

THIS FILE IS MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH THE DECLASSIFICATION EFFORTS AND RESEARCH OF:

THE BLACK VAULT

THE BLACK VAULT IS THE LARGEST ONLINE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT / GOVERNMENT RECORD CLEARING HOUSE IN THE WORLD. THE RESEARCH EFFORTS HERE ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DECLASSIFICATION OF THOUSANDS OF DOCUMENTS THROUGHOUT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT, AND ALL CAN BE DOWNLOADED BY VISITING:

[HTTP://WWW.BLACKVAULT.COM](http://www.blackvault.com)

YOU ARE ENCOURAGED TO FORWARD THIS DOCUMENT TO YOUR FRIENDS, BUT PLEASE KEEP THIS IDENTIFYING IMAGE AT THE TOP OF THE .PDF SO OTHERS CAN DOWNLOAD MORE!



PUBLIC AFFAIRS

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
1400 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1400

23 AUG 1996

Ref: 95-F-1994

Mr. Michael Sznajderman
The Tampa Tribune
1214 National Press Building
Washington, DC 20045

Dear Mr. Sznajderman:

This letter responds to your September 13, 1995, Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request which was received in this Directorate on September 14, 1995.

Your request was processed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy and Requirements (SR) and the Joint Staff (JS) and the enclosed documents are provided as responsive to your request. Mr. Tom L. Longstreth, the Principal Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Strategy and Requirements, an Initial Denial Authority, has determined that the release of additional documents must be denied pursuant to 5 USC 552(b)(5). The documents are predecisional in nature, and their release would reasonably be expected to interfere with the government's deliberative process. Additionally, JS has located other documents that may be responsive to your request, but the release authority for those documents are other Department of Defense agencies. Therefore, your request and those documents have been referred to the proper agencies for a direct response to you. The following addresses refer.

Department of the Army
Freedom of Information/Privacy Acts Office
ATTN: SAIS-IDP-F/P, Suite 201
1725 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, VA 22202

Department of the Navy
Chief of Naval Operations
N-09B30, Room 5E521
2000 Navy Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350-2000

Department of the Air Force
OL-P, 11 CS/SCSR(FOIA)
1000 Air Force Pentagon
Room 4A1088C
Washington, DC 20330-1000

#837



Commander in Chief, U.S. Southern Command
Attn: Unit 1111
APO AA 34003

You have the right to appeal Mr. Longstreth's decision to deny this information. Any such appeal should offer justification to support reversal of the initial denial and should be forwarded within 60 calendar days of the date of this letter, to this office. Should you appeal, please cite our case number 95-F-1994.

There are no chargeable costs for processing your request in this instance.

Sincerely,



A. H. Passarella
Director
Freedom of Information
and Security Review

Enclosures:
As stated

DEFENSE DIALOG

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT
BACKGROUND BRIEFING
ATTRIBUTABLE TO: SENIOR DEFENSE
OFFICIAL
(DOD PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIRECTOR
KENNETH BACON IS ALSO PRESENT)
SUBJECT: RELOCATION OF SOUTHCOM
FROM PANAMA TO FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 1995

MR. BACON: Welcome. You've no doubt seen wire service stories about the SOUTHCOM decision. The president will announce later today that the Defense Department has made decision on relocating SOUTHCOM from Panama to Miami. And a senior Defense official is here to describe on background how we came to this decision and the implications of the decision. So, I'll turn it over to him now.

SR. DEFENSE OFFICIAL: Good afternoon. What I'd like to run through is the series of briefing charts that have been distributed to most of you and just use that to talk from to discuss the selection process that has been followed over the last several months, culminating in the selection of the Miami area and with one specific site as the most likely location. But it's -- as ***** was saying, there are pending final deliberations and approvals before you can have an individual site that will be, in fact, committed to.

The issuer, of course, is the necessity to relocate SOUTHCOM headquarters, going back to the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977. And let me talk a little bit about what SOUTHCOM is just in background, and then I'll talk about the process that led us to the conclusion collectively within the Department of Defense for the location in south Dade County.

SOUTHCOM itself, of course, is one of the five regional unified commands in the

American global arrangements to try to organize our approach to military responses around the world. It is the command that has 19 countries of Central and South America. All the countries south of Mexico are in the Southern Command, and as the one chart indicates, it has 7 million square miles -- a great distance running north to south, 7,000 miles. And there are about 8,500 military personnel from all four services serving within the Southern Command.

The SOUTHCOM mission is indicated on our next chart, and the point to know is that in SOUTHCOM's case, unlike most of the other geographic regions, where we are oriented toward the potential for contingencies to commit American forces with friends and allies to defend against aggression, predominantly in SOUTHCOM we have a political military mission. We do have a set of important responsibilities, including continuing responsibility for the defense of the canal and to be prepared to carry out joint military operations within that area of responsibility of Southern Command, should that be necessary, and we obviously cooperate closely in a series of defense-to-defense and military-to-military contacts with nations throughout the region. And we have been involved and remain involved in this region in connection with the American drug control strategy.

Because of the dominantly political military character of this mission, there's a lot of importance on face-to-face meetings and visits and discussions with representatives, with the various officials in the defense establishments, including the armed forces, of all the members -- all the states that fall within Southern Command. We also provide support to other unified commands as necessary.

I think that covers about everything.

In our military-to-military and defense-defense relationships on a regular basis, it includes discussions of issues of common interest, and training exercises and

#837

Page 2

Command's normal fare.

Southern Command headquarters itself is currently located in Panama, and, because of the treaty, must move. That move must be completed by the 31st of December of 1999, and what Southern Command consists of here is the commander in chief -- at this point, Army General Barry McCaffrey, with his staff of around 700 personnel, military and civilians. It also includes some representatives from other agencies, with which they coordinate various initiatives in the region of responsibility. There are about 1,500 family members as a representative sample of those that would be part and parcel of this activity of the command itself.

The requirement, then, was to find a facility, a headquarters facility that would provide about 140,000 square feet, and would be equipped, have access to very substantial communications capability because of the necessity to communicate with the various participating nations in the area of responsibility.

A point of some importance for those is that the annual payroll associated with the headquarters itself is around \$27 million.

On the relocation itself -- from this next slide I speak to -- I noted that this was precipitated by the Panama Canal Treaty concluded in 1977. There have been a variety of relocation studies begun in the late '80s on into the early '90s. The most recent version that did lead to the current decision began last spring. It was conducted under the auspices of the Southern Command, initially conducted by an element of the Department of the Army. It was brought forward into the leadership of the Department of Defense, the deputy secretary of defense to be specific, in mid-fall.

At that time he looked at the results to date, which had narrowed down, as I'll go through this narrowing process in some detail in a moment, from possible candidate locations of over 100, down. In their case they had run through a series of screening criteria, looking at two broad issues. One issue was mission accomplishment, the ability to fulfill that set of missions associated with Southern Command's responsibilities, and the other was the issue of quality of life for the military and civilian

personnel that would be maintaining the headquarters.

They brought forward to the secretary of defense a set of recommendations. They were narrowing down to about -- to four sites that were -- they would have had as the semi-finalists, if you will, and were prepared then with the direction of the deputy secretary to go out and do detailed cost analysis of those potential sites. At this point the deputy secretary elected to really expand and refine the analysis to make sure that we factored cost considerations in a bit sooner before you were down to just four finalists. He wanted to make sure that a somewhat wider set of alternatives were not only analyzed for mission and quality of life, but also from the question of cost considerations.

So he formed a selection committee in the office of -- or in the Department of Defense. I was asked to head that committee. It had members also from the Office of the Comptroller and from the senior leadership of the offices of the joint staff. That committee, with the assistance of a series of specialists from -- drawn from a variety of places, reviewed and in some key areas expanded and refined the SOUTHCOM analysis. It now is on the basis of the three criteria of mission, quality of life, and cost. And on that basis in a manner I'll go through it in a little bit more detail in just a moment. It came out with a set of -- it had winnowed the list down to 12 key sites. And then within those 12 candidate sites six of them were visited by the staff in order to get really detailed information. And then the information was developed on the basis of a series of objective criteria and some sensitivity analyses were run, and this information was made available to the deputy secretary in early March, and he in consultation with the chairman and the secretary of defense then helped make a decision in the Department of Defense, which the president will be announcing tonight.

On this question of the critical parameters to do the analysis that was done, well, let me go ahead and, if you look -- if you're looking at the charts, the chart that describes process here, a series of boxes moving from left to right, there were at first a large universe of potential locations in what might be the

southern half of the United States, including up to 126 sites. They were screened in terms of the ability to get air -- ready air access into the theater. And they needed to have direct flights so it was a one-stop flight into the various cities associated with the member nations -- the nations that are located within the area of responsibility of Southern Command. On that basis, the screen took us down to 26 cities. That set of cities was then screened again on the basis of regional presence, regional representation in the diplomatic sense in the local area. And on that basis we came down to a list of 12 cities, and those cities are listed there in alphabetical order. Then those 12 cities were all analyzed in detail according to an evaluative process and developed and eventually displayed in a matrix that would indicate along measurable parameters associated with those three main categories of concern mission, quality of life, and cost.

Within those parts, then, some of the key issues that fell out: in mission we were looking at issues of access to the theater, they were looking at the cultural environment and its Latin American flavor, if you will.

We were looking also at the question of communications, connectivity into the theatre, and finally issues -- the potential for interagency coordination. And then we went on to the issues associated with quality of life -- they are really rather obvious, they had to do with housing, schooling, medical care, crime -- that is the safety and security of people in the area -- and military support infrastructure, since many of these people are employees of the Department of Defense, many of them military.

Finally, with regard to costs, basically we (looked at?) the initial investment costs, the start-up costs associated with putting the headquarters (in?) any location and then we looked also at the life cycle costs over a 20 year period, which fall into operations in maintenance, travel, cost of living allowances associated with the personnel and so forth.

On the basis of all of those things then we did a rating scheme and on that basis were able to find a rank order among the candidate locations. And we ran a variety of what they call in the analytical business sensitivity analyses, where we weighted these three

categories in different manners. And after doing various weighting and sensitivity analyses as well as the (basic props?) -- I'd say the baseline is one that gave a predominant emphasis to mission, but also substantial concern about quality of life and costs.

Having then looked at all of that information and had a basis for making a rigorous comparison, the deputy secretary of defense initially -- then consulting with the chairman and the secretary, came to the conclusion that the right place to re-locate Southern Command Headquarters was -- to the Miami area, with particular preference if it goes through the rest of the process -- toward this U.S. Coast Guard facility at Richmond Heights in southern Dade County.

The final slide I have here says, well then, why was Miami selected? Quite simply, Miami, in the balance when you went through the various parameters associated with mission, had superior performance with regard to mission.

Miami is truly a gateway to the southern hemisphere in this part of the world, to Latin America. It has strong cultural business, economic -- strong ties into Latin America. And it just -- it also had a substantial presence of government agencies. In one press release story came out -- said the only reason Miami won is because it had X amount of consulates there. That was one of many dimensions that was measured, but it was not the dominant dimension by any means. It was a combination of factors in the mission area that led Miami to have superior capability with regard to mission.

In quality of life and cost it also was highly competitive. It was not necessarily the leader in either of those categories, but it had a strong enough performance that -- when you weighed all of these and totalled them and took the combined score, if you will, the combined performance of Miami as a location -- it was judged to be the best one to do the job. And so it is on that basis that over the last couple of weeks the senior leadership in the Department of Defense made the decision that will be announced this evening.

I'll be prepared to answer your questions.

Q: When will it be final? And what are the steps --

that lie ahead is -- there has to be an environmental. There's an environmental impact process, environmental statement process that must be run through over the next several months. And as that is then completed, they will also move ahead with design, planning and design activities. That planning and design activity will continue on through next year and then on into '97 and '98 you will actually do the construction for the -- if, in fact, this Coast Guard station is the one that is chosen, it would be the expansion of an existing facility and the construction of some other facilities in order to provide SOUTHCOR headquarters. And the objective is to be able to occupy that headquarters by the late summer of 1998.

Q: Do you have a backup site in mind just in case some major environmental thing should spring up, something that --

SR. DEFENSE OFFICIAL: There are other potential sites in the Miami area that could be -- would meet -- I mean, they'd meet the general criteria of what attracts one to Miami. And if that one does not prove to be the one, one would most certainly be looking at those. I wouldn't single out any specifics in that regard.

Q: But you're not looking at backups in other cities at this point?

SR. DEFENSE OFFICIAL: Not at this point.

Q: Could you generally describe what you'll have to do at this particular site? You mentioned expansion of the Coast Guard facility and construction of other things? What, *****, does that mean? And can you put a cost to that?

SR. DEFENSE OFFICIAL: The cost is roughly \$60 million in the cost that will be associated with the entire creation of that as the full-up SOUTHCOR headquarters capability over the next several years -- I mean, up through 1998. I mean, those are costs incurred in that time period. The main thing is the expansion of the headquarters site itself. There will -- it's the potential to build some senior officer housing. There is some available there. There may be the construction of some additional. That would have to go with the specific site design activities.

