Base Wing operates the airfield, maintains all infrastructure and provides security, communications, medical, legal, personnel, finance, transportation, air traffic control, weather forecasting, public affairs, recreation and chaplain services for more than 100 associate units. The Wing is responsible for three primary missions: operating the installation; training and deploying expeditionary Airmen in support of joint operations, and defending the base and its people.

- History: The base has a rich aviation heritage. It was here in 1904 and 1905 on Huffman Prairie Flying Field where the Wright Brothers learned to fly. Here they flew the first turn, circle, and figure eight. From 1910 to 1916 the brothers operated a flying school at Huffman Prairie. Among their 119 students were Henry "Hap" Arnold who commanded the Army Air Forces in World War II and H. Roy Brown, the Canadian ace who was credited with shooting down the Red Baron in World War I.

Today, just off the end of Runway 23, a marker, sign and replica of the Wright Brothers’ 1905 hangar and catapult launcher commemorate the exact location of their early aviation accomplishments. In 1992, Huffman Prairie became one of four sites in the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park.

- Numbers: The state’s largest military installation has approximately 27,000 employees and 100 units inside the fence. It is the most complex of Ohio’s military facilities. Among its many units, the base is home to the 445th Airlift Wing, the Air Force Life Cycle Management Center, the Air Force Research Laboratory, the National Air and Space Intelligence, and the 88th Air Base Wing headquarters.

The 88th Air Base Wing is comprised of more than 5,000 officers, enlisted, Air Force civilian and contractor employees. There are two runways supporting an average of 47,000 aircraft operations annually in addition to handling the payroll, keeping records on the workforce, maintaining infrastructure, providing security, communications, medical, transportation, air traffic control, weather forecasting, legal, and chaplain services.
The 88th Medical Group operates the second largest U.S. Air Force medical center, and deploys medical personnel to support global operations, and exercises. The 88th Communications Group provides computer network, telephone and radio support to more than 20,000 base and over 36,000 active phone lines. The 88th Mission Support Group oversees the largest Force Support Squadron in the continental U.S. The Wing also hosts the annual U.S. Air Force Marathon.

- Economic Impact: As Ohio’s largest single-site employer, the base administers $2.2 billion in payroll annually and has a regional economic impact of $4.3 billion. The last BRAC round in 2005 brought more than 1,100 jobs to Wright-Patterson and the addition of the Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine and the AFRL Sensors Directorate.

- Opportunities for growth: Last year, state lawmakers set aside $500,000 over two years to pay for infrastructure needs at Wright-Patterson to bolster the installation’s military value.

- Hindrances: Some aging infrastructure needs updated to keep ahead of the technological curve, while uncertainties of future conflicts hinders the ability to modernize certain facilities.

Youngstown ARS
Vienna, OH
910th Airlift Wing

- Mission: The 910th Airlift Wing's mission is to deliver, deploy and defend. In wartime, the 910th Airlift Wing’s mission is to employ the Lockheed C-130 Hercules aircraft in combat operations of tactical airlift. These operations include low-level infiltration into a combat environment, where aircrews can deliver personnel and materials by airdrop and airland techniques. The 910th also maintains a unique Areal Spray Mission, which has been used by numerous state and federal agencies outside the DOD (EPA, Health and Human Services, etc).

- History: The 910th Troop Carrier Group was established at Youngstown Air Reserve Station, Ohio on 17 January 1963, as the headquarters for the 757th Troop Carrier Squadron, which had been stationed there since November 1957. The 910th periodically deployed to Panama to support Air Force missions in Central and South America beginning in 1983. It has trained to airdrop and airland personnel and materiel and added the only full-time, fixed-wing aerial spray in the Department of Defense in January 1992. It has deployed personnel and equipment worldwide to support contingency operations, exercises, and humanitarian missions.

In May 1995, the 910th Airlift Group was re-designated as the 910th Airlift Wing, with 16 permanently assigned and authorized aircraft. Youngstown Air Reserve Station was also named as the site for a regional maintenance facility.

