

Appendix D

DoD Policy Memoranda

Index of Memoranda

- o Defense Base Closure and Realignment Procedures
(December 10, 1990)
- o Base Closure Policy Memorandum One -- Treating All Bases
Equally (January 7, 1991)
- o Base Closure Policy Memorandum Two -- Review
Requirements, Responsibilities and Controls
(February 13, 1991)
- o Base Closure Policy Memorandum Three -- Cumulative Impact,
Report Format and Other Guidance (March 7, 1991)
- o Base Closure Policy Memorandum Four -- Multiple Installation
Impacts (March 26, 1991)



THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301

1 0 DEC 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
UNDER SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING
ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE
COMPTROLLER
GENERAL COUNSEL
INSPECTOR GENERAL
DIRECTOR, OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION
ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT
DIRECTORS OF THE DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUBJECT: Defense Base Closure and Realignment Procedures

Background and Scope

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101-510 (the "Act"), enacted new base closure and realignment procedures and established an independent Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Applicability

Title XXIX, Part A of the Act establishes the exclusive procedures under which the Secretary of Defense may pursue closure or realignment of military installations, with the exceptions listed below.

The Secretaries of the Military Departments, the Directors of the Defense Agencies, and the heads of other DoD components shall assess immediately all ongoing base closure, realignment and consolidation studies to determine the impact on each study of the new base closure and realignment legislation.

Exceptions

These new procedures and the guidance below do not apply to:

o Implementing the closures and realignments under Public Law 100-526 (relating to the 1988 Base Closure Commission); or

o Closures and realignments to which Section 2687 of Title 10, United States Code, is not applicable.

Policy Guidance

Base closure, realignment or consolidation studies that could result in a recommendation for base closure or realignment, other than one covered by an exception above, must meet the following requirements:

- o The studies, including their recommendations, must have as their basis the Force Structure Plan required by Section 2903 of the Act;

- o The recommendations in the studies must be based on the final base closure and realignment selection criteria established under that Section; and

- o The studies must consider all military installations inside the United States as defined in the Act (including those which the 1988 Base Closure Commission recommended for partial closure or designated to receive units or functions) on an equal footing, without regard to whether the installation has been previously considered or proposed for closure or realignment by the Department of Defense.

Contract study efforts regarding base closures and realignments which must be redirected may be continued to the next contractual milestone. Study efforts for the 86 installations closed under Public Law 100-526 shall be completed.

Record Keeping

DoD components shall keep:

- o Descriptions of how base closure and realignment selections were made, and how they met the final selection criteria;

- o Data, information and analyses considered in making base closure and realignment selections; and

- o Documentation for each recommendation to the Secretary of Defense to close or realign a military installation under the Act.

Submitting Recommendations

The Secretaries of the Military Departments, the Directors of the Defense Agencies, and the heads of other DoD components shall, by April 1, 1991, submit their recommendations for closures or realignments to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Production and Logistics for forwarding to the Secretary of Defense. They may not delegate responsibility for making these recommendations.

Compliance with Public Law 100-526

Consistent with the requirements of Section 201 of Public Law 100-526, the Secretaries of the Military Departments shall take all actions necessary to carry out the recommendations of the 1988 Base Closure Commission and shall take no action that is inconsistent with such recommendations. The Secretaries of the Military Departments shall review their implementation plans for Public Law 100-526 to ensure that:

- o All recommended closures and realignments will be initiated by September 30, 1991;

- o All recommended closures and realignments will be completed by September 30, 1995; and

- o Implementation plans are consistent with the temporary prohibition on military construction.

Implementation plans for Public Law 100-526 shall be revised in time to be included with the FY 92/93 Budget Justification. Budgetary impacts of the revised plans are due to the DoD Comptroller three days from the date of this memorandum.

Responsibilities

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Production and Logistics may issue such instructions as may be necessary to implement this memorandum and to ensure consistency in application of the selection criteria, methodology, and reports to the Secretary of Defense, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, and the Congress.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Production and Logistics shall be the exclusive point of contact for the Department of Defense with the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

D. J. Atwood



ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-8000

PRODUCTION AND
LOGISTICS

January 7, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
DIRECTORS OF THE DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUBJECT: Base Closure Policy Memorandum One -- Treating All
Bases Equally

Section 2903(c)(3) of the FY 1991 Authorization Act directs the Secretary of Defense to treat all bases equally in considering them for closure or realignment, "without regard to whether the installation has been previously considered or proposed for closure or realignment by the Department." In report language, the conferees stated they expect bases on the January 29, 1990, list of candidates to be "properly operated and maintained while this base closure process is implemented."