Q: Since the four-star general will be in Miami looking over the Caribbean to Central and South America, was there any consideration given to having the SOUTHCOR commander report to the Atlantic Command; in other words, get rid of that whole concept, since you're moving it to the states and it's no longer in the southern part of the hemisphere, and just have it all under CINCLANT?

SR. DEFENSE OFFICIAL: The assumption at this point is that we will sustain a separate and independent Southern Command for the current area of responsibility. As you undoubtedly know, there have been periodic suggestions on redrawing of boundaries among different commands. There was no assumption made that that would occur; that is a possibility. I guess the next -- but the next logical time that that could be raised is when General Shalikashvili does one of -- the triennial review that he does of roles and missions and the like which will be completed in the latter part of 1995.

But the assumption at this point that most certainly the deputy secretary and the chairman agreed in, is that we will sustain a separate and independent Southern Command with an area of responsibility covering Latin America.

Q: Other than the headquarters personnel, there are no troops, air units, anything like that that will accompany --

SR. DEFENSE OFFICIAL: No, there are not.

Q: What happened to the 24th Wing from Howard in Panama?

SR. DEFENSE OFFICIAL: There still are decisions to be made, having to do with the terms of the Panama Canal Treaty on the whole question of the reorientation of the -- and the final disposition of both the facilities associated with Southern Command and the forces currently deployed with Southern Command. General McCaffrey, the commander-in-chief of Southern Command, is developing recommendations; I mean, he has a plan for the next couple of years, and developing recommendations for the evolution there, up through the end of '99.

Q: One more question? So it's not going to be the Miami International Airport, you can knock that down?


SR. DEFENSE OFFICIAL: That surely is

Q: Thank you.

END



HEADQUARTERS SOUTHCOM RELOCATION




Office of the Secretary of Defense
U.S. SOUTHCOM Headquarters Relocation
Selection Committee



U.S. SOUTHCOM

- 19 Countries in Central and South America
- Seven million square miles
- 7,000 miles, North to South
- Over 8500 military personnel





U.S. SOUTHCOM MISSION

- **Predominantly Political-Military**
 - Face-to-face planning/coordination with key officials
 - Defense of the Panama Canal
 - Military-to-military contact
 - Support to other Unified commands
- **Current focus are key countries in Central and South America**
 - Counterdrug
 - Security Cooperation
 - Support for democratic institutions
- **Programs**
 - Support for regional counterdrug efforts
 - Combined training
 - Cooperative security discussions



Southern Command Headquarters

- **Commander in Chief, with staff of 700 military and civilians**
- **Approximately 1500 Family members**
- **140,000 square foot building with extensive communications**
- **Annual payroll of \$26.8 Million**



SOUTHCOM HQs RELOCATION


Background

- 1977 Panama Canal Treaty
 - Stationing rights until December 31, 1999
 - US continues to provide defense of the Canal
- 1994 Relocation Study (SOUTHCOM)
 - Focused on mission & quality of life (no cost analysis)
 - Identified four sites in Florida and Puerto Rico as best suited
- December 1994 Selection Committee appointed by DepSecDef
 - Reviewed and refined SOUTHCOM's analysis
 - Expanded list of candidates for detailed evaluation
 - Added cost analysis
 - Provided results to DepSecDef March 1995



HQs SOUTHCOM RELOCATION

First & Second Tier Screening





HQs SOUTHCOM RELOCATION CRITICAL PARAMETERS

• MISSION

- Access to the theater
- Latin American cultural environment
- Need for sites with effective communications and transportation links
- Availability of other government agencies for policy and tasking coordination

• QUALITY OF LIFE

- Housing
- Schools
- Medical
- Crime
- Military support

• COSTS

- Construction: Headquarters & key personnel housing
- Communications
- Life cycle costs: O&M, leases, rotation, travel and cost-of-living allowances



Why Miami?

MISSION:

- Unmatched for mission effectiveness
- Principal transportation, business & cultural link between U.S. and Latin America
- Substantial presence of related U.S. government agencies

QUALITY OF LIFE:

- Moderate cost of living
- Good housing, medical support and recreation
- Strong community support

COST:

- Competitive with other finalists
- Existing government facility allows for renovation
- Excess capacity in communications infrastructure



NEWS RELEASE

**OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)**
WASHINGTON, D.C. - 20301
PLEASE NOTE DATE

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

March 29, 1995

No. 161-95
(703)697-5131(media)
(703)697-3189(copies)
(703)697-5737(public/industry)

U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND HEADQUARTERS TO MOVE TO MIAMI

Secretary of Defense William J. Perry announced today that South Dade County, Miami, was selected as the future location for the headquarters of the United States Southern Command. The Miami area was selected following an extensive and comprehensive review process which considered more than 100 potential sites in the continental U.S. and Puerto Rico. While final site selection is pending completion, a leading candidate is the U.S. Coast Guard facility at Richmond Heights in South Dade County. "Given the quality of our candidate sites, this was a very difficult decision," said Deputy Secretary of Defense John M. Deutch, "We chose the city that we believe will allow Southern Command to accomplish its mission and provide a good quality of life for its personnel at reasonable cost to the American taxpayer."

Under provisions outlined in the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, United States military forces must be withdrawn from Panama by December 31, 1999. Southern Command will move its headquarters to Miami in the summer of 1998.

U.S. Southern Command, commanded by Gen. Barry McCaffrey, is currently located in Quarry Heights (near Panama City) Panama. The joint-service headquarters consists of about 700 Department of Defense civilians and military personnel, as well as representatives from the Department of State, Drug Enforcement Administration, and U.S. Coast Guard. The current payroll of the staff is \$27 million and it is estimated that the establishment and construction of the headquarters facilities will involve expenditures of approximately \$60 million.

Southern Command's area of responsibility encompasses all of Central and South America south of Mexico. Its principal missions are to assist Panama in defending the Panama Canal, remain prepared to command U.S. joint operations in the theater, and assist nations in the promotion of democracy and fostering hemispheric cooperation. The command also has significant responsibilities in support of the U.S. Drug Control Strategy and support to other Unified commands.

-MORE-

INTERNET AVAILABILITY: This document is available on DefenseLINK, a World Wide Web Server on the Internet, at: <http://www.duc.dla.mil/defenselink/>

7904

Several preliminary studies were conducted between 1988 and 1994 to identify potential locations for the U.S. Southern Command headquarters. The most recent study was sponsored by Southern Command and conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the fall of 1994.

After that study was completed, Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch established a Selection Committee to review, expand and refine potential site options. The committee included Dr. Edward Warner, assistant secretary of Defense for Strategy and Requirements, Alice Maroni, principal deputy Comptroller, and Lt. Gen. Wesley Clark, director for Strategic Plans and Policy, the Joint Staff. Working for the Selection Committee was a small staff that included representatives from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, U.S. Southern Command, and the Army's Treaty Implementation and Planning Agency. At the direction of the Committee, the staff conducted a detailed analysis on the three key selection criteria of mission effectiveness, quality of life, and cost. The staff also conducted a series of site visits to validate relevant data and gather more information.

Attached are two Southern Command fact sheets.

-END-

OVERVIEW OF THE U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND

The U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) is responsible for all U.S. military activities on the landmass of Latin America south of Mexico. It is located in the Panama Canal Area, with its headquarters at Quarry Heights adjacent to Panama City and the Pacific entrance to the Panama Canal.

The Commander in Chief of the Southern Command is responsible for designing, coordinating, and executing military strategy to support U.S. national security objectives within Central and South America in coordination with U.S. ambassadors in country.

The Southern Command's area of responsibility encompasses 19 countries, covering about seven million square miles and stretching 7,000 miles from the Mexican-Guatemalan border to the southern tip of South America.

COMMAND ORGANIZATION

Headquarters, U.S. Southern Command is a joint-service headquarters with about 770 DoD civilian and military personnel representing all four services. It further includes representatives from the Department of State, Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), Coast Guard, U.S. Customs Service (USCS), and other U.S. Government agencies.

SOUTHCOM has Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine components, a Special Operations sub-unified command, two subordinate joint task forces, and 16 Military Groups that enhances military contacts and provide security assistance to countries in the region. Total current permanently assigned military strength, including Headquarters SOUTHCOM, is about 8,500.

-- **U.S. Army South** (headquartered at Fort Clayton, Panama) with forces that include an infantry battalion, the Army's Jungle Operations Training Center, and aviation, engineer, intelligence, logistics, and military police units.

-- **U.S. Southern Air Forces (12th Air Force)** at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona) and its forward element, 24th Wing, at Howard Air Force Base, Panama) is SOUTHCOM's air component.

-- **U.S. Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet (CINCLANTFLT)** at Norfolk, Virginia (and its forward element, CINCLANTFLT Detachment South at Rodman Naval Station, Panama) is SOUTHCOM's naval component. It has several small commands in Panama, have the responsibility to provide security for U.S. Naval Forces transiting the Canal, and offer temporary maintenance and refueling for U.S. and allied warships. The Navy also operates the Naval Small Craft Instruction and Technical Training School (NAVSCIATTS) at Rodman Naval Station. This school teaches riverine operations and small craft maintenance in spanish to Latin American navies and coast guards and trains U.S. experts who deploy throughout the Americas to advise their counterparts in establishing similar programs.

-- **II Marine Expeditionary Force (II MEF)**, located at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, is SOUTHCOM's marine component, which will be represented in Panama by a planning element later in 1995. In addition, a Marine Company provides security for Rodman Naval Station and assists in the conduct of riverine training for allied forces.

-- **U.S. Special Operations Command South** is a sub-unified command in Panama located at Albrook Air Force Station plays a critical training and support role, particularly for Counterdrug operations.

-- Two Joint Task forces:

>> **Joint Task Force-Panama**-responsible since 1990 for SOUTHCOM programs designed to support democracy in the Republic of Panama. In consonance with American Embassy objectives, this task force works with the Government of Panama to identify and carry out humanitarian and civic action projects that benefit local communities as well as provide meaningful training for U.S. military personnel.

>> **Joint Task Force Bravo in Honduras**-This Joint Task Force is located at the Honduran Soto Cano Air Base outside of Comayagua. The unit is manned by U.S. military personnel who provide command, communications, intelligence, and logistic support for U.S. exercises and deployments for training activities in Honduras, and who operate a C-5 capable airbase. In addition to exercises, JTF-Bravo organizes humanitarian, counterdrug and disaster relief operations. JTF-Bravo is downsizing from about 1100 to 495 soldiers and airmen.

-- **U.S. Military Groups** provide security assistance for 16 Central and South American countries. The military group commander serves as the command's representative to U.S. Ambassadors, to support U.S. National security obligations in the region. The military groups manage SOUTHCOM's security assistance programs, serve as the command's liaisons to the region's militaries, and oversee all U.S. military activities and deployments in Latin America.

MISSION

The mission of the Southern Command is to support U.S. national security policies by:

- Being prepared to command U.S. Naval, Air and Ground Force operations;
- Implementing the Panama Canal Treaties with the Government of Panama, keeping the Panama Canal open and neutral; and
- Assisting nations to sustain democracy, promote human rights and create regional security cooperation.

THEATER STRATEGY

The Southern Command's theater strategy, derived directly from the President's National Security Strategy is based on ensuring regional security and stability. It is focused on the following objectives:

- **Command:** Maintain capability to provide strategic and operational direction to naval, air, and ground elements of the U.S. Armed Forces;
- **Military to Military Contacts:** Strengthen professional relationships with host nation armed forces to develop cooperative military structures and doctrine;
- **Counterdrug Efforts:** Provide military support to U.S. lead agencies and host nation allies;
- **Humanitarian Aid:** Provide U.S. military support to disasters in the region when requested by U.S. ambassadors;
- **Support Democracies:** Promote peace and stability and provide military support;
- **Quality of Life:** Maintain a high quality of life for U.S. forces and their families throughout the theater.

RESOURCES

The Southern Command--with a total current permanent strength of about 8,500 military personnel--relies on augmenting forces from the United States to accomplish most of its tasks in Latin America. SOUTHCOM is proud of its extensive use of more than 50,000 temporarily deployed Reserve Component Army and Air National Guard, and Army, Air Force, and Navy Reserve forces. These forces are deployed throughout the region, primarily for nation assistance and civic action exercises, Joint Chiefs of Staff-directed exercises, deployments for training and operational mission support (in fiscal year 1994, more than 55,000 military personnel--42 percent from the Reserve Component--deployed to 18 countries in the theater, in support of 4,063 deployments, of which more than 1,000 were separate training support deployments, such as engineering and medical exercises, joint/combined exercises, and deployments for training (DFT's), and on about 2,900 operational support missions, such as joint planning assistance teams, manning ground-based radars, and mobile training teams).

