

Utah Defense Alliance Board of Directors Meeting  
May 21, 2014, 7:30 a.m.  
Minutes

**Welcome Board Members:** Tage Flint

**Approval of Last Meeting Minutes — Board Action:** Motion to approve the minutes of February 19, 2014: Louenda Downs, 2<sup>nd</sup> Mike Bouwhuis, the vote was unanimous.

**Report on the Comparison Study of DoD Depots by LSI Study:**

**Bottom Line:**

1. Hill AFB and its depot operation ranked #1 overall against the Critical Study Components criteria.
2. Size Matters - ability to absorb additional workload
3. AF Depots have distinct advantage
4. Aviation Depot Maintenance Capability
5. Depots compared against OO-ALC's current (and contemplated) product mix
6. Existing and enduring Joint (inter-service) workloads
7. Projected workload gains/losses based on published force structure changes
8. Cost/Rate Differentials - where available & relevant
9. Unique capabilities - Range availability, T&E capability, etc.

**CSC 1 – Critical Study Components:**

- a) The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department of Defense, including the impact on joint war fighting, training and readiness. Use current QDR data in making this assessment.

**Recommendations:**

- Focus on gaining additional software workload through increased infrastructure and capacity
- Build on F-35 repair assignment to prepare for interservice fighter aircraft and component workload opportunities
- Pursue workload associated with unmanned aerial systems
- Create capacity in key repair areas to position the Air Logistics Complex to accept additional workload
- Facilitate a common and united approach by all ALCs to prepare for potential workload consolidation under BRAC

**CSC 2 -** The availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.

**Recommendations:**

- Showcase UTTR capability to support USAF, Joint, and multinational training; test requirements for new weapons and weapon systems; and UAS operations within UTTR's controlled airspace.

**CSC 3 - The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements to support operations and training**

**Recommendations:**

- Maintain vigilance to prevent encroachment issues from becoming a limiting factor for base operations, mission changes, and workload growth
- UDA and Hill AFB should ensure robust capabilities based on:
  1. A highly trained (current) workforce
  2. Modern facilities, available capacity
  3. Investment in plant and equipment recapitalization
  4. Ensuring ready access to a skilled labor (future) base supplied through local universities and applied technical colleges

**CSC 4 - The cost of operating the installation and manpower implications. Specifically address the cost of depot operations using approved Department of Defense comparison methodologies**

**Recommendations:**

- Facilitate an aggressive strategy with the community and Hill AFB to reduce infrastructure costs through Public-Public/Public-Private partnership (P4) implementation
- Focus on reducing operational costs by reducing overhead, improving process efficiency, and increasing throughput to position the OO-ALC to generate capacity without additional infrastructure costs
- The UDA should advocate and the OO-ALC should pursue additional work and missions for assignment to Hill AFB, helping reduce overhead costs and increase competitiveness for future defense work

**CSC 5 - The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed cost**

**Recommendations:**

- Work closely with OO-ALC to ensure appropriate capacity is reported

**CSC 6 - The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of the military installation**

**Recommendations:**

- UDA advocate the use of a market-based economic impact methodology to assess an installation's true impact, which normalizes the outcome and prevents impact escalation by individual communities

**CSC 7 - The ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel. Include an assessment of the value of the Falcon Hill Development in this area**

**Recommendations:**

- Engage local communities and State officials to address the area's ranking in key factors such as education, medical, and cost of living
- To fully realize the benefits of Falcon Hill, UDA must engage:
  1. Utah's Congressional Delegation, State and Local elected officials to advocate the vision and benefits of Falcon Hill, and address lack of proactive support from USAF, particularly the Air Force Civil Engineering Center (AFCEC)
  2. USAF leadership to advocate the vision and benefits of Falcon Hill, and address lack of proactive support from AFCEC
  3. Davis/Weber Chambers to ensure continued state and local business community support for Falcon Hill
  4. Sunset Ridge Development Partners to address the high price of office space in Falcon Hill

**CSC 8** - The environmental impact, including the costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance

**Recommendations:**

- Facilitate cooperation among local and state regulators, private industry, and public entities to ensure proactive management of all aspects of environmental compliance and air attainment
- Advocate communication among communities to mitigate environmental impacts related to BRAC-and mission-driven changes to ensure acceptance and prevent restrictions
- UDA support and advocate Hill AFB's MILCON efforts to execute a comprehensive upgrade of the Industrial Water Treatment Plant (IWTP)

**CSC 9** - The study will include two excursions involving potential future mission assignments to Hill AFB. Evaluate the impact on each criteria of: (a) relocating Utah Air National Guard activities currently located at Salt Lake International Airport to Hill AFB and; (b) establishing a National Security Agency Personnel Center at Hill AFB

**Recommendations:**

- Relocating Utah Air National Guard activities
  1. Gain support and approval for the unit's move from State of Utah, USAF, and NGB leadership and their staffs
  2. Prepare the detailed Integrated Master Plan and Integrated Master Schedule necessary to effect the unit's move
  3. Develop and gain support for financing the unit's move through State and private sector means, to include the construction of facilities and support capabilities on Hill AFB
- Establishing a National Security Agency Center
  1. Engage with the NSA and Hill AFB leadership to support continued definition and development of this initiative

**CSC 10** - The final report will include a ranking of each selected location against each of the eight closure criteria, along with an assessment of Hill AFB's strengths and weaknesses and what can be done to improve the overall ranking of the base and the surrounding community

**Summary:**

- Active political and community advocacy in Washington, DC has entered every BRAC round, and can be a significant factor in the comparison study analysis
- OO-ALC lags in terms of advocacy, ranking 6th overall
- Bases/Industrial installations will benefit from a strong Congressional and Community advocacy strategy

**Recommendation:**

- UDA needs to develop and execute political and community advocacy to address weaknesses in Washington, DC engagement

**Wrap-up:**

- Hill AFB and its depot operation ranked #1 overall against the Critical Study Components criteria

**However...Base and Community leaders must:**

1. Be vigilant to prevent encroachment issues from becoming a limiting factor
2. Emphasize and ensure robust growth capacity and capability
3. Focus on reducing operational costs
4. Foster partnering through the P4 initiative on opportunities to reduce Base Operating Support costs
5. Broker a unified strategy/approach to BRAC industrial input with AFSC and surrounding communities

6. Recognize the political aspect of BRAC and focus on strengthening the support and influence for Hill AFB in Washington, D.C.

The Executive Committee will now review the information provided by LSI and make its recommendations to the full board. The complete power point presentation is available upon request.

#### **UPCOMING EVENTS OF INTEREST**

June 18-19, Focus on Defense Forum and AEF Charity Golf Tournament

June 28-29, Air Show

August 20, UDA Board of Directors Meeting

September 2, Commander's Cup Golf Tournament

November 19 UDA Annual Board of Directors Meeting

**Those in attendance:** Collette Mercier, Vickie McCall, Pat Condon, John Bahney, Mike Pavich, Brian Tarbet, Dell Smith, Brian Garrett, Louenda Downs, Gary Harter, Bob Stevenson, Tage Flint, Kevin Sullivan, Mark Shepherd, Peter Jenks, Mike Bouwhuis, Ron Richins, Ted Frederick, Gary Carney, Dave Ayala, Garry Richey, Kylee Smith, Kori Ann Edwards. Mark Johnson, Josh Johnson, Ross Marshall, Colton Miles, Ryan Wilcox, Mike Jensen, Jim Sutton  
Detlef Galke.