

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

Department of Defense, Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA)

Project Needs Assessment (PNA) – September 2009 Snapshot: *Assessing a Continuing Funding Gap for Local Economic Adjustment Projects*

I. Introduction to PNA Effort

OEA, on behalf of the Department of Defense, assists communities, regions, and states adversely impacted by significant defense program changes, including special impact assistance in expanding public service facilities, for meeting requirements generated by major base closures, realignments, and expansions. As a result of base closure and realignment (BRAC) recommendations which became law in 2005, Army transformation initiatives, the Global Defense Posture Realignment, Grow the Army, and Grow the Force initiatives, OEA is working with nearly forty communities in twenty states across the nation as they respond to defense-related major closure and growth actions. For many, OEA has been supporting their local responses since May 2005.

OEA's Project Needs Assessment (PNA) effort was initiated to collect information from defense communities about their economic adjustment funding needs and is in response to community concerns that local and state public resources, as well as private sources, are insufficient to allow them to carry out economic adjustment projects. Most projections are derived from planning that has been underway for several years.

This September 2009 Snapshot presents findings for (1) twenty-five installation mission growth communities across sixteen states (shown in Appendix 1) and (2) twelve base closure-related communities across eight states (shown in Appendix 2); it assesses new installation mission growth projects identified by communities since the first August 2008 PNA effort; and it has been expanded to include twelve major base closure locations.¹ This information is intended to assist appropriate Federal, state and local entities as they craft their programs of assistance and as they develop their respective policies for affording priority consideration of defense adjustment assistance requests.

II. Findings – As of September 2009

Mission Growth Communities

- Growth communities can accommodate the growth and spur job creation to the national economic recovery—ONLY IF these communities are able to compliment significant Defense spending for new military installation infrastructure with investments in new / upgraded community infrastructure and facilities critical to supporting the expanding Defense missions.

¹ The immediacy of project implementation for base closure communities depends on site control issues on the closing installation. Please see comments related to this topic under section IV in this Snapshot.

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

- Growth communities face an immediate \$2.48 billion funding gap associated with 93 critical mission growth related projects worth \$3.05 billion that are otherwise ready-to-move; that is, key community projects with sufficiently advanced planning, engineering design and cost estimates to seek Federal grant implementation funds, if such were available.
- Growth communities identified another 320 mission growth related projects worth \$8.83 billion that are in various stages of design/development, many fast-approaching the ready-to-move phase, and for which funding is uncertain. Consequently, the funding gap grew by \$769 million between March 2009 and September 2009 and is expected to continue growing (see Appendix 5).
- Despite significant challenges associated with planning and undertaking community responses to military installation mission growth, communities have already mobilized more than \$1.2 billion of primarily local and state resources and expended local political capital to give priority consideration to a variety of outside-the-fence projects critical to the success of the military missions.
- Growth communities have continued to re-prioritize funds for projects that could not be delayed: specifically, a significant number of education capital facility projects were started. Project priorities are also being reconsidered based on newer information from the Military Departments, e.g., final EIS issuance.
- The impact of current and persistent economic conditions on local funding has worsened, and many communities—after tapping capital reserves to cover some of these gaps—find themselves both nearing bonding limits and exhausting reserves. Exhausted local and state resource capacity for critical mission growth projects has diminished the ability of communities to carry out mission growth projects without outside assistance.
- Although growth communities are tapping Federal funding wherever possible, existing Federal programs and resources cannot accommodate either the level of need or the urgency of military mission growth.
- Transportation projects account for over 83% of identified and projected funding needs. Project cost has decreased for projects in several categories, a reflection of surplus capacity in many construction markets as well as declining commodity costs.
- ***Growth communities that have . . .***
 - The ability to set / influence project priorities (e.g. transportation, regional infrastructure projects) through effective state and regional coordination

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

- Access to a mix of public revenue sources (e.g. impact fees, public /private partnerships, tax revenue capture)
- A good (and transparent) relationship between the community and the growing installation

... demonstrate an ability to execute mission-growth related projects in an expedited manner.