While not the lead agency in the U.S. agency counterdrug effort in Latin America, SOUTHCOM assists its interagency partners, including the DEA, the Department of Justice and the U.S. Customs Service, as well as our regional allies, SOUTHCOM receives only about 1% of the total federal counterdrug budget (\$153 million out of 13 billion) to support the counterdrug efforts of other U.S. agencies and committed host nations, which is approximately 22% of the DoD drug funds.

CONTINUED IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1977 PANAMA CANAL TREATY

In compliance with the U.S. Government's commitment to the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977, the Southern Command is carrying out the Department of Defense's Panama Canal Treaty Implementation Plan, which calls for a phased withdrawal of the approximately 8,500 U.S. military personnel currently assigned in Panama. In addition, we will transfer to the Government of Panama all U.S. military controlled installations, facilities, and lands by the end of 1999.

Since implementation of the Treaty in October 1979, 420 buildings and some 16,000 acres of land had been transferred to the government of Panama. In the remaining five years of the 20-year transition period, approximately 5,000 buildings and 77,000 acres must be transferred to Panama and U.S. forces drawn down to zero by December 31, 1999. In 1995, all military facilities on the Atlantic side of the isthmus will be transferred to Panama, except for the Jungle Operations Training Center at Fort Sherman and a communications site at Galeta Island.

Major drawdown of U.S. forces began in 1994 with the inactivation of U.S. Army South's 193d Infantry Brigade (Light). In the next three years about 3,000 more troops and 5,000 family members will depart Panama as part of the continuing drawdown. By the end of 1995, troop strength will be about 7,500; By 1998, it will be approximately 5,600--a reduction of almost 50 percent since 1992. Remaining U.S. military forces in Panama will be consolidated in a few Pacific side installations.

As part of the withdrawal from Panama, SOUTHCOM Headquarters is expected to relocate from Panama in 1998.

SUMMARY OF USSOUTHCOM RELOCATION DECISION PROCESS

1988 - An analysis of relocating U.S. Southern Command was conducted by Mobile District Office, Army Corps of Engineers. No final report was released but seven sites were identified for further study.

1991 - A relocation study was conducted by DoD's Panama Canal Treaty Implementation Plan Agency (TIPA). Although the study made a recommendation on a new site for USSOUTHCOM, a final site selection was deferred by then Secretary of Defense Cheney.

September 1994 - A new relocation study was completed by USSOUTHCOM and submitted to DoD for review. The study focused on the criteria of mission and quality of life and did not look at cost issues. It concluded that four sites at two locations best fulfilled these criteria: Naval Station Roosevelt Roads & San Juan in Puerto Rico; and Miami & Homestead Air Reserve Station in the Miami, Florida, area. It also recommended that cost analyses of these sites be conducted.

October - November 94: At the direction of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, an initial review of the SOUTHCOM study was undertaken by senior officials in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. They modified the screening process to expand the number of sites to be examined.

19 December 1994 - The Deputy Secretary of Defense directed the creation of a small Selection Committee, including the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy and Requirements, the Principal Deputy Comptroller and the Director for Strategic Plans and Policy, the Joint Staff. The Selection Committee was charged with establishing a comprehensive process employing an explicit and appropriate set of criteria and cost analysis techniques to provide a well-reasoned recommendation to the Secretary of Defense on where to relocate USSOUTHCOM headquarters.

December 1994 - February 1995 - The Selection Committee and its staff conducted a careful and thorough review of USSOUTHCOM's September 1994 study and expanded the analysis through additional evaluation of SOUTHCOM's mission requirements and quality of life issues. It also conducted a detailed analysis of relocation costs and communications requirements.

January - February 1995 - The Committee's staff undertook a series of visits to a number of relocation candidate sites: Atlanta, Miami, New Orleans, San Juan and Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C. It also continued to further refine its qualitative and cost analyses.

March 1995 - The Selection Committee briefed the Deputy Secretary of Defense on its findings and conclusions.

ENC 6

3/29/95 1 p.m.

INSERT TO
TALLAHASSEE ARRIVAL STATEMENT

TO:
COL. Ken
FESS

I'm also pleased to announce a decision just reached by the Defense Department that is important to the citizens of this state. After an extensive, comprehensive site review, the Headquarters of the U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) will relocate to South Dade County, Miami from Quarry Heights in Panama in the summer of 1998.

This move -- which is required by the Panama Canal Treaty -- will bring real economic benefits to the people of southern Florida. SOUTHCOM's staff is made up of nearly ⁷⁰⁰~~1000~~ military and civilian personnel with an annual payroll of about \$27 million. Building the Command's facilities will require about \$60 million. Over the long term, we expect SOUTHCOM to inject several million dollars every year into Florida's economy for salaries, contracts and support services.

The Southern Command -- which covers all of Central and South America below Mexico -- has a broad and vitally important mission. It helps nations in our hemisphere promote democracy; it fosters regional defense cooperation; it assists Panama in defending the Panama Canal; and it stands ready to carry out military operations in the Americas should the need arise. SOUTHCOM also plays an important role in the U.S. Drug Control strategy.

SEP 14 '94 26:49PM

TRENT LOTT
MISSISSIPPI
SECRETARY
BILKIN CONFERENCE

COMMITTEES:
ARMED SERVICES
BUDGET
COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND
TRANSPORTATION
ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-2403

September 14, 1994

General John M. Shalikashvili, USA
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
Department of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20318

Dear General:


I want to thank you for your personal and timely attention to my request dated September 6, 1994, regarding a site visit to Pascagoula Naval Station related to the relocation of the United States Southern Command. Yesterday, the Treaty Implementation Plan Technical Manager from the Mobile District of the Corps of Engineers visited Pascagoula, along with a Social Scientist from the Mobile District.

As I understand the process from this point, on September 22, 1994, General McCaffrey will submit to Secretary Perry a short list of recommended sites for the relocation of the Southern Command. The final decision will be announced by President Clinton in December of this year.

My objective has always been to ensure that Pascagoula be given full and fair consideration. Pascagoula Naval Station would provide the United States Southern Command many advantages which deserved consideration. Your response to my request has provided the Pascagoula community the opportunity to make their pitch. I appreciate your attention and follow through on my request.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,



Trent Lott

PLEASE REPLY TO:

☐ 245 EAST CAPITOL STREET
SUITE 220
JACKSON, MS 39201

☐ 3100 S. PASCAGOULA STREET
PASCAGOULA, MS 39367

☐ P.O. BOX 1657
GULFPORT, MS 39502

☐ 101 S. LAFAYETTE STREET
STARKVILLE, MS 39759

☐ P.O. BOX 1494
OXFORD, MS 38655

☐ 200 E. WASHINGTON STREET
SUITE 145
GASTONVILLE, MS 38930

DOC 17



STRATEGY
AND
REQUIREMENTS

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
2900 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-2900



24 MAR 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

FROM: SOUTHCOM Selection Committee:

Dr. Edward L. Warner, Assistant Secretary of Defense for *ELW*
Strategy and Requirements;
Ms. Alice Maroni, Principal Deputy Comptroller *AM*
LTG Wes Clark, Director, J-5, the Joint Staff *Wes Clark*

SUBJECT: Relocation of U.S. Southern Command - ACTION
MEMORANDUM

Discussion. This memorandum summarizes the results of the analysis we presented in our recent briefing to you on selecting a site for relocating U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM).

At TAB A is a summary of the three evaluation criteria and the factors that contribute to them. As you'll recall, the Selection Committee and its staff utilized a refined version of the basic approach developed by SOUTHCOM in its September 1994 relocation study in putting together the recent analysis. Within the key considerations of: 1) the ability of SOUTHCOM to effectively perform its mission and; 2) quality of life for SOUTHCOM headquarters personnel; the various contributing factors listed in TAB A were examined for validity and accuracy, and modified where the Committee determined such a change would more accurately measure SOUTHCOM's requirements.

At your direction, the Selection Committee added cost as the third key consideration and calculated both non-recurring and recurring costs for each candidate site. Non-recurring costs are largely construction costs for the headquarters itself and housing, if required, as well as costs associated with establishing USCINCSOUTH's communications architecture. Recurring costs include civilian pay, official travel, headquarters security, housing allowances and other O&M-related costs aggregated over an estimated 20-year lifecycle. The results of this cost study were then converted into a points rating and factored into the overall analysis.

Excursions were then run with different weightings assigned to the three key considerations of mission effectiveness, quality of life and cost. These varying weightings were examined by the Committee in order to determine their broader implications for selecting a site for SOUTHCOM's relocation. The Committee staff also undertook site visits to the six leading candidates to validate relevant data and



gather more refined information. The results of the Committee's review of those results are outlined below.

Analytical Excursions

TAB B summarizes the results of several of the analytical excursions that were conducted.

Weighting Mission Effectiveness Highest - When mission effectiveness is weighted highest (50 percent) and quality of life and cost are also factored in (25 percent each), Miami finishes first (84.7 pts.), the Washington, D.C., area finishes second (78.5), New Orleans third (73.6), Atlanta fourth (68.3), and Tampa fifth (62.4). Key to Miami's high ranking are its position as a key air transportation and communications link between the United States and South and Central America, and its strong cultural and business ties to countries in the SOUTHCOM AOR.

Conclusion: If mission effectiveness is most important among the three parameters, Miami is clearly the superior candidate location.

Weighting Quality of Life Highest - As Chart #2 indicates, increasing the weighting of quality of life considerations (50 percent) relative to mission (25 percent) and cost (25 percent) changes the comparative attractiveness of the candidate locations. Under this approach, the Washington, D.C. area has the highest point total (79.1 pts), Miami is second (73.3), New Orleans is third (72.9), Atlanta fourth (71.2), and Tampa fifth (70.2).

The greater Washington area's relatively strong showing when quality of life is emphasized stems in part from the fact that, given the substantial military infrastructure already located there, it scores high in such important dimensions of quality of life as medical and other personnel support. In addition, in examining other factors contributing to quality of life (e.g., schools, housing and crime), the analysis considered the overall Washington metropolitan area and not just the District of Columbia itself. This also contributed to Washington's high ranking in quality of life and is consistent with the method used to examine other competing locations. Roosevelt Roads and Tampa also score very high in the key factors contributing to quality of life.

Conclusion: If quality of life is the most important consideration in relocating SOUTHCOM headquarters, then the analysis shows that Washington is the leading candidate.

Weighting Cost Highest - As Chart #3 indicates, if lifecycle cost is weighted highest (50 percent) and mission and quality of life weighted equally (25 percent), then New Orleans scores highest (82.2 pts.), Miami is second (80.7), Atlanta is third (77.4), Tampa is fourth (75.6) and Washington is fifth (73). Generally, the heavier the weighting assigned to cost considerations, the more attractive New Orleans and Tampa appear as candidates.

Several key factors helped determine a candidate location's score with regard to cost. One was the area's relative construction costs. A second was whether a sufficient amount of adequate quality housing for headquarters personnel was available in the vicinity or whether new housing would have to be built. A third was the amount of capacity available in the local telecommunications network. The more saturated the existing network, the higher the likely cost for providing additional capacity to accommodate the substantial requirements associated with SOUTHCOM headquarters.

The cost analysis was not based on specific sites within the candidate areas but assumed general construction costs associated with each area. The results could vary slightly depending on the individual buildings available for lease or purchase at the specific site chosen within an area. However, the staff did run a site-specific excursion for each of the six highest ranking candidates, analyzing the relocation costs for the most attractive specific candidate site currently identified within each area. The results of this excursion confirmed the broader cost analysis.

It should also be noted that, when the total cost is averaged over the estimated 20-year lifecycle, the difference in cost between the first and fourth place finishers amounts to less than \$2 million per year.

Conclusion: If cost is the most important consideration in determining SOUTHCOM's relocation, then New Orleans is the leading candidate.


Other Weightings - Charts #4 and #5 are included to demonstrate another conclusion derived from the analytical excursions; whenever mission effectiveness is weighted at one-third or above of the overall score, Miami will rank first. The greater the weight given to mission effectiveness, the higher Miami's score and the greater the distance between it and its closest competitor.

Coordination:

General Counsel PMH

Recommendation: Based on the three broad criteria for selection, Miami, New Orleans and Washington are the top three candidates. Recommend you select the final SOUTHCOM relocation site from among those three candidate cities. Recommend that the U.S. Army, as executive agent, be informed of your selection decision so it can proceed with detailed design work and other necessary implementation procedures.