As you and your subordinate commands allocate FY 1991 operations and maintenance (O&M) funds to your military installations, care must be taken, until April 15, 1991, to treat all installations without regard to previous base closure or realignment lists. This requirement does not apply to actions falling below section 2687, title 10, U.S. Code thresholds or those actions under Public Law 100-526. Please report to me within two weeks of the date of this memorandum the steps you have taken to promulgate the above guidance throughout your components.

In addition, all bases must be treated equally when requesting waivers or exceptions to either the temporary prohibition on military construction or the moratorium on land acquisition. Consequently, justification that a base would never close or is not being considered for closure continues to have no bearing on the validity of such waiver or exception requests.

Colin McMillan

cc: CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
UNDER SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING
ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE
COMPTROLLER
GENERAL COUNSEL
INSPECTOR GENERAL
DIRECTOR, OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION
ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT



PRODUCTION AND
LOGISTICS

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-8000

February 13, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
UNDER SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING
ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE
COMPTROLLER
GENERAL COUNSEL
INSPECTOR GENERAL
DIRECTOR, OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION
ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT
DIRECTORS OF THE DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUBJECT: Base Closure Policy Memorandum Two -- Review
Requirements, Responsibilities and Controls

Background

Title XXIX, Part A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (the Act) establishes procedures for closing and realigning bases. The Deputy Secretary's memorandum of December 10, 1990, established procedures for implementing the provisions of the Act. This memorandum is the second in a series of additional policy guidance for implementation of the Act. The first policy memorandum was dated January 7, 1991.

Final Criteria

The Deputy Secretary has approved the final criteria for recommending the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under the Act. The final criteria are at attachment (1).

Categories of Bases

The first step in the process of evaluating your base structure for potential closures and realignments must involve grouping bases with like missions or capabilities/attributes into categories, and when applicable, subcategories. Categorizing bases is the necessary link between the forces described in the Force Structure Plan and the base structure. Determining appropriate categories of bases is a Service and Defense Agency responsibility.

Capacity Analysis

Should you determine there is no excess capacity in a category/subcategory, you do not need to continue analyzing that portion of your base structure, unless there is a military value or other reason to continue the analysis.

Conversely, if you recommend a base for closure or realignment, your analysis must have considered all bases within that category/subcategory, as well as cross-category opportunities. If in applying the military value criteria, you find bases that are militarily/geographically unique or mission-essential (such that no other base could substitute for them) you may justify that fact and exclude these bases from further analysis.

Criteria Measures/Factors

You must develop and use one or more measures/factors for analyzing each of the final criteria. We recognize that it will not always be possible to develop appropriate objective and quantifiable measures or factors, and that they may vary for different categories of bases (whether they be objective or subjective).

Cross-Category/Multi-Service Opportunities

As you analyze your base structure, you should continually look for cross-category opportunities, and coordinate and cooperate with your sister Services and Defense Agencies to pursue multi-service asset sharing or exchange.

Internal Controls

Services and Defense Agencies must develop and implement an internal control plan for these base structure reviews to ensure the accuracy of data collection and analyses. At a minimum, your plan should include:

- o Uniform guidance defining data requirements and sources for each category of base,
- o Systems for verifying accuracy of data,
- o Documentation justifying any changes made to data submissions, and
- o Procedures to check the accuracy of the analyses made from the data provided.

Costs and Savings

Specific instructions follow for the calculation of health care costs, unemployment costs, and environmental costs and savings.

- o CHAMPUS Costs. Base closures and realignments can impact CHAMPUS costs DoD-wide. These net cost impacts must be included in your analysis, regardless of which Military Department may eventually have to budget for such costs.

- o Unemployment Costs. The Services and Defense Agencies annually budget unemployment contributions to the Federal Employees Compensation Account for DoD military and civilian employees. You should include the contributions attributable to closures and realignments in your cost calculations.

- o Environmental Costs and Savings. Environmental Restoration costs at closing bases are not to be considered in your cost calculations. DoD has a legal obligation for environmental restoration, regardless of whether a base is closed or realigned. Where installations have unique contamination problems requiring environmental restoration, these will be considered as a potential limitation on near-term community reuse of the installation.

On the other hand, environmental compliance costs or savings can be factors in a base closure or realignment decision. Environmental compliance costs can potentially be avoided by ceasing the existing practice through the closure or realignment of a base. Conversely, environmental compliance costs may be a consideration in determining appropriate closure, realignment or receiving location options.