Base Closure Communities

- Base closure communities have the potential to redevelop surplus property, create new job opportunities, and add productive real estate to local tax rolls—**ONLY IF** these communities are able to promptly invest in critical public infrastructure as soon as possible once the property is transferred.
- Base closure communities face a \$442 million funding gap associated with 63 critical base redevelopment projects worth \$466 million. Immediacy of need for funding, in many cases, is tied to obtaining site control for the project to proceed.
- Base closure communities identified another 46 base redevelopment projects worth \$474 million that are in various stages of planning, design/development, many fast-approaching the ready-to-move phase, for which funding is uncertain and/or lack site control.
- Site control risk represents a major impediment both to base closure communities' implementation of redevelopment plans and to the identification of funding sources for redevelopment.
- ***Base closure redevelopment planning efforts that have . . .***
 - Realistic sources of early, continuous, and (where possible) diverse cash flow
 - Plans for a phased development of the site, spreading project risk and limiting immediate upfront development costs
 - Active plans for the mitigation of risk

... have a higher likelihood of successful redevelopment.

III. Explanation of Findings - GROWTH

Mission Growth PNA (G-PNA)

Twenty-five growth communities (and one state, Maryland) were asked to identify local economic adjustment projects that, but for additional Federal assistance, cannot be undertaken through existing non-Federal resources to respond to mission growth (see Appendix 1). A PNA OEA staff team reviewed local economic adjustment project needs of twenty-two of these communities (including Maryland).

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

Guam Note: The military build-up in the Territory of Guam associated with the U.S. Marine Corps relocation from Japan to Guam constitutes a significant mission growth action impacting the Island. However, PNA data for the Territory of Guam is not included in this assessment pending completion of DoD’s Environmental Impact Statement/NEPA process and further refinement of community requirements related to the military build-up.

As of 9 September 2009, the PNA team conducted site visits (see Appendix 3) and analyzed and documented the local economic adjustment project estimates against four criteria:

1. Projects proposed are clearly and substantially related and responsive to military growth.
2. Details about, cost estimates, and funding sources for the project are specific and substantive and can be validated.
3. There is a demonstrated gap in funding and Federal funding is required to carry out the proposed project.
4. The effort represents a “drop dead” project for the community without which the community cannot absorb the military growth.

G-PNA Assessments

Determining the relationship of a project to mission growth relied, in large part, on the judgment of the OEA team as influenced by the team members’ collective economic development experience, a tour of the installation and surrounding community, and presentations by community officials. To determine the funding gap, the OEA team accepted and relied upon information provided by the community regarding local, state, Federal, or private funding that had been obtained or pursued. The “drop dead” project factor reflected the installation’s perspective on pressing need, where possible, and/or other obviously predictable adverse consequences on mission success if the project were not pursued. In all cases, OEA site visit conclusions were shared back with growth management organizations and local and state officials for review and comment.

Assessed Project Needs for Mission Growth

The universe of 413 projects depicted in Table 1 conveys the magnitude of impact communities are beginning to identify. Projects deemed “unrelated” to the mission growth or overtaken by events (OBE) are not included. Fully-funded projects account for \$1.21 billion of the approximately \$11.8 billion in projects identified by impacted communities.

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

Table 1: Assessed Community Project Needs for Mission Growth

Category	Projects Identified	Total Cost of Projects
Communications	4	\$105,425,000
Education	87	\$1,364,253,738
Energy & Utilities	6	\$9,752,000
Planning & Zoning	5	\$1,395,000
Social	16	\$40,260,331
Transportation	238	\$9,912,985,738
Water & Sewer	52	\$417,841,284
Workforce	5	\$39,500,000
TOTALS	413	\$11,891,413,091

Calculating a G-PNA Funding Gap

Table 2 depicts the subset of the above 413 projects that fully comported with all four G-PNA criteria and that OEA believes are available for immediate funding. The 93 projects are all required to meet short-term mission growth adjustment needs. If funds were made available, communities could compete for funding for final design and construction immediately. Projects that are already fully-funded by communities are not included in Table 2’s funding gap total.

Table 2: Projects Responding to Mission Growth

Category	Projects	Cost of Projects	Funding Available	Funding Gap
Transportation	66	\$2,696,144,913	\$416,092,619	\$2,280,052,294
Education	17	\$275,926,831	\$147,160,000	\$128,766,831
Water & Sewer	6	\$58,761,000	\$2,110,000	\$56,651,000
Workforce	3	\$14,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$11,000,000
Social	1	\$8,125,000	\$225,000	\$7,900,000
TOTALS	93	\$3,053,457,744	\$569,087,619	\$2,484,370,125

Note that: (1) as more of the Table 1 “Projects Identified” become “Fundable;” and (2) as the universe of “Projects Identified” expands, when additional communities are visited by the G-PNA team, the above Funding Gap can be expected to grow significantly.