SECDEF/DEPSECDEF Decision:

Miami  New Orleans _____ Washington, D.C. _____



TAB A

Evaluation Criteria

MISSION:

Theater Access

- ∞ Centrality
 - Travel man-hours
 - # AOR Nations served
- ∞ Diplomatic Presence
 - Embassies/consulates

Cultural Integration

- ∞ Regional Orgs
 - Bi-national professionals
 - Trade associations
 - Financial institutions
 - Major Corp. HQ
- ∞ Media
 - Print
 - Radio
 - Television
 - English-LATAM
- ∞ University Spt
 - Availability
 - LATAM programs

Interagency Cooperation

- Dept of State
- Dept of Commerce
- Dept of Justice
- Dept of Transportation
- Dept of Treasury

MILITARY SUPPORT/

QUALITY OF LIFE:

Housing & Cost of living

- ∞ Affordable housing
- ∞ Cost of living (military)
- ∞ Cost of living (civilian)

Schools

- ∞ Quality of public education
- ∞ Availability of Magnet schools
- ∞ Availability of private schools

Medical Svcs

- ∞ Quality of medical care
- ∞ CHAMPUS availability
- ∞ Military care availability

- Hospital

- Catchment area

- Dispensary

Crime

- ∞ Violent crime rate (100,000 MSA)
- ∞ Property crime rate (100,000 MSA)

Personnel Support

- ∞ Military (PX, commissary, etc.)
- ∞ Public

- Child care

- Public transportation

Employment Opportunities

- ∞ Availability of employment
- ∞ Population growth rate

COSTS:

Non-recurring

Facilities/site prep
Communications
Furniture/fixtures
Relocation expenses
Key pers housing

Recurring

Civilian Pay
Official travel
Maintenance
Security
Utilities
Service contracts
Supplies/equipment
Housing allowances



TAB B

Five Analytical Excursions

#1 Mission, Quality of Life and Costs (50:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
Miami	84.73
Wash DC	78.51
New Orln	73.60
Atlanta	68.33
Tampa	62.42
Rossv Rds	57.21
Houston	53.22
New York	55.81
Los Angl	53.43
Chicago	53.11
San Anton	44.11
San Fran	40.52

#2 Quality of Life, Mission and Costs (50:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
Wash DC	79.13
Miami	73.34
New Orln	72.94
Atlanta	71.17
Tampa	70.15
San Anton	60.64
Rossv Rds	58.20
Houston	56.56
Los Angl	55.74
Chicago	54.04
New York	52.76
San Fran	43.54

#3 Costs, Mission & Quality of Life (50:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
New Orln	82.18
Miami	80.73
Atlanta	77.37
Tampa	75.59
Wash DC	73.08
San Anton	66.50
Houston	65.98
Chicago	58.35
Los Angl	52.95
New York	46.79
San Fran	39.59
Rossv Rds	38.47

#4 Mission, Quality of Life, and Costs Equal (25:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (75 pts)
Miami	59.69
Wash DC	57.55
New Orln	57.18
Atlanta	54.23
Tampa	51.92
Houston	44.71
San Anton	42.75
Chicago	40.60
Los Angl	40.59
New York	38.81
Rossv Rds	38.47
San Fran	31.17


#5 Mission and Costs twice QOL (40:40:20)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
Miami	84.50
New Orln	78.88
Wash DC	74.82
Atlanta	73.21
Tampa	68.48
Houston	62.06
Chicago	54.21
San Anton	54.09
Los Angl	52.82
New York	50.94
Rossv Rds	45.77
San Fran	39.97

OSD SOUTHCOM SELCOM



HEADQUARTERS SOUTHCOM RELOCATION




DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
U.S. SOUTHCOM Headquarters Relocation
Selection Committee



U.S. SOUTHCOM

- 19 Countries in Central and South America
- Seven million square miles
- 7,000 miles, North to South
- Over 8500 military personnel





U.S. SOUTHCOM MISSION

- **Predominantly Political-Military**
 - Face-to-face planning/coordination with key officials
 - Defense of the Panama Canal
 - Military-to-military contact
 - Support to other Unified commands
- **Current focus is key countries in Central and South America**
 - Counterdrug
 - Security Cooperation
 - Support for democratic institutions
- **Programs**
 - Support for regional counterdrug efforts
 - Combined training
 - Cooperative security discussions



Southern Command Headquarters

- Commander in Chief, with staff of 700 military and civilians
 - 567 Military (317 Officers & 250 Enlisted)
 - 133 Civilians
- Approximately 1500 Family members
- 140,000 square foot building
 - Extensive communications
 - Secure facilities
- Housing
 - Key & essential personnel
 - Families
 - Unaccompanied personnel
- Base support



SOUTHCOM HQs RELOCATION

Background

- **1977 Panama Canal Treaty**
 - Stationing rights until December 31, 1999
 - US continues to provide defense of the Canal
- **1994 Relocation Study (SOUTHCOM)**
 - Focused on mission & quality of life (no cost analysis)
 - Identified four sites in Florida and Puerto Rico as best suited
- **December 1994 Selection Committee appointed by DepSecDef**
 - Reviewed and refined SOUTHCOM's analysis
 - Expanded list of candidates for detailed evaluation
 - Added cost analysis
 - Provided results to DepSecDef March 1995



HQs SOUTHCOM RELOCATION CRITICAL PARAMETERS

• MISSION

- Access to the theater
- Cultural environment with strong Latin American ties
- Effective communications links
- Availability of other government agencies for policy and tasking coordination

• QUALITY OF LIFE

- Housing
- Schools
- Medical
- Crime
- Military support

• COSTS

- Construction: Headquarters & key personnel housing
- Communications
- Life cycle costs: O&M, leases, rotation, travel and cost-of-living allowances



Evaluation Criteria

MISSION:

Theater Access

- ∞ Centrality
 - Travel man-hours
 - # AOR Nations served
- ∞ Diplomatic Presence
 - Embassies/consulates

Cultural Integration

- ∞ Regional Orgs
 - Bi-national professional
 - Trade associations
 - Financial institutions
 - Major Corp. HQ

Media

- Print
- Radio
- Television
- English-LATAM

University Spt

- Availability
- LATAM programs

Interagency Cooperation

- Dept of State
- Dept of Commerce
- Dept of Justice
- Dept of Transportation
- Dept of Treasury

MILITARY SUPPORT/

QUALITY OF LIFE:

- Housing & Cost of living
 - ∞ Affordable housing
 - ∞ Cost of living (military)
 - ∞ Cost of living (civilian)

Schools

- ∞ Quality of public education
- ∞ Availability of Magnet schools
- ∞ Availability of private schools

Medical Svcs

- ∞ Quality of medical care
- ∞ CHAMPUS availability
- ∞ Military care availability
 - Hospital?
 - Dispensary?
 - Catchment area?

Crime

- ∞ Violent crime rate (100,000 MSA)
- ∞ Property crime rate (100,000 MSA)

Personnel Support

- ∞ Military (PX, commissary, etc.)
- ∞ Public

Employment Opportunities

- ∞ Availability of employment
- ∞ Population growth rate


COSTS:

Non-recurring

- Facilities/site prep
- Communications
- Furniture/fixtures
- Relocation expenses
- Key pers housing

Recurring

- Civilian Pay
- Official travel
- Maintenance
- Security
- Utilities
- Service contracts
- Supplies/equipment
- Housing allowances





Mission, Quality of Life and Costs [50:25:25] (Masked)

	Max Pts	CITY A	CITY B	CITY C	CITY D	CITY E	CITY F	CITY G	CITY H	CITY I	CITY J	CITY X	CITY Z
<i>Mission</i>													
<i>Theater Access</i>	14.0	14.0	4.9	3.2	0.1	3.1	2.3	3.3	5.5	0.1	4.9	7.4	0.8
<i>Diplomatic Pres</i>	14.0	14.0	14.0	12.4	11.5	11.5	13.2	9.9	10.7	9.9	6.6	0.0	0.0
<i>Cultural</i>	15.0	15.0	15.0	11.3	7.5	11.3	15.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	11.3	11.3	0.0
<i>Interagency</i>	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.6	7.0	7.0	5.6	1.4	1.4
<i>Mission Total</i>	50.0	50.0	40.9	33.8	26.2	32.8	37.5	18.8	23.2	20.1	28.3	20.0	2.2
<i>Quality of Life</i>													
<i>Housing/COL</i>	5.0	3.2	1.9	1.1	1.0	4.6	3.3	2.3	2.7	0.1	3.6	4.3	4.8
<i>Schools</i>	5.0	2.6	5.0	2.6	2.1	1.7	4.5	2.9	1.5	2.7	2.5	2.3	0.7
<i>Medical Svcs</i>	5.0	3.9	5.0	3.5	2.8	2.9	4.7	3.0	2.0	3.4	1.9	3.0	3.6
<i>Crime</i>	3.0	0.0	2.9	1.9	2.1	1.9	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.4	1.9	2.3	2.1
<i>Personnel SPT</i>	5.0	2.2	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.6	1.5	1.3	2.5	5.0	4.6	5.0
<i>Employment</i>	2.0	1.8	2.0	0.0	1.9	0.1	0.6	1.3	1.9	1.2	2.0	2.0	1.7
<i>QOL Total</i>	25.0	13.7	21.6	14.0	15.2	15.8	19.7	13.4	11.9	12.4	17.0	18.4	17.9
<i>Costs</i>													
<i>Non-recurring</i>	\$M	58.2	64.7	77.8	67.7	56.7	138.2	66.2	59.9	64.5	58.4	55.2	57.9
<i>Lifecycle</i>	\$M	173.4	213.3	268.0	236.3	145.8	325.9	171.7	197.23	264.9	158.7	154.4	153.8
<i>Cost Score</i>	25.0	21.0	16.0	8.0	12.0	25.0	0.0	21.0	18.0	8.0	23.0	24.0	24.0
<i>TOTAL</i>	100.0	84.7	78.5	55.8	53.4	73.6	57.2	53.2	53.1	40.5	68.3	62.4	44.1



Cost Analysis

Recurring Costs

Housing Allowance
Facility lease (incl. storage)
Facility/ground maintenance
Security
Utilities
Interservice support agreements
Supplies
Civilian Pay
Travel

Non-Recurring Costs

Site infrastructure
Facilities construction
Headquarters
Sr. Officer Housing
Other required facilities
Communications
Furniture
Repairs & renovation
Transition Costs
Relocation
Severance
VHA/OHA Delta
Training
Network Facility Operations
Personnel
PCS
Early retirements
Housing assistance



Costs Analysis

(millions of dollars)

[Masked]

	CITY A	CITY B	CITY C	CITY D	CITY E	CITY F	CITY G	CITY H	CITY I	CITY J	CITY X	CITY Z
Non-recurring												
Facilities	12.60	11.13	15.23	13.86	12.60	11.20	9.98	13.34	15.33	13.44	10.50	9.98
Comms	32.53	37.85	38.09	38.09	32.53	33.15	38.09	38.09	32.29	32.45	33.05	32.84
Housing	1.18	1.13	1.55	1.41	1.06	82.62	1.02	1.35	1.56	1.23	1.08	1.01
Relocation	8.13	10.25	16.26	9.90	7.35	7.77	7.49	9.26	10.60	7.42	7.28	7.07
Other	3.72	4.33	6.68	4.41	3.13	3.49	3.30	4.16	4.76	3.54	3.27	3.16
Sub-total	58.15	64.69	77.8	67.67	56.74	138.23	59.88	66.20	64.54	58.08	55.17	54.05
Recurring												
Civ Pay	0.00	0.08	0.13	0.12	0.00	0.49	0.22	0.15	0.12	0.04	0.00	0.00
Travel	0.00	0.22	0.39	0.47	0.40	0.55	0.43	0.27	0.56	0.50	0.25	0.42
Maint	0.06	0.14	0.45	0.14	0.00	4.30	0.05	0.21	0.36	0.05	0.01	0.05
Security	0.07	0.21	0.60	0.18	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.14	0.23	0.02	0.01	0.00
Utilities	0.35	0.07	0.15	0.83	0.32	1.77	0.43	0.18	0.90	0.19	0.33	0.46
Supp/Svcs	0.22	.67	1.93	0.58	0.06	0.15	0.09	0.46	0.74	0.07	0.04	0.00
Housing	5.06	6.05	5.86	6.11	3.65	2.08	4.34	5.13	7.10	4.15	4.31	4.06
Sub-total	5.76	7.43	9.51	8.43	4.45	9.38	5.59	6.55	10.02	5.03	4.96	4.99
First Year	63.92	72.12	87.31	76.10	61.19	147.61	65.47	72.75	74.56	63.11	60.13	59.03
Lifecycle	173.44	213.33	268.01	236.33	145.79	325.85	171.73	197.23	264.87	158.73	154.40	153.78
Score (25)	21.00	16.00	8.00	12.00	25.00	0.00	21.00	18.00	8.00	23.00	24.00	24.00



Five Analytical Excursions (Masked)

#1 Mission, Quality of Life and Costs (50:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
City A	84.73
City B	78.51
City E	73.60
City J	68.33
City X	62.42
City F	57.21
City G	53.22
City C	55.81
City D	53.43
City H	53.11
City Z	44.11
City I	40.52