- Numbers: The 910th Airlift Wing is composed of three groups and one medical unit, the 910th Medical Squadron. The 910th Operations Group is composed of one flying squadron and one support unit, the 910th Operations Support Squadron. The flying squadron is the 757th Airlift Squadron, which includes the only large-area, fixed-wing aerial spray mission in the Department of Defense. The 910th Maintenance Group is assigned two squadrons, the 910th Maintenance Squadron and the 910th Aircraft Maintenance

- Opportunities for growth: The 910th Airlift Wing’s mission is to modernize the base. They have 200 acres of available space to expand if needed, and plan on improving their indoor firing range which can be accessible to public employees. The areal spray mission is unique to the nation and must be protected. Moreover, publicity on the areal spray missions’ capabilities must be expanded to generate more missions, thus more support for its operation.

- Hindrances: Pilot retention is down across the board. A strong family support group and increased outreach services may improve morale and thus retention. Ohio must push for increased support to ensure our pilots and their families are taken care of to continue our missions in Youngstown.

Joint Systems Manufacturing Center
Lima, Ohio
General Dynamics Land Systems
Defense Contract Management Agency

- Mission: The Joint Systems Manufacturing Center (JSMC), often referred to as the Lima Tank Plant, is a government-owned, contractor-operated facility. JSMC is the production center of the United States Army Armor branch’s primary combat vehicle, the M1 Abrams tank. Additionally, JSMC jointly produces the Stryker combat vehicle. Various global contracts allow the facility to produce a variety of combat vehicles for several foreign allies such as Morocco and Israel. To reduce production costs, many of the combat vehicles currently in production consist of salvaged hulls and components shipped in to be repaired and reassembled into new combat vehicles with entirely rebuilt engines and refurbished armor and frames. While JSMC works in tandem with a secondary site in Anniston, AL, Lima remains the sole production facility for all M1 Abrams tanks. Every tank in use, past or present, has come from their production line.

- History: Construction for the Lima Army Tank Plant began in 1941. Some of the first tanks produced included the M-5 and the T-26 "Pershing Tank." The Korean War saw another production increase after years of stagnation at the end of WWII. The plant saw little activity until Chrysler Defense was selected to use the site to produce the next generation of U.S. Army tanks. In 1980, the first M1 Abrams tanks began rollout. The levels of tank production skyrocketed when General Dynamics Land Systems acquired Chrysler Defense. Under their supervision, approximately 30 tanks were produced every month.

Today, JSMC produces several variations of tracked and wheeled vehicles, including the Abrams tanks, Stryker and LAV family of vehicles, the British Army’s AJAX, and MRAPS. While the Anniston location provides additional components and assembly to many of these vehicle classes, Lima remains the sole producer of the Abrams tank.
- Opportunities for growth: Average production of Abrams tanks remains at one per month. Lima is able to cut production costs of these tanks by stripping old components and rebuilding tanks from scratch using their hulls. The plant stands to benefit from continued refurbishments as well as international contracts with allies around the globe.
Conclusion

This report briefly explained the value of sustaining as well as attracting new federal missions to the state of Ohio. In order to ensure this mission is executed, many other states across the country have dedicated an office within their state government that is continually focused on federal assets. Ohio currently does not have an office with this focus and is therefore at a disadvantage when it comes to a future Base Realignment and Closure. The following recommendations ensure Ohio will be prepared to best sustain and attract federal missions.

Recommendations

The Base Realignment and Closure Task Force would like to offer the following recommendations to the State.

1) Create a state-level Office of Government and Military Affairs independently reporting to the Governor. The following duties would be assigned to this office.
   a. Develop a facilities and installations strategy for Ohio.
   b. Develop a process for development of federal investment priorities at the state level. The OFMJC detailed a process whereby the state would conduct regular military value analyses and then prioritize the list of needs and investments. This is an example of a process the state could utilize.
   c. Regular review of federal installation strengths and weaknesses to include military value and facility conditions.
   d. Develop a website or other platform for the appropriate agencies across the state to share information and data on installation needs.
   e. Regular meetings and updates with military affairs committees across the state.
   f. Facilitate regular visits for Ohio legislators to bases around the state to understand all mission sets.
   g. “Why-Ohio” campaign for attraction of new federal missions as well as retired federal workforce.
   h. Regular interaction with installation commanders and directors of federal installations across Ohio.
   i. Work with Ohio Department of Higher Education and Ohio Department of Education on Ohio federal installations workforce needs.
   j. Work with Ohio Department of Veterans Services to develop a campaign to attract Veterans from around the world to Ohio to work for our federal installations.
   k. Continue to aggressively pursue Public/Public and Public/Private Partnerships across the state.