Additional Challenges for Mission Growth Communities

Timing Challenges

- Perhaps the most significant challenge associated with military growth is the tight timeline associated with this growth. Unlike the 10 – 15 year timeframe during which most growth occurs, military growth occurs over much shorter time periods. This timeframe challenges the mechanisms that communities have in place to adjust to growth.
- Communities are at different stages in their respective growth management planning programs. Depending on the status of that growth management planning, input for this initiative varied but is anticipated to become more defined across the board as community efforts progress.

“Elusive Footprint” Challenges

Closely related to the issue of timing, communities also highlighted the challenge of managing a growth planning process heavily dependent on dynamic Defense Department mission growth projections. Several recurring challenges were:

- Evolving or changing mission bed-down locations on the installation and the associated impacts for planning outside the fence line (such as community transportation planning for efficient installation access)
- Deployment schedules—which can affect migration plans for families and impact school aged children figures—that need to be accommodated by local educational authorities (LEAs)
- Speculation regarding new residential patterns complicates infrastructure planning. Since incoming military or defense contractor personnel have a number of choices where to locate themselves and their families, local efforts to estimate increased intersection traffic, gate access issues, LEA capacity issues, etc., may vary until sufficient individual decisions are made to support planning predictions

Financing Challenges

Public finance mechanisms that growth communities would typically mobilize to finance adjustment activities conflict with two primary characteristics of military growth:

1. Incoming mission growth-related populations will not arrive in growth locations until their respective missions move. This means that those incoming populations are neither available as a tax base nor as a voting base for referenda to raise money to pay for growth adjustment projects. Populations arriving “by 2011” also would not be counted for the 2010 Decennial Census—with tangible implications for formula funding that communities will receive in the future.
2. Communities do not have the advantage of long lead times, as may be typical for other large growth adjustment projects, such as a new highway bypass or the construction of a new school. For example, states and communities prioritize many transportation projects through highly competitive TIPs or STIPs, commonly a 6-year cycle to receive Federal DOT funding through the state.

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

Defense mission growth occurs over a much shorter period of time, meaning that communities do not have multiple years to plan for, scale, design, finance, and build mission growth adjustment projects. Consequently, communities must consider reprioritizing (i.e. putting aside) other—often long-planned—initiatives in lieu of military growth projects. For transportation projects, this often means suggesting politically charged changes to previously agreed and hard-fought project priorities. Also, whereas communities can control the pace of community growth by denying or delaying permits and plans of developers and builders until infrastructure is in place, public infrastructure to support military growth must be ready by the time those incoming populations arrive.

Examples of how these military growth characteristics challenge traditional local growth mechanisms are numerous. After the failure of a May 2008 school levy in the Lawton, OK (Fort Sill) area, the City of Lawton put before voters on October 13th, 2009 another referendum that sought 1) authorization for a \$37.3 million school bond and 2) support for a half-cent, five-year sales tax increase that would raise approximately \$25 million for other improvements to Lawton public schools. While the bond measure failed a second time (the 51.8% vote it received was not enough to meet Oklahoma’s “super majority” requirement of 60% for the approval of such bonds), the sales tax increase (which requires only a simple majority) passed. However, subsequent to the passage of the sales tax, the school district indicated that those funds will likely not be used for improvements to or construction on schools in areas of the district directly impacted by mission growth occurring on Fort Sill (notably the Sheridan Road School).

Even with priority consideration for Federal help, communities expressed concern that resources will still not be sufficient to address all the requirements from mission growth in a timely manner.

The “Crowding Out” Effect

By expanding bonding and by tapping into capital reserves for BRAC-related projects, communities are reducing their ability to address other issues that might arise, such as those created by natural disasters or economic changes. This is indicative of the risk communities assume by preparing for BRAC growth: hedging their bet that it will eventually pay off in terms of tax base revenue. But if it doesn't, communities may be so leveraged that they will not be able to bounce back—particularly if they need to respond to a sudden event with capital improvements required (e.g. the repair of a levy due to flooding). This effect has the potential to manifest itself most acutely should the Department of Defense reverse course after a community has expended significant resources to prepare for an anticipated/announced build-up.