#2 Quality of Life, Mission and Costs (50:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
City B	79.13
City A	73.34
City E	72.94
City J	71.17
City X	70.15
City Z	60.64
City F	58.20
City G	56.56
City D	55.74
City H	54.04
City C	52.76
City I	43.54

#3 Costs, Mission & Quality of Life (50:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
City E	82.18
City A	80.73
City J	77.37
City X	75.59
City B	73.08
City Z	66.50
City G	65.98
City H	58.35
City D	52.95
City C	46.79
City I	39.59
City F	38.47

#4 Mission, Quality of Life, and Costs Equal (25:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (75 pts)
City A	59.69
City B	57.55
City E	57.18
City J	54.23
City X	51.92
City G	44.71
City Z	42.75
City H	40.60
City D	40.59
City C	38.81
City F	38.47
City I	31.17

#5 Mission and Costs twice (QOL40:40:20)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
City A	84.58
City E	78.88
City B	74.82
City J	73.21
City X	68.48
City G	62.06
City H	54.21
City Z	54.09
City D	52.82
City C	50.94
City F	45.77
City I	39.97

UNMASKED ANALYSIS



HQs SOUTHCOM RELOCATION

First & Second Tier Screening

126 Sites in
SE US + all hubs

First Screen

NON-STOP
FLIGHTS TO
MIAMI

26 Cities

Second Screen

Regional
Presence
(Consulates)

10 Cities

Atlanta GA
Chicago IL
Houston TX
Los Angeles CA
Miami FL
New Orleans LA
New York City NY
Roosevelt Rds PR
San Francisco CA
Washington DC

Tampa FL (1991 Study)
&
San Antonio TX
(avail. 140k sf facility)

6 Site Visits:
Tampa, Atlanta,
New Orleans, Miami,
Puerto Rico & Wash DC

DETAILED
ANALYSIS
(All criteria
& costs)
FOR ALL
12 SITES



Mission, Quality of Life and Costs [50:25:25]

	Max Pts	Miami FL	Wash DC	New York	Los Angeles	New Orleans	Rossv Roads	Houst TX	Chicago IL	San Fran	Atlanta GA	Tampa FL	San Anton
<i>Mission</i>													
<i>Theater Access</i>	14.0	14.0	4.9	3.2	0.1	3.1	2.3	3.3	5.5	0.1	4.9	7.4	0.8
<i>Diplomatic Pres</i>	14.0	14.0	14.0	12.4	11.5	11.5	13.2	9.9	10.7	9.9	6.6	0.0	0.0
<i>Cultural</i>	15.0	15.0	15.0	11.3	7.5	11.3	15.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	11.3	11.3	0.0
<i>Interagency</i>	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	5.6	7.0	7.0	5.6	1.4	1.4
<i>Mission Total</i>	50.0	50.0	40.9	33.8	26.2	32.8	37.5	18.8	23.2	20.1	28.3	20.0	2.2
<i>Quality of Life</i>													
<i>Housing/COL</i>	5.0	3.2	1.9	1.1	1.0	4.6	3.3	2.3	2.7	0.1	3.6	4.3	4.8
<i>Schools</i>	5.0	2.6	5.0	2.6	2.1	1.7	4.5	2.9	1.5	2.7	2.5	2.3	0.7
<i>Medical Svcs</i>	5.0	3.9	5.0	3.5	2.8	2.9	4.7	3.0	2.0	3.4	1.9	3.0	3.6
<i>Crime</i>	3.0	0.0	2.9	1.9	2.1	1.9	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.4	1.9	2.3	2.1
<i>Personnel SPT</i>	5.0	2.2	5.0	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.6	1.5	1.3	2.5	5.0	4.6	5.0
<i>Employment</i>	2.0	1.8	2.0	0.0	1.9	0.1	0.6	1.3	1.9	1.2	2.0	2.0	1.7
<i>QOL Total</i>	25.0	13.7	21.6	14.0	15.2	15.8	19.7	13.4	11.9	12.4	17.0	18.4	17.9
<i>Costs</i>													
<i>Non-recurring</i>	\$M	58.2	64.7	77.8	67.7	56.7	138.2	66.2	59.9	64.5	58.4	55.2	57.9
<i>Lifecycle</i>	\$M	173.4	213.3	268.0	236.3	145.8	325.9	171.7	197.23	264.9	158.7	154.4	153.8
<i>Cost Score</i>	25.0	21.0	16.0	8.0	12.0	25.0	0.0	21.0	18.0	8.0	23.0	24.0	24.0
<i>TOTAL</i>	100.0	84.7	78.5	55.8	53.4	73.6	57.2	53.2	53.1	40.5	68.3	62.4	44.1



Costs Analysis

(millions of dollars)

	Miami	Wash DC	New York	Los Angeles	New Orleans	Roosevelt Islands	Houston	Chicago	San Francisco	Atlanta	Tampa	San Antonio
Non-recurring												
Facilities	12.60	11.13	15.23	13.86	12.60	11.20	9.98	13.34	15.33	13.44	10.50	9.98
Comms	32.53	37.85	38.09	38.09	32.53	33.15	38.09	38.09	32.29	32.45	33.05	32.84
Housing	1.18	1.13	1.55	1.41	1.06	82.62	1.02	1.35	1.56	1.23	1.08	1.01
Relocation	8.13	10.25	16.26	9.90	7.35	7.77	7.49	9.26	10.60	7.42	7.28	7.07
Other	3.72	4.33	6.68	4.41	3.13	3.49	3.30	4.16	4.76	3.54	3.27	3.16
Sub-total	58.15	64.69	77.8	67.67	56.74	138.23	59.88	66.20	64.54	58.08	55.17	54.05
Recurring												
Civ Pay	0.00	0.08	0.13	0.12	0.00	0.49	0.22	0.15	0.12	0.04	0.00	0.00
Travel	0.00	0.22	0.39	0.47	0.40	0.55	0.43	0.27	0.56	0.50	0.25	0.42
Maint	0.06	0.14	0.45	0.14	0.00	4.30	0.05	0.21	0.36	0.05	0.01	0.05
Security	0.07	0.21	0.60	0.18	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.14	0.23	0.02	0.01	0.00
Utilities	0.35	0.07	0.15	0.83	0.32	1.77	0.43	0.18	0.90	0.19	0.33	0.46
Supp/Svcs	0.22	.67	1.93	0.58	0.06	0.15	0.09	0.46	0.74	0.07	0.04	0.00
Housing	5.06	6.05	5.86	6.11	3.65	2.08	4.34	5.13	7.10	4.15	4.31	4.06
Sub-total	5.76	7.43	9.51	8.43	4.45	9.38	5.59	6.55	10.02	5.03	4.96	4.99
First Year	63.92	72.12	87.31	76.10	61.19	147.61	65.47	72.75	74.56	63.11	60.13	59.03
Lifecycle	173.44	213.33	268.01	236.33	145.79	325.85	171.73	197.23	264.87	158.73	154.40	153.78
Score (25)	21.00	16.00	8.00	12.00	25.00	0.00	21.00	18.00	8.00	23.00	24.00	24.00



Communications Costs Analysis

	Miami FL	Wash DC	New York	Los Angeles	New Orleans	Roosevelt Rds	Houston	Chicago	San Francisco	Atlanta	Tampa	San Antonio
Red Switch	\$4,170	\$4,170	\$4,170	\$4,170	\$4,170	\$4,170	\$4,170	\$4,170	\$4,170	\$4,170	\$4,170	\$4,170
Cellular Phone	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$120
Non Tac Radio	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
LAN Backbone	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,623	\$2,623
LAN	\$716	\$716	\$716	\$716	\$716	\$716	\$716	\$716	\$716	\$716	\$716	\$716
Email	\$2,657	\$2,657	\$2,657	\$2,657	\$2,657	\$2,657	\$2,657	\$2,657	\$2,657	\$2,657	\$2,657	\$2,657
MLS	\$162	\$162	\$162	\$162	\$162	\$162	\$162	\$162	\$162	\$162	\$162	\$162
GCOS*	\$1,939	\$1,939	\$1,939	\$1,939	\$1,939	\$1,939	\$1,939	\$1,939	\$1,939	\$1,939	\$1,939	\$1,939
SIMS/CSP-HOL	\$4,354	\$4,354	\$4,354	\$4,354	\$4,354	\$4,354	\$4,354	\$4,354	\$4,354	\$4,354	\$4,354	\$4,354
JPL AMHS	\$336	\$336	\$336	\$336	\$336	\$336	\$336	\$336	\$336	\$336	\$336	\$336
Comm Center	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15	\$15
Exec AIDS	\$2,008	\$2,008	\$2,008	\$2,008	\$2,008	\$2,008	\$2,008	\$2,008	\$2,008	\$2,008	\$2,008	\$2,008
VTC	\$501	\$501	\$501	\$501	\$501	\$501	\$501	\$501	\$501	\$501	\$501	\$501
MAPP	\$2,241	\$2,241	\$2,241	\$2,241	\$2,241	\$2,241	\$2,241	\$2,241	\$2,241	\$2,241	\$2,241	\$2,241
Sat Terms**	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Phones	\$23	\$23	\$23	\$23	\$23	\$23	\$23	\$23	\$23	\$23	\$23	\$23
HF Radios	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200
UHF SATCOM	\$2,645	\$2,645	\$2,645	\$2,645	\$2,645	\$2,645	\$2,645	\$2,645	\$2,645	\$2,645	\$2,645	\$2,645
CMS	\$1,349	\$1,349	\$1,349	\$1,349	\$1,349	\$1,349	\$1,349	\$1,349	\$1,349	\$1,349	\$1,349	\$1,349
JWICS	\$893	\$893	\$893	\$893	\$893	\$893	\$893	\$893	\$893	\$893	\$893	\$893
ADNET***	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$325
T-1 Wash DC	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45	\$45
AOR connect.	\$2,132	\$2,132	\$2,132	\$2,132	\$2,132	\$2,132	\$2,132	\$2,132	\$2,132	\$2,132	\$2,132	\$2,132
Total of line items												
Variable Costs:												
Nonsec Voice	\$243	\$5,805	\$5,805	\$5,805	\$304	\$304	\$5,805	\$5,805	\$0	\$304	\$304	\$304
TCF/CER	\$2,534	\$2,534	\$2,534	\$2,534	\$2,534	\$2,488	\$2,534	\$2,534	\$2,534	\$2,488	\$2,488	\$2,534
DISN IPR Services	\$200	\$0	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$100	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$100	\$0	\$200
Cable Plant Upgrade	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$700	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$700	\$250
Total Variable Costs	\$2,977	\$8,293	\$8,539	\$8,539	\$3,038	\$3,592	\$8,539	\$8,539	\$2,734	\$2,892	\$3,492	\$3,288
TOTAL [x\$1000]	\$32,531	\$37,847	\$38,093	\$38,093	\$32,592	\$33,146	\$38,093	\$38,093	\$32,288	\$32,446	\$33,046	\$32,842



Five Analytical Excursions

#1 Mission, Quality of Life and Costs (50:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
Miami	84.73
Wash DC	78.51
New Orln	73.60
Atlanta	68.33
Tampa	62.42
Rossv Rds	57.21
Houston	53.22
New York	55.81
Los Angl	53.43
Chicago	53.11
San Anton	44.11
San Fran	40.52

#2 Quality of Life, Mission and Costs (50:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
Wash DC	79.13
Miami	73.34
New Orln	72.94
Atlanta	71.17
Tampa	70.15
San Anton	60.64
Rossv Rds	58.20
Houston	56.56
Los Angl	55.74
Chicago	54.04
New York	52.76
San Fran	43.54

#3 Costs, Mission & Quality of Life (50:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
New Orln	82.18
Miami	80.73
Atlanta	77.37
Tampa	75.59
Wash DC	73.08
San Anton	66.50
Houston	65.98
Chicago	58.35
Los Angl	52.95
New York	46.79
San Fran	39.59
Rossv Rds	38.47

#4 Mission, Quality of Life, and Costs Equal (25:25:25)

CITY	TOTAL (75 pts)
Miami	59.69
Wash DC	57.55
New Orln	57.18
Atlanta	54.23
Tampa	51.92
Houston	44.71
San Anton	42.75
Chicago	40.60
Los Angl	40.59
New York	38.81
Rossv Rds	38.47
San Fran	31.17

#5 Mission and Costs twice (QOL40:40:20)

CITY	TOTAL (100 pts)
Miami	84.58
New Orln	78.88
Wash DC	74.82
Atlanta	73.21
Tampa	68.48
Houston	62.06
Chicago	54.21
San Anton	54.09
Los Angl	52.82
New York	50.94
Rossv Rds	45.77
San Fran	39.97



Post Decision Activities

✓ 28 March	DepSecDef Decision
✓ 30 March	Public Announcement of Miami
✓ 1-24 April	Mobile Office, Army Corps of Engineers survey of all potential Miami area sites
✓ 25 April - 18 May	Preparation of Environmental Assessment (EA) > Impact on community > Assessment of site alternatives > Identification of environmental issues
✓ 23 May	Release date of EA; public will have 30 days to comment
*May-June	Information to Congress
15 December	Submission of project documentation to OMB

**A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS
FOR SELECTION OF A SITE FOR
HEADQUARTERS, US SOUTHERN COMMAND**

March 1995

**PREPARED BY
THE SELECT COMMITTEE
REPRESENTING THE
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
AND THE JOINT STAFF**

**DR. EDWARD L. WARNER, III
Assistant Secretary Of Defense For
Strategy And Requirements**

INTRODUCTION: This document provides a brief description of the processes used by the Department of Defense to select a location for the Headquarters of US Southern Command (USSOUTHCOM).