Return on Investment

Return on investment must be calculated, considered and reported with your justifications for each recommended closure or realignment package. All costs and savings attributable over time to a closure or realignment package should be calculated, including costs or savings at receiving locations. Costs or savings elements that are identified, but determined to be insignificant, need not be calculated. However, your records should indicate that determination.

We have been working to improve the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) model used by the 1988 Base Closure Commission. It shall be used for your return on investment calculations. Attachment two provides additional guidance on the model and return on investment calculations.

Impacts

Attachment three provides guidance on the calculation of economic impact on closing, realigning and receiving communities. Attachment four provides guidance on environmental impact considerations at closing, realigning and receiving locations, in addition to the environmental costs and savings considerations above.



Colin McMillan
Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Production and Logistics)

Attachments

1. Final Criteria
2. Return on Investment Calculations
3. Economic Impact Calculations
4. Environmental Impact Considerations

Final Criteria

The final criteria to be used by the Department of Defense in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under Title XXIX, Part A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 are as follows:

In selecting military installations for closure or realignment, the Department of Defense, giving priority consideration to military value (the first four criteria below), will consider:

Military Value

1. The current and future mission requirements and the impact on operational readiness of the Department of Defense's total force.
2. The availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace at both the existing and potential receiving locations.
3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at both the existing and potential receiving locations.
4. The cost and manpower implications.

Return on Investment

5. 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.

Impacts

6. The economic impact on communities.
7. The ability of both the existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions and personnel.
8. The environmental impact.

Attachment (1)

Return on Investment Calculations

The Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) model (used by the 1988 Base Closure Commission) is a useful tool to calculate return on investment for closure and realignment options. The model does not produce budget quality data. The model uses standard cost factors and algorithms to estimate costs and savings over time. It then calculates return on investment years and the 20-year net present value of a closure or realignment package.

In order to ensure consistency in methodology, Services and Defense Agencies shall use the improved COBRA model developed under the sponsorship of the Army's Total Army Basing Study (TABS) office. We recognize that Service and Defense Agency planning and accounting mechanisms are sufficiently different to warrant Service/Agency specific standard cost factors. Your documentation must justify use of such cost factors.

Return on Investment can be calculated as follows:

- 1) Array all the calculated costs and savings by fiscal year for the closure or realignment option. Costs and savings should be arrayed uninflated for 20 years.
- 2) Discount each year of the net costs or savings using a 10 percent discount rate.
- 3) Determine the fiscal year the closure or realignment is completed.*
- 4) Count the number of years, after the year of completion, it takes for the net present value to reach zero or become negative. This number is the return on investment years.
- 5) Sum the discounted net costs/savings for the 20-year period. This sum is the 20-year net present value.

OMB Circular A-94 applies to these calculations, in general, by specifying a 10 percent discount rate and zero percent inflation. Final criterion number five specifically applies to return on investment. If you have any questions, please call Mr. Dom Miglionico on (703) 697-8048 (AV 227-8048).

- * The year of the closure is defined as the year in which the majority of personnel have left, and the mission and functions cease to be performed at the installation. For these calculations, a closure or realignment can be considered complete even if the installation is in caretaker status.

Economic Impact Calculations

The 1988 Base Closure Commission calculated economic impact by measuring the decrease or increase in direct employment in a community, county, or standard metropolitan district that would result at closing or realigning bases or at receiving locations. The General Accounting Office, in their review of the Commission's work, recommended that indirect employment impacts also be considered.

Economic impact on communities will be measured by the direct and indirect effect on employment at closing and realigning bases, as well as at receiving locations.

The Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) will develop computerized spreadsheets based on the formulae and rationale used in 1988, with the addition of appropriate multipliers to measure indirect economic impacts. OEA will provide a description of how they developed the formulae, rationale and multipliers, and how they are used in the calculations.

The Services and Defense Agencies will be responsible for determining changes in military, civilian and contractor (local on-base contracts only) employment at each base. This is the direct employment impact. The OEA spreadsheets have a place for entry of this data which will be a Service and Defense Agency responsibility. Once entered, the computerized spreadsheet will calculate the economic impact (the direct and indirect effect on employment) of the closure or realignment for each affected installation.

Attachment (3)

Environmental Impact Considerations

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

RESULTING FROM CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION AT:

Installation Name

Location

(Provide a summary statement and status for the following environmental attributes at each installation affected by the closure/realignment action, including receiving installations. These key environmental attributes are not meant to be all inclusive. Others may be added as appropriate.)