Effective Strategies for Growth

States, regions, and communities successfully addressing mission growth challenges display some common characteristics. Generally, these entities have demonstrated an

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

effective process of planning, prioritizing, and executing (mission growth-related projects).

Some communities have already begun construction of critical military growth impact projects. Table 3 depicts those projects that already have received full funding as of 9 September 2009.

Table 3: Fully-funded Projects in Response to Mission Growth

Category	Fully-Funded Projects	Cost of Projects
Transportation	34	\$1,083,722,386
Water & Sewer	10	\$45,615,000
Education	9	\$83,010,000
Planning & Zoning	1	\$650,000
TOTALS	54	\$1,212,997,386

Although Federal funding accounts for some of the funding included in Table 3's project cost figures, state and local funding sources, such as those based on tax revenue, account for the majority of the funding that has been made available.

Very few cases were found where private funding was used to pay for military growth impact projects. In one, responding to the projected growth of more than 21,000 additional service members scheduled to arrive at Fort Bliss by 2011, El Paso, TX, began planning ways to mitigate traffic congestion that would result from growth on Fort Bliss. Local planning began with a comprehensive transportation planning study, the Transborder Mobility Plan, and progressed in close coordination with the Army. With the Army's input, the Texas Department of Transportation (TXDOT – El Paso District) identified the 601 Spur project as the most critical in response to the growth on Fort Bliss. Designed as a design/bid/build project, prior to releasing a RFP for the project, TXDOT received an unsolicited bid to do the project as a public/private partnership. The project developer will collect revenue on the spur through an innovative "pass-thru toll" system. Through this method of project delivery, El Paso has been able to fund a critical, BRAC-related impact project without Federal assistance.

IV. Explanation of Findings – BASE CLOSURE/DOWNSIZING

Base Closure PNA (D-PNA)

With an identical objective to assess community project need estimates and better inform cognizant Federal agencies as well as appropriate policy makers, OEA engaged twelve base closure locations (see Appendix 2), formed a D-PNA team and conducted nine site visits (see Appendix 4) to analyze and document local economic adjustment / redevelopment project estimates against four criteria:

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

1. The project is clearly and substantially linked to supporting implementation plans (e.g. a business plan) resulting from the redevelopment planning process.
 - Is the project required to—at a minimum—open up the site for redevelopment?
 - Is the project required to reduce the risk of presumed cash flow sources that would finance redevelopment?
2. Cost estimates and funding sources are specific and can be validated.
3. The project has been identified in some kind of a detailed, specific plan (e.g. CIP, TIP, business plan, etc.).
4. The project represents a community priority without which the community cannot execute the preferred redevelopment or business plan.

D-PNA Assessments

To determine clear and substantial linkage, the PNA team considered the project's relevance to the redevelopment plan (either in draft or final form) and the broader economic impacts created by the closure. The presence of a broader, comprehensive economic development strategy into which a redevelopment or business plan fit often bolstered a project's conformity with D-PNA criteria 1. To determine the funding gap, OEA accepted and relied upon information provided by the community (the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA)), specifically that funding gaps were not likely to be offset by future project cash flows. Several considerations—such as the absorption rate of the local market, project phasing specified in the redevelopment plan, and which fundamental improvements were required to open up a site (at a very minimum) for any sort of redevelopment use—were made when assessing projects against criteria 4, the “drop dead” project factor. In all cases, OEA site visit conclusions were shared back with LRAs and local and state officials for review and comment.

Assessed Project Needs for Base Closure

The universe of 109 projects depicted in Table 4 conveys the magnitude of impact communities are beginning to identify. Projects deemed “unrelated” to the base closure or “OBE” are not included. Fully-funded projects account for only \$1.5 million of the approximately \$941 million in projects identified by impacted communities.