SOUTHCOM is currently stationed in the Republic of Panama with a staff of approximately 700 military and civilian personnel. As part of the plan to implement the Panama Canal Treaty, SOUTHCOM will be relocated to the continental United States in 1998 or 1999.

The location of the Command in Panama is a legacy of the US construction and administration of the Panama Canal begun in 1903. The presence in Panama afforded several advantages from location, though its operations are partially impeded by the need, on occasion, to narrowly focus on Panamanian issues. The relocation to the United States affords the Department of Defense an opportunity to reshape the mission capabilities and effectiveness of the Command for the future.

SOUTHCOM is responsible for all US military relations and operations with the nineteen independent nations of Central and South America. It is one of five Unified Commands with geographic areas of responsibility world-wide. In peacetime, it promotes US regional security interests through the development of access and influence with counterpart military leaders. Latin America culture places great value on personal relations of trust established through face-to-face contacts. Therefore, travel to, and receiving visitors from, the region is a key element of the Command's operations.

The Command will require office space for 700 assigned and liaison personnel consisting of 567 military officers and 133 civilians. This translates to a building requirement of 140,000 square feet to include special use space to such as conference rooms and secure classified areas. The Command is presently sited in Panama on 11 installations and 20 buildings. The relocation thus also affords the opportunity to realize greater efficiencies through consolidation of staff sections in more efficient infrastructure, both in terms of energy and staff operations.

BACKGROUND ON SITE SELECTION EFFORTS: In 1988 and 1991, DOD elements examined alternatives for the relocation of the Command. For various programmatic and foreign policy considerations, those early initiatives did not result in a formal recommendation to the Secretary of Defense.

In March 1994, HQ SOUTHCOM initiated a study of alternative sites for the Command. In September 1994, SOUTHCOM forwarded its completed report to the Joint Staff recommending site surveys and cost analysis be performed. The SOUTHCOM Study assessed sites based on factors essential to the mission capabilities of the Command and quality of life considerations. Because detailed cost information was not available to the Command, financial evaluation was deferred to the Pentagon's review of the Study.

The Command's Study emphasized factors supportive of its mission. Specifically, it looked at sites with strong ties to the Latin American area and sites with excellent air access, commercial and military, into the Latin America region. The Quality of Life assessment delved factors which impact directly on the servicemember and family member access to essential community services and DOD's ability to support them. Based on these considerations, the study identified two sites in Puerto Rico and two in south Florida, and recommended detailed assessment of Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico and Miami, Florida. The Joint Staff completed an initial review and obtained rough cost estimates and comments from the military Services.

THE SECDEF SITE SELECTION PROCESS: In October 1994, at the direction of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, OSD conducted a quick review concluding that the study needed cost-benefit analysis and a more comprehensive consideration of existing facilities at a broader spectrum of sites. An informal assessment with a macro cost analysis identified an additional eight sites (12 total) as potentially suitable for the Command's mission at competitive cost.

The OSD staff recommended further study, and in December, 1994, DEPSECDEF established a study group that included members from OSD, the Joint Staff, and SOUTHCOM, with assistance from the Army Corps of Engineers, the Treaty Implementation Plan Agency, and the Army Staff. The SOUTHCOM analytical model was refined through additional research of qualitative, quantitative, and cost factors. This study group provided a summary assessment to the Deputy Secretary with a 'pros and cons' look at the leading five candidate sites.

On 19 December 1994, the Deputy Secretary of Defense formed a Select Committee consisting of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy and Resources, the OSD Principal Deputy Comptroller and the Director for Strategy and Policy of the Joint Staff. The Committee was chartered to fully assess alternative sites, using an open process, and to forward a recommendation to the Deputy Secretary of Defense by March 1995.

FACTORS CONSIDERED IN THE PROCESS: The Committee decided that the framework for analysis should be consistent with that employed by the SOUTHCOM study. Criteria used to describe each critical area were retained. Cost analysis was established. Critical parameters for each major area were determined:

Mission

SOUTHCOM's mission demands that the CINC and his staff travel frequently to the 19 host nations, the Pentagon and the four component command headquarters. Equally, if not more important, the host nation representatives must be able to travel easily to SOUTHCOM.

Cultural infusion

Communications Links

Quality of Life

Cost

SITES CONSIDERED UNDER THE SECDEF PROCESS: The pool of considered cities in the SOUTHCOM study identified cities that had air access to the region and federal facilities with potential for establishing the headquarters. The Committee added all major air hubs with direct service to Miami Florida (gateway to the region. The initial pool of locations was thus set at 126 metropolitan areas.

The SOUTHCOM screening tools for access to the region and cultural presence were then applied to the pool:

Access - The international airport at Miami provides 88% of all CONUS-based flights into SOUTHCOM's area of responsibility. Locations were thus screened for direct air service to Miami (or into the region). 26 Cities were identified meeting this first screening tier.

Consulates - SOUTHCOM's study, as validated by the Committee's staff, found that a strong correlation between the presence of consulates (or Embassies) and a much broader spectrum of mission-related factors, including international business, foreign interests, inter-governmental activities, and routine foreign travel. Availability of consulates in each of the 26 cities from the first screen were measured. 10 Cities had at least half of the 19 AOR countries represented.

The SOUTHCOM study applied a third screen for ease and access of military travel within the region. The Committee felt that this screening tool did not have a clear impact on mission accomplishment, and thus did not use this screening tier.

Having established ten locations for further analysis, the Committee then examined past studies to ensure that all aspects of importance would be represented. It decided to add two cities to the pool of 10 for detailed analysis.

-- Tampa, Florida was the selected site in the 1991 cost-oriented study. It was a city that passed the Committee's first screening tier, but only had two consulates. Initial examination of the city indicated that there was sufficient cultural aspects to the city to wave that screening requirement.

-- Inquiries to Installation managers for each of the services were made to ascertain the availability of federal facilities that could be used to house SOUTHCOM headquarters. The only facility identified was by the Army at San Antonio Texas. Pending further examination into facilities that would be made available through the BRAC process, the Committee elected to add San Antonio to

the sites for evaluation despite its failure to pass either the access or consulate screening tests.

The 12 locations identified by the Committee for detailed evaluation were:

Atlanta, Georgia
Chicago, Illinois
Houston, Texas
Los Angeles, California
Miami, Florida
New Orleans, Louisiana
New York City, New York
San Antonio, Texas
San Francisco, California
San Juan/Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico
Tampa, Florida
Washington, D.C.

*add piece
can costs*

GENERAL ANALYTICAL PROCESS: The initial step in OSD's analysis was to review SOUTHCOM's criteria. Each element used in the study was examined to ensure that it was comprehensive, appropriate to what was being measured, and that it was, in fact, measureable. Source material used in the SOUTHCOM study was surveyed and evaluated to ensure objective measurements were being used. In some instances, additional sources were developed by the Committee's staff to provide a more comprehensive evaluation of some criteria. These data sources included surveys associated with quality of life measurements.

Initial analysis was conducted using relative weightings between each category of criteria and point allocations for each of the criteria consistent with that of the SOUTHCOM study. Results of this analysis were compared to that of the original (SOUTHCOM) analysis.

Sensitivity analysis was conducted with mission-related criteria to measure relative importance of any individual criteria to the overall score and rankings of competitive locations. Particular study was devoted to the areas dealing with theater access and cultural aspects as a validating technique for the initial screening process.

The results of this initial analysis, to include approximately a dozen different excursions based on different sensitivity weightings, indicated that, of the 12 competing locations, there was a clear difference in the performance of the top six competing cities. Consequently, the Committee's staff reexamined, in detail all aspects of the top six competing locations.

Upper Tier:

Atlanta, Georgia
Miami, Florida
New Orleans, Louisiana

San Juan/Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico
Tampa, Florida
Washington, D.C.

Lower Tier:

Chicago, Illinois
Houston, Texas
Los Angeles, California
New York City, New York
San Antonio, Texas
San Francisco, California

The Committee directed its staff to visit the Upper Tier locations in order to achieve the following objectives:

- to confirm that the data developed from reference material was current and accurate
- to visit potential sites within each locale that could accomodate the headquarters (through new construction, renovation of existing facilities, or leasing existing structures)
- to obtain cost estimates for the establishment of the headquarters
- to solicit communitiy views on the availability of supporting activities or other impacts associated with the relocation of SOUTHCOM's headquarters

Each of the Upper Tier locales were visited. The Committee's staff was augmented with experts in civil engineering, communications and community relations for these visits. Although the itineraries varied, the following procedures were followed in each instance:

- An overview of the purpose and objectives of the staff visit were provided to the hosting city. Officials from civic associations, political interests, businesses and other community groups, as well as key military officials (where applicable) were in attendance.
- A hosting organization provided an overall assessment of the capabilities of the community to support the relocation, and the expected impact of SOUTHCOM headquarters' presence on both the economy and civic services.
- The staff would meet with key officials of those offices responsible for facilities planning. Where federal property was the prime focus for a visit, this would normally be the Installation Facilities Planning Office (usually a function of the Civil Engineers). In those cities where no military activity was present, tthe staff coordinated with those officials designated by the political leadership of the visited city. Coordination with these agencies was focused on the availability of specific sites or buildings that could accomodate Headquarters SOUTHCOM's physical requirements.-- including the headquarters building, key personnel housing, and communications infrastructure.

- Each identified site was then visited by the staff, and an informal assessment of the utility of each location was made. Details for each location were gathered for further analysis.

METHODOLOGY FOR ASSEMENTS:

MISSION FACTORS: The SOUTHCOM mission requires that the CINC U.S. Southern Command and his staff frequently meet with political and military leaders of the theater. Proper location of the headquarters serves to optimize the efficiency of this high volume of coordination and travel.

- a. Centrality: This factor addresses both the command travel to the AOR and the region's key officials' ease of travel to the headquarters.

Factors considered

- (a) U. S. carrier commercial airline flights available to the theater, Washington, D.C., and the Component Headquarters
- (b) ~~Frequency of flights to theater and Washington, D.C.~~
- (c) Aggregate flying hours and connection times to theater and Washington, D.C.
- (d) Distribution of SOUTHCOM staff travel to countries in the AOR.
- (e) ~~Host Nation visitation to SOUTHCOM HQ.~~
- (e) (f) Foreign airline carriers - ~~as an indicator of the ease and frequency of AOR visitors to the headquarters site.~~

Sources

- (a) World Computer Systems, ~~a world-wide computer reservation system which gives real-time access to airline schedules and data.~~
- (b) SOUTHCOM J8 travel records for SOUTHCOM staff. *and S*
- (c) ~~SOUTHCOM J8 travel records for visitors from AOR to SOUTHCOM HQ.~~

(d) *Pentagon travel agency (Carlson Travel Network)*

Method

- (a) Determine US carrier flight routes available from each candidate city to the 19 capitals in the theater. *and flight times*
 - (b) ~~Determine air flight times (including connections) from each candidate location to AOR capitals and Washington, D.C.~~
 - (c) ~~Analyze SOUTHCOM travel records and estimate future staff travel requirements.~~
 - (d) ~~Estimate man-hour difference for the major candidate cities.~~
 - (e) Compute travel man-hours for each candidate city.
- b. Diplomatic support - As an indicator of cultural support in the area this factor maximizes the number of embassies and/or consulates to provide current, country specific information and services.

Factors considered: Number of embassies and/or consulates located in candidate cities and proximity to specific site.

Source: U. S. Department of State, 1993, Foreign Consular Offices in the United States, 1993. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents. [This is a listing by country of the consular offices located in cities throughout the United States and Puerto Rico.]

Method: Determine embassies and consulates for candidate cities.

2. ENHANCE INTERNAL EFFECTIVENESS/STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The location chosen should enhance the ability of CINC U.S. Southern Command and his staff to gain an understanding and maintain the pulse of the dynamics of the region. Ideally, the location will create a synergism which will bolster SOUTHCOM's effectiveness - establish "a marriage between the mission and community." The SOUTHCOM mission requires a staff that has access to the latest information and technology in each individual area of expertise. The selection process should serve this professional development by ready access to institutions of higher learning and technical schools with a broad range of curricula. Therefore, the location should maximize the number of key institutions with a regional focus.