- o Threatened or Endangered Species
- o Wetlands
- o Historic or archeological sites
- o Pollution Control
- o Hazardous Materials/Wastes
- o Land and Air Uses
- o Programmed Environmental Costs/Cost Avoidances

Attachment (4)



ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-9000

March 7, 1991

PRODUCTION AND
LOGISTICS

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
UNDER SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING
ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE
COMPTROLLER
GENERAL COUNSEL
INSPECTOR GENERAL
DIRECTOR, OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION
ASSISTANTS TO THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT
DIRECTORS OF THE DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUBJECT: Base Closure Policy Memorandum Three -- Cumulative
Impact, Report Format and Other Guidance

Background

This is the third memorandum in a series of policy guidance for implementation of Title XXIX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (the Act). The first two policy memoranda were dated January 7, 1991, and February 13, 1991.

Effect of Budget, Defense Management Review and Other Decisions

Civilian employment at individual bases can be affected by management decisions made at all levels, from installation commander up to the Secretary of Defense. We must report to the Commission when the cumulative civilian employment impacts of these decisions at an individual base call for reporting under the Act: specifically, when the cumulative impacts exceed the numerical thresholds of section 2687, title 10, U.S. Code (a civilian personnel reduction of 1,000 or 50 percent).

You should establish procedures to track all these decisions at installations where 300 or more civilian employees are authorized to be employed.

In general, DoD will aggregate employment impacts which would have been reportable, other than for the fact they were below section 2687 numerical thresholds. Specifically, to be considered part of a cumulative impact on an individual installation, each decision should:

- (1) Both reduce and relocate functions and civilian personnel positions from one installation to another; and
- (2) Involve management, consolidation or other decisions and not simply involve a reduction in force resulting from workload adjustments, reduced personnel or funding levels, skill imbalances, or other similar causes; and
- (3) Be scheduled for initial implementation during FY 92 or FY 93.

When aggregating impacts, associated outyear (FY 94-97) employment impacts of decisions which meet the above guidelines shall be counted. Outyear employment impacts (FY 92/93 impacts) of earlier FY 90/91 decisions shall not be counted.

Those actions requiring reporting to the Commission in accordance with the above guidelines will need to have justifications including:

- (1) The relationship of each decision to the force structure plan and/or the FYDP; and
- (2) The relationship of each decision to the final criteria.

Actions With Multiple Installation Impacts

As you review your base structure or conduct functional studies with base closure or realignment impacts, you must determine whether a review or study impacting more than one installation should be considered a single action under P.L. 101-510.

To be considered a single action, the review or study must:

- (1) Result in the closure or realignment of at least one installation which would trigger the numerical thresholds of P.L. 101-510; and
- (2) Involve inextricably linked elements, in that failure to proceed with any one element of the action would require reevaluation of the entire action.

Receiving Bases

You must identify receiving bases for larger units or activities, including tenants, which are to be relocated from closing or realigning bases. The COBRA model will calculate the costs for relocating such larger units or activities. You do not need to identify specific receiving bases for units or tenants with less than 100 civilian/military employees. Finding homes for these activities can be left to execution. However, you should establish a generic "base x" within the COBRA model to act as the surrogate receiving base for each of these smaller units or activities.

Return on Investment

The following guidance applies to return on investment calculations for land value, force structure savings, and construction savings.

o Land Value. Services and Defense Agencies must estimate the value of land which can be disposed of as a result of a closure or realignment. Estimated land value will generally be based on the anticipated highest and best use for the land. You should assume appropriate zoning to allow the highest and best use. You must also take into account the impact environmental restoration activities could have on land value. Where installations have unique contamination problems, a portion of the installation may have to be segregated so the rest can be disposed of and community reuse can begin. Estimated land value needs to be adjusted for any such segregation, or where you anticipate reduced land value resulting from expected sales for less than unrestricted use.

o Force Structure Savings. The savings associated with force structure drawdowns shall not be included in your return on investment calculations. While decreased force structure will often be the underlying reason for recommending base closures or realignments, the savings associated with closing bases should be founded on the elimination of base operating support (BOS), infrastructure and related costs.

o Construction Cost Avoidances. Closing bases will result in construction cost avoidances. For FY 92-97, your cost avoidances should include the budgeted or programmed military and family housing construction, major repair and minor construction that can be avoided at the closing or realigning base. To calculate 20-year net-present value, extract the new-mission construction from the FY 92-97 total before you annualize the new total, and use that for each of the remaining fourteen years of the 20-year period. One exception to this guidance is where you have estimates for new-mission construction beyond FY 97. Those estimates shall be included in the cost avoidance total.