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

Table 4 Assessed Community Project Needs for Base Closure

Category	Projects Identified	Total Cost of Projects
Building Renovation	5	\$128,572,348
Communications	3	\$51,650,000
Education	1	\$34,762,000
Energy & Utilities	12	\$43,148,438
General Construction	2	\$45,890,000
Planning & Zoning	1	\$150,000
Site Work	16	\$94,055,296
Social	3	\$9,578,900
Transportation	33	\$390,987,750
Water & Sewer	32	\$141,683,366
Workforce	1	\$1,00,000
TOTALS	109	\$941,478,098

Calculating a D-PNA Funding Gap

Table 5 depicts the subset of the above 109 projects that fully comported with all four D-PNA criteria. In contrast to the G-PNA implications for “Fundable” projects, many of the D-PNA projects deemed as comporting with all four criteria may not be as immediately ready to receive Federal (or other) funding should it become available. This is due to a lack of site control on the base closure site by either the LRA or the Implementing LRA (ILRA). In all cases—assuming clear site control is or can be obtained—the 63 projects are all required to meet short-term base redevelopment needs. Projects that are already fully-funded by communities are not included in Table 5’s funding gap total.

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

Table 5 Projects Responding to Base Closure

Category	Projects	Cost of Projects	Funding Available	Funding Gap
Water & Sewer	23	\$113,342,366	\$0	\$113,342,366
Transportation	19	\$159,303,419	\$24,125,000	\$135,178,419
Site Work	8	\$59,570,330	\$0	\$59,570,330
Energy & Utilities	7	\$29,737,438	\$0	\$29,737,438
Building Renovation	3	\$101,997,348	\$0	\$101,997,348
Social	2	\$2,632,900	\$0	\$2,632,900
Communications	1	\$300,000	\$0	\$300,000
TOTALS	63	\$466,883,801	\$24,125,000	\$442,758,801

Note that: (1) as more of the Table 4 “Projects Identified” become “Fundable;” and (2) as the universe of “Projects Identified” expands, when additional communities are visited by the D-PNA team, the above Funding Gap can be expected to grow significantly.

Additional Challenges for Base Closure Communities

The Perils of Site Control Risk

Prior to acquiring site control, costs and exact project information are somewhat speculative, particularly for those projects supporting longer-term redevelopment elements (as opposed to just opening up the property at a very basic level). Site control risk may also partially explain the dearth of fully-funded projects assessed through the D-PNA process (see Table 6).

Effective Strategies for Base Redevelopment

Reusing a closed military base is at its core a redevelopment project. Successful redevelopment mitigates broader community impacts from base closure, such as an increase in the local unemployment rate or a weakening of the local economic base. But the vehicle that drives the mitigation of those economic effects is often the reuse of the surplus military property/facilities. Communities (i.e. LRAs) successfully addressing base closure challenges display some common characteristics. Generally, these entities have demonstrated an effective process of planning, prioritizing and proposing a phased redevelopment of the surplus military property.

Table 6 Fully-funded Projects in Response to Base Closure

Category	Fully-Funded Projects	Cost of Projects
Planning & Zoning	1	\$1,500,000
TOTALS	1	\$1,500,000

V. Factors Affecting both Mission Growth and Base Closure Communities

National Economic Climate

The economic downturn continues to affect defense-impacted communities. A November 2008 Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP)² report suggested that forty-one states faced budget shortfalls for in 2008 and 2009. At the time of the report’s publication, CBPP estimated that thirty-one states faced mid-year budget shortfalls in 2008 that already affected day-to-day operations in those states. Of the thirty-one states listed, thirteen states host military mission growth or base closure installations for which PNA assessed projects needs.

A July 2009 *Economist Magazine* article confirmed and clarified the November 2008 CBPP projections.³ As of July 2009, forty-eight states faced a budget deficit in 2009, including all states mentioned in this Snapshot that contain a defense-impacted installation. As of 1 July 2009, the start of many states’ fiscal year, a large number had not passed or balanced budgets. Those that passed budgets did so after imposing considerable cuts, higher taxes, and fees on many services. States have three main general revenue sources: revenue from personal income taxes, revenue from sales taxes, and revenue from corporate income taxes. Projections for revenue from each category were adjusted downwards for FY10 budgets. As those FY10 budgets went into effect, new projections for revenues from those sources may be even lower than previously projected.

\$135 million provided directly to the states through the passage of the stimulus package by Congress has helped. But as those funds expire in 2011, states may again confront critical shortfalls in revenue. OEA is engaged at the state level in most defense-impacted states to gauge the effects of these shortfalls on states’ abilities to fund local economic adjustment projects.