- Regional organizations.
- Media - foreign language, newspapers and broadcast stations.
- Universities and colleges - Latin American studies and students.
- a. Regional Organizations

Factors considered

- (a) International organizations or chapters of organizations with a primary focus on Latin America.
- (b) Multi-national organizations with Latin American focus.
- (c) Foreign trade associations of U. S. with Latin countries or Latin countries with the U. S.
- (d) Business corporations with offices or branches in Latin America or Latin companies with offices in the U.S.
- (e) Financial institutions with real or potential capability to accommodate Latin American banking and/or investments.

Sources

- (a) Gale Research Inc. 1994 Encyclopedia of Associations. Regional, State, and Local Organizations. Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Inc. [This is a five-volume guide to nearly 48,000 regional, state and local nonprofit organizations in all 50 states, the District of Columbia and U. S. territories including Puerto Rico. It is available in libraries throughout the continental United States.]
- (b) National Register Publishing Company 1990 Corporate Affiliations. Willamette, Il. Database Accessible via Dialog Information Services, Inc. [This database is computerized and covers over 70,000 U. S. and foreign companies in manufacturing, distribution and services. The data are gathered by questionnaires sent to companies in the National Register database, supplemented by telephone calls. 1994 data.]
- (c) The National Directory of Addresses and Telephone Numbers. 1994 edition. [The directory is compiled through original research of the staff of General Information, Inc.,
and
verified by them as well. The company charges no fee for listing in this volume. It, also, is a standard reference in libraries throughout the country.]
- (d) Jose L. Blanco, ed., 1994, The Business Register, Industrial and commercial Directory of Puerto Rico. San Juan, Puerto Rico: ITT Diversified Information Systems Corporation. [A listing updated annually of domestic and foreign companies consulates.]
- (e) World Trade Academy Press, 1991, Directory of American Firms Operating in Foreign Countries. New York: Uniworld Business Publications, Inc. [This is a listing by country of all American-owned companies doing business in that country].
- (f) World Trade Academy Press, 1992, Directory of Foreign Firms Operating in the United States. (New York: Uniworld Business Publications, Inc. [This lists each country and gives the name and location of firms with offices in cities in the United States.]])

Method

Using all three sources of information, a list of the various organizations, associations, corporations, and institutions (hereafter referred to as entities) identified in the factors considered will be developed. An entity will be included on the list if Latin America or a

Latin American country (Central and South America) is included or referred to in some way in the name or purpose of the entity and if, based on further assessment, the entity lends itself to supporting the SOUTHCOM mission (e.g. Human Rights or Nation Assistance). Organizations which are considered to bolster SOUTHCOM's effectiveness are listed in the four categories of Bi-national professional organizations, trade associations, financial institutions, and major corporate headquarters. Site is credited with one and a half (1.5) points for each category having entities. A maximum of six (6) points will be assigned.

b. Media - foreign language, newspapers, and broadcast stations.

Factors considered

- (a) Availability of media in languages of the region - primarily Spanish and Portuguese.
- (b) Mix of broadcast and print media.
- (c) Ready accessibility of newspapers, books and magazines with a focus on Latin America.

Sources

- (a) Gale Research Inc., 1994, Gale Directory of Publications and Broadcast Media, Volumes 1-3. Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research, Inc. [This directory is a compilation of data solicited directly from broadcast and print media throughout the United States. It is printed in Detroit, Michigan and is a standard source of information on American media.]
- (b) The Business Register

Method

- (a) A listing of Spanish or Portuguese language print (newspapers, magazines, and books) and broadcast (radio, television and cable) media for each community will be developed based on the sources cited above. The references will identify those media having offices in each of the candidate cities (media facilities). It is assumed that if Spanish and Portuguese language media facilities are located in a community, the publications and broadcasts will be available to the Spanish and Portuguese speaking populations and other interested citizens of these communities.
- (b) Points will be assigned as follows:
 - Foreign language print media = 1.5 points

- Foreign language broadcast media, Radio = 1.5 points
& Television = 1.5
points (including cable)
- To enhance wider dissemination of LATAM-focused issues for the SOUTHCOM staff, English language media (print or broadcast) with Latin American regional emphasis = 1.5 points

(c) Scores in the three areas are added (maximum of 6 points).

c. Universities and Colleges - Latin American studies and students. Both availability of academic resources to the SOUTHCOM staff and the presence of (foreign) LATAM students are considered relevant.

Factors considered

(a) The number and type (University, 4-year and 2-year colleges) located in the cities considered. Course offerings on Latin America and/or its countries.

(b) Program of study in Latin American affairs as an undergraduate major or graduate area focus (as a resource for the SOUTHCOM staff).

Sources

(a) College Research Group of Concord Massachusetts 1994 Arco's The Right College. New York: Prentice Hall. [Arco is a division of Simon and Schuster, Inc., one of the leading publishing houses in the U. S. The College Research Group is the successor of a non-profit corporation started by faculty from Harvard University's Graduate School of Education to conduct research in college admissions.]

(b) The National Directory of Addresses and Telephone Numbers, 1994 edition.

(c) David Savageau and Richard Boyer, 1993, Places Rated Almanac. New York: Prentice Hall Travel. Education section, pages 140-168. Primary sources utilized by Savageau and Boyer include the following:

U.S. Department of Education, Directory of Post secondary Institutions, 1992.

(d) Harold R. Doughty, 1994, Guide to American Graduate Schools, 7th edition. New York: Penguin Books. [The author is a former Director of Admissions at both New York University and Adelphi University. He succeeds the original authors who began publishing this guide in 1967. It is based on survey of graduate dean in colleges and universities throughout the

United States.]

- (e) The Business Register Edition 94-95.

Method

- (a) Information for this evaluation will be developed from The Right College Rated Almanac (number and type of institution of higher learning, e.g., two year or four+ year), and from Guide to Graduate Schools (course offerings and programs of various Graduate Schools).
3. INTER-AGENCY COOPERATION

A close working relationship with other agencies of the U.S. Government significantly enhances SOUTHCOM's mission activities. It is important that the location selected maximize the number of inter-agency main offices currently operating in the area which are involved with activities compatible with SOUTHCOM's programs in the AOR — Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, Transportation and Treasury.

Inter-Agency Offices in the Area

Factors considered

- (a) Federal agencies other than the Department of Defense involved with foreign matters in Latin America and likely to interact with SOUTHCOM.
- (b) Those agencies listed above that have field offices *at a policy level* located in candidate cities. For example, a customs activity that has only a field inspection capacity is not scored.

Sources

- (a) The National Directory of Addresses and Telephone Numbers, 1994.
- (b) Centro Hispano 1994, The Telephone Book for Puerto Rico.
- (c) Telephonic queries to the agency headquarters of the five departments.

Method

Based on listings contained in the National Directory of Addresses and Telephone Numbers, as well as direct telephonic coordination with agency offices, the field offices for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, Transportation, and Treasury in each candidate city will be identified. One point four points (1.4) will be assigned to each agency up to a maximum of 7 points.

QUALITY OF LIFE

4. MILITARY SUPPORT AND QUALITY OF LIFE

An effective staff is highly contingent upon troops and families having a wholesome, supporting environment. Without a high quality of life for the families, the mission will suffer. In addition, the command's ability to maintain a quality civilian staff will depend in large part on the attractiveness of the community.

a. Housing and Cost of Living

Factors considered

- (a) Average variable housing allowance (VHA) for an E-6 and an O-4. (These are model grades of enlisted and officers in SOUTHCOM.)
- (b) Relative cost of living - to include the affordability of adequate housing.
- (c) Existence of military family housing.

Sources

- (a) Defense Finance and Accounting System VHA Zip Code Listing (Average for an O-4 and an E-6)
- (b) Office of Personnel Management Pay Scale for the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act of 1990.
- (c) Department of Defense Regulation 7000.14-R.
- (d) American Association of Realtors, Existing Homes Sales 1990- 1993.
- (e) Profile of Census Metropolitan Areas, 1992. U.S. Department of Commerce.

Method

- (a) A measure of affordable adequate housing is the median cost to purchase. The score will be assessed
- (b) Information for evaluating this factor will be derived from DFAS Variable Housing Allowance (VHA) Zip Code Listing. An average VHA for an O-4 and an E-6 for each candidate city will be computed.
- (c) Information will be derived from OPM's locality adjustment for the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act of 1990.

b. Schools

Factors considered

- Quality of public education system (K-12).
- On-base schools.
- Availability of magnet and private schools

Sources

- (a) Education Quotient - A rating of 500 U.S. school districts, "EQ '93", Expansion Management, September-October 1993, pp. 18-19 plus tables. Boulder, CO; New Hope Communications Inc. (This is a trade magazine for site selection professionals).
- (b) Antilles Consolidated School system (DODDS), 1993, Goals for the School year 1992-1993, courtesy Dr. Richard Saddlemire, Superintendent, 30 August 1994.
- (c) Petersons Guide to Private Secondary Schools, 1993.

Method

- (a) The quality of the public education system in each candidate city will be assessed based on information from Expansion Management, which uses the following seven criteria in ranking public education (K through 12) systems:
 - High school graduation rate.
 - Average College Board Scores (ACT or SAT).
 - Minimum scheduled and average classroom teachers salaries.
 - Amount of money spent per pupil on instruction.
 - Student to teacher ratio.
 - Surrounding community's average level of education.
 - Average income level.

For OCONUS sites DODDS data will be compared to the above.

- (b) Quality of K->12 education will be assigned points based on the relative ranking of the candidate city based on the Expansion Management
- (c) Based on the expressed concerns by target sensitivity groups, the availability of private secondary schools and specialty schools was also scored as a measure of the alternative schooling opportunities in the area. Based on register of schools in the Peterson's Guide,

c. Medical Services, community and military facilities.

Factors considered

- (a) Ratio of doctors and hospitals to number of people.
- (b) Accessibility of general and specialized practitioners.
- (c) Presence of military installation with medical and dental care.
- (d) Travel time to above care.

Sources

- (a) U.S. and World Military and Government Installation Directory Service. Melvin Lippman, San Diego, CA, 1994.
- (b) David Savageau and Richard Boyer, 1993, Places Rated Almanac. New York: Prentice Hall Travel. Health Care section, pages 175-207. Primary sources utilized by PRA include the following:
 - American Hospital Association, Guide to the Health Care Field, 1993; National Physician Database, 1993.
- (c) Office of Health Statistics, 1992, Selected characteristics San Juan, Puerto Rico: Department of Health.

Method

- (a) The quality of medical care in each candidate city will be assessed based on information from Places Rated Almanac (PRA). PRA uses five criteria in rating health care in 343 metro areas:
 - general/family practitioners per 100,000 population;
 - medical specialists per 100,000 population;
 - surgical specialists per 100,000 population;
 - short-term, general hospital beds per 10,000 population;
 - hospitals approved by AMA for physician residency programs.

The *lower* the rating, the better the health care systems.

- (b) Each community will be awarded 1 point if it has ready access to CHAMPUS providers.
- (c) Sites will be scored based on the availability of military care facilities in the community:
 - Military hospital with surgical staff 2 points
 - or Catchment area program 1.5 points

- or Dispensary only 0.5 points
- No available military medical care 0 points

d. Crime

Factors considered

- Violent crime rate in the metropolitan statistical area.
- Property crime rate in the metropolitan statistical area.

Sources

(a) David Savageau and Richard Boyer, 1993, Places Rated Almanac. New York: Prentice Hall Travel. Crime section, pages 212-226. Primary sources utilized by PRA include the following:

FBI, Crime in the United States, 1988-1992

(b) Criminal Offenses File, CY'93 Surrounding Metropolitan Communities San Juan, Puerto Rico.

(c) FBI, Uniform Crime Report, October 1993.

Method

(a) Sites will be scored based on the violent crime rates per 100K in the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)

(b) Based on the greater frequency of property crimes per 100K in the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), this catalogue is also rated to more accurately reflect the exposure to property crime for the target population in a particular community.

e. Personnel Support Issues

Factors considered

- (a) Commissary availability
- (b) Exchange (PX/BX)
- (c) Finance office
- (d) Other support - claims, recreational services, etc.
- (e) Public transportation
- (f) Child care

Source

- (a) U.S. and World Military and Government Installation Directory Service. Melvin Lippman, San Diego, CA, 1994.
- (b) Transportation Profile, Places Rated Almanac, 1993.

Method

- (a) Each candidate city will receive points based on the availability of military support facilities
- (b) Candidate cities will receive one additional point if certified child care facilities (both military and civilian) are readily available in the area.
- (c) To be considered, connections with a community public transportation system must be available at the site location, and will be rated based on commuting time, mass transit, and intercity travel:

f. Employment Opportunities

Factors considered

- (a) Population base.
- (b) Places Rated Almanac score.
- (c) Travel time to employment opportunities.