2) Create a funding line in the state budget to fund federal investments to make the installations stronger and more valuable. The process whereby projects are funded should follow a benefit analysis focused on military value and cost analysis focused on economic feasibility of the project.
A BILL

To enact sections 107.64, 107.65, and 107.66 of the Revised Code to establish the Office of Government and Military Affairs, and to authorize the Office to make loans to defense or NASA communities and grants to defense or NASA communities, defense or NASA support organizations, and certain state institutions of higher education.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF OHIO:

Section 1. That sections 107.64, 107.65, and 107.66 of the Revised Code be enacted to read as follows:

Sec. 107.64. (A) As used in sections 107.64 to 107.66 of the Revised Code:

"Defense or NASA community" means a county, township, municipal corporation, or regional planning commission with a military or NASA installation located in or near its jurisdictional boundaries.

"Defense-related or NASA-related business" means a
business in this state that is engaged in providing significant and substantial defense-related or NASA-related systems, products, or services to a military or NASA installation.

"Defense or NASA support organization" means a nonprofit corporation formed under Chapter 1702. of the Revised Code that is located in or near a defense or NASA community and is engaged in activities to address exigencies of the community, which are not being met by a government entity, therein serving a public purpose.

"Military installation" means a base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility for a ship, or other activity under the jurisdiction of the United States department of defense, including a leased facility, that is located in this state.

"NASA installation" means any scientific research, test, simulation, development facility, or operations center under the jurisdiction of the national aeronautics and space administration (NASA) that is located in this state.

"State institution of higher education" means a state institution of higher education, as defined in section 3345.011 of the Revised Code, which has a collaborative or contractual relationship with a military or NASA installation.

(B) There is, within the office of the governor, the office of government and military affairs that shall perform the duties assigned under this section and sections 107.65 and 107.66 of the Revised Code.

(C) The governor shall appoint an executive director of the office of government and military affairs and shall provide such other staff as may be necessary for the office to perform
its duties. The executive director shall do all of the following:

(1) Not later than six months after being appointed, and every twelve months thereafter, submit to the governor and to the general assembly a strategic plan to support the long-term viability of military installations, and the health and well-being of service members and veterans;

(2) Annually report to the governor and the general assembly regarding the activities of the office of government and military affairs and the status of military and NASA installations in this state;

(3) Endeavor to meet at least annually with each commander of a military and NASA installation to discuss the goals and challenges facing the military or NASA installation or the organization, develop recommendations for improvements, discuss ways the state can enhance and complement the mission of the military or NASA installation, and discuss services available to assist transitioning service members and the member's families;

(4) Administer the defense or NASA community loan program under section 107.65 of the Revised Code;

(5) Administer the defense or NASA community, defense or NASA support organization, and state institution of higher education grant program under section 107.66 of the Revised Code;

(6) Make recommendations to the governor and to the general assembly regarding the design and execution of programs that support defense or NASA communities and military and NASA installations, which may include the promotion of strategic regional alliances;
(7) Assist defense or NASA communities in the design and execution of programs that enhance communities' relationships with military and NASA installations and defense-related or NASA-related businesses, which may include regional alliances;

(8) Provide information to defense or NASA communities, the governor, the general assembly, the state's congressional delegation, and appropriate state agencies regarding federal actions affecting military or NASA installations and missions;

(9) Collect and distribute to the governor, the general assembly, and defense or NASA communities information related to the operating costs, missions, and strategic value of military or NASA installations, including employment issues for defense or NASA communities that depend on military or NASA installations and defense-related or NASA-related businesses;

(10) Evaluate strategies and programs that other states use to maintain, expand, and attract defense-related or NASA-related businesses;

(11) Provide assistance to defense or NASA communities that have experienced a defense-related closure or realignment; and

(12) Advocate for the preservation and expansion of missions for reservists at military or NASA installations.