The Trickle-down of State Budget Deficits to Local Budgets

State budget deficits are a leading indicator of the health of local budgets. It is projected that an improvement in the national economy may not immediately help state budgets, since tax revenue collection rises at a rate slower than a general rise in economic growth and productivity. State budgets typically exhibit a greater reliance on revenue from

² Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) *State Budget Troubles Worsen*, Updated November 12, 2008

³ “Happy New Year: State budgets in crisis.” *The Economist*. 4 July 2009. 27-28. Print.

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

income and sales taxes. As employment and consumer spending has impacted these revenue sources, states have been forced to adjust to fluctuating revenue streams. As a result of these adjustments as well as stabilization in lower income and sales tax receipts, state budgets have stabilized.

Local budgets show greater reliance on revenue from property (more) and sales (less) taxes, and assessed property values. Declines in assessed property values are a lagging indicator, since those decreased valuations are frequently a reflection of a current and persistent dampening in home values. As assessed property values decrease, so do property tax revenues, *ceteris paribus*. Because of this, local communities are facing some of the same adjustments now that states encountered almost a year ago. This has a pronounced effect on a community's ability to fund local defense-related economic adjustment projects.

Stimulus Funds Not Generally a Funding Source for Defense Impact Projects

The promise of Federal funds to pay for brick and mortar construction projects at the local level, created by the passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), brought hope to defense-impacted communities that some of the project needs identified since 2007 might find additional funding. Unfortunately, the promise of stimulus funds for funding defense-impacted projects has largely not been realized.

The explanation is in the definition of “shovel ready.” While a PNA project's designation as “Fundable” indicates the project is sufficiently advanced to apply for Federal grant assistance, should such assistance be available, it does not necessarily mean that project construction could commence within 120 days of official notification of a funding decision, which is characteristic of ARRA “shovel ready” projects. PNA “Fundable” projects may require completion of design/engineering, permitting or environmental clearances, and in some cases acquisition of property/rights-of-way prior to start of construction. In general, smaller projects would be expected to complete any pre-construction activity and proceed to construction start more quickly.

The Challenge to “Decouple”

Community responses to installation mission growth or base closure/downsizing issues are frequently and inextricably intertwined with local economic development strategies and/or unrelated regional growth pressures. The PNA effort has attempted to identify where local responses to one effect end and the local responses to the military impact begin. This is, in the end, a matter of judgment by the OEA PNA team.

Mitigating Broad Project Risk

The pressing need for some of the most fundamental projects is associated with mitigating risk—in terms of costs versus health and safety. Environmental projects are examples of this, as are projects to ensure adequate emergency services (such as police and fire, but also adequate water pressure to enable fire protection services, or safe roads and transportation systems).

VI. Project Need Assessment Approach

PNA Team Composition

The PNA teams are comprised of OEA staff with prior experience with the Economic Development Administration (EDA), local economic development corporations, fiscal and market feasibility analyses, and public policy research.

Site Visits

Each PNA site visit included a meeting with community, state officials (where possible), and often installation representatives and focused on how the proposed projects comported with the four PNA criteria. The PNA teams also obtained project information (e.g. Environmental Impact Statement documents or local capital improvement plans) that might have a bearing on the overall picture of project funding needs as well as any supplemental information (such as descriptions of local funding sources) that would assist OEA in developing this snapshot (e.g., distinguishing military growth-related project activity from general community growth impacts).

For the purposes of this “order-of-magnitude” needs assessment, OEA accepted the project cost estimates that were provided, in many cases, by the communities’ project engineers and/or public works staff. Where applicable, the teams relied on project cost estimates used by state transportation improvement plans (TIP or STIP) where transportation projects had been nominated or included in the TIP/STIP.

Project Classification

The types of projects identified by communities were categorized as follows:

- **Building Renovation** (D-PNA only) – Building renovation or rehabilitation.
- **Communications** – Telecommunication, emergency communications, or IT infrastructure.
- **Education** – School construction, staffing for education programs, or other education responses.
- **Energy & Utilities** – Power generation.
- **General Construction** (D-PNA only) – New building construction and bricks and mortar construction unrelated to other categories.
- **Planning & Zoning** – Land use planning.
- **Site Work** (D-PNA only) – General, hard cost construction required prior to productive (or safe) occupancy of a parcel and prior to any vertical construction.
- **Social** – Healthcare, mental health, daycare child services and emergency services.
- **Transportation** – Roads, bridges, intersections and traffic signal improvements, light rail, and other multimodal transportation projects were included in this category.