Sources

- (a) 1990 Census of Population and Housing.
- (b) David Savageau and Richard Boyer, 1993, Places Rated Almanac. New York: Prentice Hall Travel. Jobs section, pages 54-66. Primary sources utilized the following:

Economic Forecast of Woods & Poole Economics, Inc.,
Washington, DC

U.S. Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review
- (c) The Business Register.

Method

- (a) Rankings in Places Rated Almanac of 343 metro areas for near-term job growth uses two criteria: (1) the percent increase in new jobs expected by 1998; and, (2) the number of new jobs created between

now and 1998. The higher the score for a metropolitan area, the more promising the area's job outlook.

(c) An additional 0.5 points will be assigned to each candidate city that exhibits a population growth rate of 10% or more based on the 1980 to 1990 rated published in the 1990 Census of Population and Housing.

COSTS

DEFINITIONS.

1. **Differential Costs.** Differential costs are those that vary from locale to locale. An example is the locality pay rate that applies to civilian employees in a particular area. Non-differentiating costs, or those which remain constant from city to city were not considered in the analysis. The base salary of a civilian employee is an example of a non-discriminating cost.

2. **Incremental Costs.** Incremental costs are those costs that are over and above normal operations that will be incurred due to the relocation. An example of an incremental cost is the cost to build or renovate a building for occupancy in the selected location.

3. **Life Cycle Costs.** Life cycle costs include all non-recurring costs and all recurring costs over a 20 year period.

4. **Non-Recurring Costs.** Non-recurring costs include the cost to build or renovate a headquarters building and related site preparation work, purchase and installation of communication equipment, purchase of office furniture/fixtures, construction/renovation of military housing, and one-time transportation relocation type expenses for dislocated military and civilian personnel.

5. **Recurring Costs.** Recurring costs include payroll costs of civilian employees, temporary duty travel of military and civilian employees, overhaul, maintenance and repair of facilities and equipment, security of facilities and grounds, utilities, service contracts/leases, supplies/equipment, housing allowances, and overseas cost of living allowances (COLAs).

6. **First Year Relocation Costs.** First year relocation costs consist of one-time non-recurring costs and the annual differential recurring costs.

7. **Incentive Costs.** Incentive costs consists of those costs that may be defrayed by the local community, if Southern Command does relocate to that area. Such costs were expressly not considered in this evaluation.

8. **Facility Costs.** Facility costs include the cost of real estate and the cost to construct, purchase, lease or renovate facilities. Also included are costs for the

design of the facility and the internal subdivision of the space into suitable administrative offices.

9. Site Preparation Costs. Site preparation costs include the cost to provide roads, parking lots, utilities, communications and other improvements for the site. Also included is the cost of grading and landscaping the surrounding area.

10. Communication Costs. Communication costs include the cost of interbase connectivity of telephones and other electronic communication equipment; access to the worldwide global telecommunication network; nonsecure and secure switching systems; nontactical and tactical radio frequency connectivity; military communication network access; classified communication area networks; intelligence communication management systems; and regional and global command and control communication systems.

11. Furniture and Fixture Costs. This element includes the cost of office furnishings, modular workstations, training and conference room furnishings.

12. Relocation Costs. Relocation costs include the cost to move military and civilian employees of SOUTHCOM from existing locations to the candidate site. Included is the cost of transporting equipment and personal belongings, severance pay, early retirements and unemployment compensation for affected employees.

13. Housing Costs. Housing costs include the cost to construct, purchase, lease or renovate housing for officers and enlisted military personnel on government property. Included are costs for family and bachelor type housing.

14. Civilian Pay Costs. Civilian pay cost includes only the differential amount of locality pay for the particular metropolitan U. S. area. Also included is the 10 per cent cost of living adjustment (COLA) for Puerto Rico.

15. Travel Costs. Travel costs includes only the differential amount of military and civilian temporary duty travel for the particular metropolitan area.

16. Maintenance Costs. This element includes only the differential amount of repair and maintenance of facilities and grounds for the particular metropolitan U. S. area.

17. Security Costs. This includes only the differential amount of payroll costs, taxes, benefits, expenses of individual firms hired or contracted from outside the normal headquarters staff to perform specific security tasks for the particular metropolitan U. S. area. Also included are the cost of intrusion detection systems, scanning devices, supplies such as batteries, control forms, and access cards.

18. Utility Costs. This includes only the differential cost of electricity, gas, water and sewage.

19. Service Contract Costs. This includes only the differential cost of contracts issued for such things as pest control and custodial services.

20. Supplies/Equipment. This includes only the differential cost of such things as personal computers, copiers and common office supplies.

21. Housing Allowance Cost. This includes only the differential amount of the Variable Housing Allowance (VHA) for each metropolitan area for military personnel and a limited number of senior civilians.

22. Overseas Military Pay Cost. This includes only the 10 percent cost of living (COLA) for Puerto Rico.

COSTING METHODOLOGY.

1. Facility Costs. Facility costs were derived by multiplying the estimated square footage of the headquarters building (140,000 square feet) by the average square footage cost to build, renovate or lease a notional building in the metropolitan area. These square footage factors were supplied by local military facility engineers and real estate planners at the regional General Services Administration offices.

2. Site Preparation Costs. Site preparation costs were derived by applying a percentage factor to the estimated cost of the facility. These planning factors were provided by real estate planners with the General Services Administration.

3. Communications. Communication costs were derived by obtaining the purchase price of numerous pieces of specialized communications equipment/gear that were determined to be needed at each candidate site. This requirement was determined by a communication expert with the Air Force Electronic Systems Command and priced out by the Defense Information Systems Agency and the Army Information System Command.

4. Furniture/Fixtures. The cost estimates for furniture/fixtures were derived by multiplying \$3,700 by the estimated number of personnel (700) occupying the headquarters building. This amount (\$2.4 million) was then adjusted by the cost of living index for the particular metropolitan area (as published in "America's Top Rated Cities", Volume IV, 1993, 2nd Edition) to arrive at differential costs.

5. Relocation Costs. Relocation costs were computed by the Southern Command for the estimated 500 personnel who are expected to relocate. This amount (\$7.1 million) was then adjusted by the cost of living index for the particular metropolitan area (as published in "America's Top Rated Cities", Volume IV, 1993, 2nd Edition) to arrive at differential costs.

6. **Housing Costs.** Housing costs were derived by multiplying average square footage cost factors for the metropolitan areas by the estimated size of the housing (2,800 square feet for senior officer quarters and 200 square feet for bachelor quarters). The square footage cost factors were supplied by local military facility engineers and real estate planners at the regional General Services Administration offices.

7. **Civilian Pay.** The civilian pay differential amounts were determined by multiplying the locality pay for candidate locations by the number of civilian personnel involved (133 people). The locality pay amounts were obtained from the U.S. Government Salary Tables, effective January, 1995.

8. **Travel.** These costs were developed by Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) personnel by repricing each Southern Command TDY trip taken in FY 1994. Each trip was repriced from the candidate location to the original destination to arrive at differential costs.

9. **Maintenance.** Annual maintenance costs were derived by multiplying five percent times the estimated facility costs. This amount was then adjusted by the cost of living index for the particular metropolitan area (as published in "America's Top Rated Cities", Volume IV, 1993, 2nd Edition) to arrive at annual differential costs.

10. **Security.** Security costs were derived by pricing out a 9 person 24 hour-a-day security operation. This amount (\$500,000) was then adjusted by the cost of living index for the particular metropolitan area (as published in "America's Top Rated Cities", Volume IV, 1993, 2nd Edition) to arrive at differential costs.

11. **Utilities.** Utility costs were derived by multiplying the average utility cost per square foot for the candidate location by the estimated size of the headquarters building (140,000 square feet)

12. **Service Contracts.** Service contract costs were estimated using Southern Command actuals for FY 1994. This amount (\$900,000) was then adjusted by the cost of living index for the particular metropolitan area (as published in "America's Top Rated Cities", Volume IV, 1993, 2nd Edition) to arrive at differential costs.

13. **Supplies/Equipment.** Supplies/equipment costs were derived using actuals for FY 1994. This amount (\$560,000) was then adjusted by the cost of living index for the particular metropolitan area (as published in "America's Top Rated Cities", Volume IV, 1993, 2nd Edition) to arrive at differential costs.

14. **Housing Allowances.** Housing allowances were computed using the FY 1995 Variable Housing Allowance (VHA) for E-5 enlisted personnel and O-4 officers for each candidate location. The number of military personnel estimated to be eligible for VHA for each location, except Puerto Rico, was 560. In Puerto Rico, the number of eligible military personnel was estimated to be only 220. In Puerto Rico

there would be a lower number of eligible personnel due to the anticipated construction of Government housing.

15. Overseas Military Pay (Puerto Rico Only). The differential amount of overseas military pay was computed by multiplying the 10 percent cost of living (COLA) allowance times the average basic pay of \$36,600 times the 567 military personnel to be assigned at the new location.

16. First Year Relocation Costs. First year relocation costs were derived by summing the one-time non-recurring costs and the annual differential recurring costs. Differential non-recurring costs were computed by subtracting the cost for the lowest cost location from the instant location.

17. Life Cycle Costs. This is the sum of the non-recurring costs, and recurring annual differential costs multiplied by a 20 year life cycle.

18. Now Year Dollars. All estimated costs are expressed in FY 1996 dollars.

ASSUMPTIONS.

1. Facility Requirements. It was assumed that the size of the headquarters building would be about 140,000 square feet, including a classified security area of about 40,000 square feet.

2. Staffing Requirements. It was assumed that the headquarters staffing would consist of 567 military and 133 civilian personnel. The ratio of officers/ enlisted was assumed to be about 60/40.

3. Housing. It was assumed that at each candidate site, except Puerto Rico, only seven senior officer quarters would need to be built. Due to a severe housing shortage in Puerto Rico, it was assumed that 220 family and 120 bachelor quarters would need to be constructed there.

4. Site Preparation. Site preparation costs were assumed to equate to 15 percent of facility costs for an unimproved area, 10 percent for a partially improved area that will be renovated and 5 percent for an area that requires minimal improvements. These factors were obtained from real estate planners from the General Services Administration.

5. Maintenance. Annual maintenance costs for any location were assumed to equate to five percent of the facility costs. This factor was obtained from real estate planners from the General Services Administration.

6. Security. It was assumed that the security program for any location would entail a 24 hour operation manned by a staff of 9 personnel an an aggregate annual cost of \$500,000.

SCORING AND ANALYSIS:

Comparative analysis: For most criteria, a comparative analysis technique was used. Each location would be assigned data based on consulted sources. The location with the best performance in the measured area would be assigned the maximum points for that criteria. The worst performing location would be awarded zero points. All other locations between these two extremes were awarded points based on their relative position within the overall range of data between the best and worst performing cities.

Linear analysis: In a few instances, scores were awarded on the basis of a fixed scale. The maximum number of points for such criteria were spread equally along a scale of potential quantifiable possibilities. Locations were then awarded scores based on their performance against the scale.

Weightings

Basic - The baseline analysis used a modified version of the SOUTHCOM study (100 total points).

Mission areas:

Theater Access	14 pts	
Diplomatic Presence	14 pts	
Cultural Aspects	15 pts	
Interagency Presence	7 pts	
<i>Mission Total</i>		50 pts

Quality of Life areas:

Housing & Cost of Living	5 pts	
Schools	5 pts	
Medical Services	5 pts	
Crime	3 pts	
Personnel Support	5 pts	
Employment Opportunity	2 pts	
<i>Quality of Life Total</i>		25 pts

Costs

Non-Recurring		
Recurring		
First-year		
Lifecycle (20 years)		
<i>Costs Total</i>		25 pts

Excursions - Four additional excursions in weighting the analysis were performed:

Quality of Life weighed		
Mission areas		25 pts
Quality of Life areas		50 pts

Costs	25 pts
Costs weighted	
Mission areas	25 pts
Quality of Life areas	25 pts
Costs	50 pts
All areas equally weighted	
Mission areas	25 pts
Quality of Life areas	25 pts
Costs	25 pts
Mission heavily weighted	
Mission areas	67 pts
Quality of Life areas	16.5 pts
Costs	16.5 pts

FINAL ANALYSIS:

Requirement for all three critical areas
Decision parameters
 Mission weighted
 Quality of Life weighted
 Cost weighted
 All factors equal
 Mission and Cost same, weighted over quality of life
Analytical Indicators

CONCLUSIONS FOR SITE SELECTION:

Three leading contenders
Strong and weak points of each
Mission as the key consideration

SITE SELECTION: On March 27, 1995, Deputy Secretary of Defense Deutch selected the metropolitin area of Miami, Florida, as the future location for Headquarters, Southern Command. The preliminary site under consideration is the U.S. Coast Guard C3I Facility at Richmond Heights, in South Dade County.