(D) The office of government and military affairs may solicit and accept gifts and grants from any source. Any funds that come into the possession of the office in this manner shall be deposited into the state treasury to the credit of the military value revolving loan fund.

(E) The military value revolving loan fund is established in the state treasury. Money in the fund may be used for loans.
and grants made by the office of government and military affairs. All payments received for loans made by the office shall be deposited into the state treasury to the credit of the military value revolving loan fund. Money in the fund shall be used to reimburse the general revenue fund for money appropriated by the general assembly and to pay expenses for administering the office of government and military affairs. Any money remaining in the fund after all appropriations and expenses have been settled shall be used to fund loans under section 107.65 of the Revised Code and grants under section 107.66 of the Revised Code.

Sec. 107.65. (A) The executive director of the office of government and military affairs shall establish a defense or NASA community loan program under which the executive director may loan funds in the military value revolving loan fund to defense or NASA communities.

(B) The executive director shall adopt rules under Chapter 119. of the Revised Code to administer the program. The rules shall establish at least all of the following:

(1) An application form and process for a defense or NASA community to receive a loan;

(2) A procedure for prioritizing the award of loans, which shall include the process described in division (B) of this section;

(3) A requirement that a loan be for an infrastructure project intended to accommodate new or expanded missions assigned to a military or NASA installation located in or near a defense or NASA community;

(4) A requirement that a loan be documented in a written
agreement containing the terms and conditions of the loan, including loan repayment requirements;

(5) A requirement that an infrastructure project financed with a loan be completed not later than five years after the loan is awarded;

(6) A prohibition from the loan amount exceeding the total project cost;

(7) Any other criteria, procedures, or guidelines the executive director determines are necessary to administer the program, including fees, charges, interest rates, and payment schedules.

(C) Before awarding a loan, the office of government and military affairs shall make at least all of the following determinations:

(1) Whether the infrastructure project meets the criteria under division (B)(3) of this section;

(2) Whether the defense community is creditworthy and has the ability to repay the loan; and

(3) Whether the defense community has pledged a sufficient source of revenue to repay the loan.

Sec. 107.66. (A) The executive director of the office of government and military affairs shall establish a defense or NASA community, defense or NASA support organization, and state institution of higher education grant program under which the executive director may grant funds in the military value revolving loan fund to defense or NASA communities, defense or NASA support organizations, and state institutions of higher education.
(B) The executive director shall adopt rules under Chapter 119. of the Revised Code to administer the program. The rules shall establish at least all of the following:

(1) An application form and the process to receive a grant;

(2) A procedure for prioritizing the award of grants;

(3) A requirement that the office consider, as part of the office's grant award criteria, whether or not the applicant has been or may be affected by an anticipated, planned, announced, or implemented action, of the United States department of defense, to close, reduce, increase, or otherwise realign military or NASA installations;

(4) A requirement that a grant must not be less than fifty thousand dollars;

(5) A requirement that a grant must not be more than the least of any one of the following:

(a) If the applicant desires to use the grant to fulfill a requirement to provide matching funds in order to be eligible to receive funding from another source, fifty per cent of the amount of matching money the applicant is required to provide, or, if the applicant demonstrates that the applicant lacks the necessary resources to provide that amount, eighty per cent of the amount of matching money;

(b) Fifty per cent of the applicant's investment if federal assistance is unavailable; or

(c) Five million dollars.

(6) A requirement that, in order to award a grant under this section, the office must determine that the grant enables
the recipient to do at least one of the following:

(a) Match money or meet an investment requirement necessary to receive federal assistance provided to the applicant;

(b) Match the applicant's contribution at a closed or realigned military or NASA installation;

(c) Construct infrastructure and other projects necessary to accommodate a new, expanded, or retained mission at a military or NASA installation or to reduce the impact of an action of the United States department of defense that negatively impacts a military or NASA installation located in or near the applicant; or

(d) Construct infrastructure or other projects necessary to prevent the reduction or closing of a military or NASA installation or to increase the overall value of the installation to the military or to NASA.