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

- **Water & Sewer** – Water source, supply, treatment, storage and distribution—as well as wastewater collection and treatment.
- **Workforce** – Workforce development (e.g. facilities) and programs for workforce development.

The PNA teams placed projects into one or more of six groups described in Table 7. Projects that were ultimately assigned as “Fundable” form the basis of this report.

Table 7 PNA Assessed Project Categories

Group	Description
Monitor	Project may be related to the defense action but more information is necessary, or more information is forthcoming at a later time yet to be determined
Follow-Up	Project may be related to the defense action but requires additional information to make an immediate assessment; cost and timing information is available but requires more detail
Fundable	<p>Installation Mission Growth: Project is related to the defense action; cost and timing detail is specific; and there is justification for additional Federal funding. The project is otherwise ready-to-move; that is, a key community project with sufficiently advanced planning, engineering design and cost estimate to seek Federal grant implementation funds, if such were available. Transportation projects nominated for or included in a TIP/STIP were considered “fundable.”</p> <p>Base Closure: Project is required to meet short-term base redevelopment needs; cost and timing detail is specific; and there is justification for additional Federal funding. The project is otherwise ready-to-move; that is, a key community project with sufficiently advanced planning, engineering design and cost estimate to seek Federal grant implementation funds, if such were available, and assuming site control is obtained. Transportation projects nominated for or included in a TIP/STIP were considered “fundable.”</p>
Unrelated	Project is unrelated to the defense action
Fully-Funded	Project is already fully funded
OBE	The project is no longer a priority or is no longer relevant

VII. Future PNA Activities

This Snapshot assesses project readiness and funding needs through September 2009. OEA will assess the need for additional updates prior to requesting additional information or scheduling future PNA site visits.

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

VIII. Backup Documentation & Appendix

Appendix 1: Mission Growth Locations & Projects Identified⁴

	Growth Installation	State	Projects Proposed
1	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	14
2	Andrews AFB	MD	2
3	Bethesda NNMC	MD	8
4	Lejeune-MCAS New River-MCAS Cherry Point	NC	5
5	Cannon AFB	NM	0 ⁵
6	Eglin AFB	FL	12
7	Fort Belvoir	VA	36
8	Fort Benning	GA	21
9	Fort Bliss	TX	13
10	Fort Bragg-Pope AFB	NC	22
11	Fort Carson	CO	28
12	Fort Drum	NY	9
13	Fort Hood	TX	11
14	Fort Knox	KY	24
15	Fort Lee	VA	16
16	Fort Lewis-McChord AFB	WA	12
17	Fort Meade	MD	18
18	Fort Polk	LA	0 ⁵
19	Fort Riley	KS	54
20	Fort Sam Houston-Lackland AFB	TX	5
21	Fort Sill	OK	27
22	Fort Stewart	GA	4
23	Quantico MCB	VA	13
24	Redstone Arsenal	AL	59
25	State of Maryland	MD	0 ⁶
26	White Sands Missile Range	NV	0 ⁵
	TOTAL		413

⁴ This table does not include those projects marked as “Unrelated” or those marked as “OBE.”

⁵ The community is still in the process of determining impacts resulting from mission growth. Data will be incorporated in future updates of this “snapshot” report.

⁶ Impact projects proposed by the State of Maryland have been disaggregated by installation and are represented in the APG, Andrews AFB, Bethesda NNMC, and Fort Meade numbers.

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

Appendix 2: Base Closure Locations & Projects Identified⁷

	Base Closure	State	Projects Proposed
1	NSCS Athens	GA	0 ⁸
2	Brooks City Base	TX	0 ⁸
3	NAS Brunswick	ME	25
4	Fort Gillem	GA	7
5	NS Ingleside	TX	6
6	Kansas AAP	KS	15
7	Lone Star AAP / Red River AD	TX	9
8	Fort McPherson	GA	14
9	Fort Monmouth	NJ	20
10	Fort Monroe	VA	0
11	NS Pascagoula	MS	0 ⁸
12	Riverbank AAP	CA	4
	TOTAL		109

⁷ This table does not include those projects marked as “Unrelated” or those marked as “OBE.”