Community Preference

Services and Defense Agencies should establish procedures to give special consideration and emphasis to official local community closure or realignment requests received under section 2924 of the Act. You should document the receipt of such reports and the steps you have taken for possible review by the General Accounting Office, the Commission and the Congress.

Relocation Impacts

Where ammunition, chemical warfare agents or other materials which require special storage areas or facilities must be relocated, adequate safe accommodations must be assured at the receiving locations. Returns of such items from Southwest Asia or other overseas locations must also be considered as you analyze your base structure.

Environmental Impact Considerations

For environmental impact considerations, there is no need to undertake new environmental studies. You may use all available environmental information you or your subordinate activities have, regardless of when, how or for what purpose it was collected. If you should choose to undertake a new environmental study, the study must collect the same information from all U.S. bases in your base structure, unless the study is designated to fill gaps in information so that all bases can be treated equally.

Reporting Formats

The attachment describes the reporting formats for: (1) the anticipated DoD report to the Commission, and (2) Service and Defense Agency justifications for your April 1, 1991, closure and realignment recommendations.



Colin McMillan
Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Production and Logistics)

Attachment

Base Closure and Realignment Report Format

Report to Commission
(Unclassified)

Unclassified Report

	<u>Responsibility</u>
1. Executive Summary	P&L
2. Introduction	P&L
- Background	
- Description of P.L. 101-510	
- Objective	
3. Force Structure Plan	OJCS
- Unclassified Version	
(Classified Version at Appendix F)	
4. Selection Criteria Development	P&L
5. DoD Policy Guidance	P&L
6. Description of Recommendations	Services/ Agencies
7. Budget Impacts (DoD Roll-Up)	P&L

Classified Appendices

1. Service and Defense Agency Analyses and Recommendations	Services/ Agencies
A. Army	
B. Navy	
C. USMC	
D. Air Force	
E. Defense Agencies	
2. Appendix F. Classified Force Structure Plan	OJCS

Base Closure and Realignment Report Format
Service and Defense Agency Analyses and Recommendations
(Classified)

1. **Executive Summary**
2. **Statement of Purpose**
 - Background
 - Applicable Specific Legislation
 - Objective or Purpose
 - Service Basing Concepts or Visions
3. **Service Projected Force Structure (General Description)**
4. **Service Process**
 - Determination of Categories
 - Capacity Analysis for Every Category
 - General Findings if Recommendations Resulted
 - Justification if No Recommendations Resulted
 - Data Collection and Use
 - Application of Final Criteria (General Description)
 - Application of DoD Policy and Service Specific Guidance
5. **Base Closure Account and Other Budget Impacts (Service Roll-up)**

TABS: (One TAB for Each Category Where There is a Recommendation)

- TAB A. Description of Analysis**
- Description of Category
 - Results of Capacity Analysis
 - Application of Final Criteria
 - Measures/Factors
 - Role Each Final Criteria Played in Decision Process
 - Recommendations* and Impacts
 - Implementation Plan

TAB B. (Repeat as required)

*** Each recommendation should describe the "package", including the receiving bases associated with the closure or realignment.**



PRODUCTION AND
LOGISTICS

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-8000

March 26, 1991

**MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
DIRECTORS OF THE DEFENSE AGENCIES**

**SUBJECT: Base Closure Policy Memorandum Four--Multiple
Installation Impacts**

I have reconsidered the DoD policy regarding actions with multiple installation impacts which I issued on March 7, 1991.

The Department of Defense will only submit recommendations to the Commission which meet or exceed the thresholds established in Section 2687, title 10, United States Code. Actions which depart from the recommendations of the 1988 Commission on Base Realignment and Closure (established pursuant to Public Law 100-526) must, however, be submitted to the Commission when such departures are necessary to comply with the Force Structure Plan and the final criteria.

General Counsel concurs.

Colin McMillan

cc: Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
Under Secretaries of Defense
Director, Defense Research and Engineering
Assistant Secretaries of Defense
Comptroller
General Counsel
Inspector General
Director, Operational Test and Evaluation
Assistant to the Secretaries of Defense
Director, Administration and Management

(Ed. note: On April 8, 1991, the Secretary of Defense decided to include below threshold actions nominated by the Secretaries of the Military Departments that had undergone the Services detailed analyses and were based on the force structure plan and the final criteria.)