⁸ The community is still in the process of determining impacts due to base closure. Should data become available it will be incorporated in future updates of this “snapshot” report.

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

Appendix 3: G-PNA Site Visits

	Growth Installation	State	Date of Site Visit
1	Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG)	MD	21 Jul. 2009
2	Lejeune-MCAS New River-MCAS Cherry Point	NC	02 Sep. 2009
3	Eglin AFB	FL	20 Jun. 2009
4	Fort Benning	GA	09 Jul. 2009
5	Fort Bliss	TX	20 May 2009
6	Fort Bragg-Pope AFB	NC	02 Sep. 2009
7	Fort Carson	CO	11 Jun. 2009
8	Fort Drum	NY	09 Sep. 2009
9	Fort Hood	TX	18 May 2009
10	Fort Lewis-McChord AFB	WA	28 May 2009
11	Fort Riley	KS	23 Jun. 2009
12	Redstone Arsenal (VTC)	AL	15 Jul. 2009
13	State of Maryland (included APG, Bethesda NNMC, and Fort Meade)	MD	28 Jul. 2009

Appendix 4: D-PNA Site Visits

	Base Closure	State	Date of Site Visit
1	NAS Brunswick	ME	21 Jul. 2009
2	Fort Gillem	GA	04 Jun. 2009
3	NS Ingleside	TX	09 Jun. 2009
4	Kansas AAP	KS	23 Jun. 2009
5	Lone Star AAP / Red River AD	TX	10 Jun. 2009
6	Fort McPherson	GA	05 Jun. 2009
7	Fort Monmouth	NJ	20 Aug. 2009
8	Fort Monroe	VA	09 Jul. 2009
9	Riverbank AAP	CA	27 May 2009

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

Appendix 5: G-PNA Changes Resulting from September 2009 Update of March 2009 Data

Changes to March 2009 Snapshot Table 2

Category	Projects Identified	Total Cost of Projects
Communications	1	\$20,000,000
Education	22	\$238,426,091
Energy & Utilities	-	\$-
Planning & Zoning	1	\$650,000
Social	3	\$16,689,631
Transportation	29	\$2,608,988,226
Water & Sewer	3	\$8,154,384
Workforce	2	\$8,500,000
TOTALS	61	\$2,901,408,332

Changes to March 2009 Snapshot Table 3

Category	Projects	Cost of Projects	Funding Available	Funding Gap
Transportation	22	\$770,763,073	\$76,318,250	\$694,444,823
Education	12	\$222,426,831	\$138,060,000	\$84,366,831
Water & Sewer	2	\$4,300,000	\$-	\$4,300,000
Workforce	2	\$8,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$5,000,000
Social	1	\$8,125,000	\$225,000	\$7,900,000
TOTALS	39	\$1,014,114,904	\$218,103,250	\$796,011,654

Changes to March 2009 Snapshot Table 4

Category	Fully-Funded Projects	Cost of Projects
Transportation	15	\$606,421,861
Water & Sewer	2	\$1,275,000
Education	2	\$160,000
Planning & Zoning	1	\$650,000
TOTALS	19	\$608,506,861

September 2009 PNA – Snapshot

Appendix 6: Combined G-PNA and D-PNA “Fundable” Projects

Table 8: Combined G-PNA and D-PNA “Fundable” Projects

Category	Projects	Cost of Projects	Funding Available	Funding Gap
Transportation	85	\$2,855,448,332	\$440,217,619	\$2,415,230,713
Water & Sewer	29	\$172,103,366	\$2,110,000	\$169,993,366
Education	17	\$275,926,831	\$147,160,000	\$128,766,831
Site Work	8	\$59,570,330	\$0	\$59,570,330
Energy & Utilities	7	\$29,737,438	\$0	\$29,737,438
Building Renovation	3	\$101,997,348	\$0	\$101,997,348
Social	3	\$10,757,900	\$225,000	\$10,532,900
Workforce	3	\$14,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$11,000,000
Communications	1	\$300,000	\$0	\$300,000
TOTALS	156	\$3,520,341,545	\$593,212,619	\$2,927,128,926