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FOREWORD

The enclosed Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis of Monterey County, CA military installations and activities is a deliverable under the City of Monterey contract, dated July 16, 2015, with Public Private Solutions Group, Inc. (PPSG). The contract was executed by the City to promote military related interests in California and Monterey County.

PPSG, Inc. is a small consulting firm headquartered in Alexandria, VA, that focuses on Department of Defense (DoD) military installation infrastructure and base realignment and closure (BRAC) issues. The firm has conducted SWOT analyses of numerous military installations of all military Services across the country. Below is the project’s contracted Scope of Work.

1. Scope of Work:
This Scope of Work outlines the regional demand for a comprehensive Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis for Monterey County Military Installations and the associated facilities and missions. Monterey County Installations include:

1. Presidio of Monterey, home to the Defense Language Institute (DLI), the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC), and the Defense Personnel and Security Research Center (PERSEREC).
2. Naval Support Activity Monterey, home to the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS), Naval Research Laboratory (NRL), and the Fleet Numerical Meteorology & Oceanography Center.
3. Fort Hunter Liggett, home to the US Army Reserve's largest installation.
4. Camp Roberts, home to the California Army National Guard, and a US Army Satellite Communications facility (SATCOM).
5. Ord Military Community and former Fort Ord National Guard and US Army Reserve Centers.

The selected firm will provide specialized consulting services to include, but not limited to, the following:

1.1. A comprehensive report applying 2005 Department of Defense (DoD) Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) analyses and currently available DoD budget and planning data to provide insight into 2005 BRAC installation grades and implications to assess potential actions in a future BRAC round. Analysis will focus on DOD Services and related processes used to assess Monterey installations. Potential competitor installations/missions will be identified and incorporated in this analysis.

The BRAC 2005 joint, functional analysis process will be evaluated as a part of this SWOT effort. Specific task elements will include:

1.1.1. A review and analysis of appropriate BRAC 2005 process and DoD, Service and Joint Cross Service Group (JCSG) installation evaluations;
1.1.2. Contrasting comparative listing of the evaluation criteria, metrics and weighting for the appropriate Services' and JCSG Military Value assessment by installation;
1.1.3. Identification how the installations and activities were graded against the installation/activity evaluation elements;
1.1.4. Report demonstrating the Military Value score placement for Monterey's Military Installations and Associated Facilities against competitors;
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1.1.5. Assessment defining metrics/measures used that incorrectly, inappropriately or improperly assessed/applied the intended evaluation elements and how those metrics impacted overall grading;

1.1.6. Identification of evaluation weighting that incorrectly biased assessments toward or away from higher Military Value;

1.1.7. Analysis of evaluation elements that may or do inherently bias grading/scoring negatively from support installations;

1.1.8. Identify and describe capacity issues, within activities and the host region, that may enable or inhibit mission growth; and

1.1.9. Recommend strategies to improve scoring in weak areas if similar analysis is used in future BRAC processes.

1.2. Update the 2005 BRAC analysis and data to reflect known BRAC and program changes to establish a current analysis baseline.

1.2.1 Identify and describe current Monterey Installation Strengths, competitive advantages, and opportunities.

1.2.2 Identify and describe current Monterey Installation weaknesses and vulnerabilities.

1.3. Complete an evaluation applying notional Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) cost modeling to assess the financial impacts of strengths, weaknesses and/or opportunities identified in the SWOT analysis.

1.4. Assess potential implications from, and the interactions between, recent policy initiatives/indications, studies and documents to include:

1.4.1. Federal Deficit Reduction Efforts;

1.4.2. Administration/SECDEF DoD mission and capabilities strategic guidance;

1.4.3. 2010 Strategic Posture Review;

1.4.4. 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review;

1.4.5. Increased use of simulation in military training; and the emergence of machine language translation capabilities;

1.4.6. Changes in defense-related, private sector business strategies;

1.4.7. 2012 NPS Inspector General Report and related response;

1.4.8. Monterey Military Installations 2010-2014 Budget/manpower reductions;

1.4.9. NPS 2008 Strategic Plan and 2012 Futures Report;

1.4.10. NPS Board of Visitors Reports 2008-2014 and the Naval Support Activity Monterey Installation Master Plan; and

1.4.11. The DLI Strategic Plan and Installation Master Plan.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Monterey Military Activities presence on the Monterey Peninsula is the result of links to mission and geographic imperatives and invaluable mission synergy relationships. Some of these relationships were determined at the time the missions were originally sited in the region; others have grown from successful collaborations and adaptions to DoD requirements and world events; and powerful synergies that, if broken, would prevent/significantly impaire the ability of the remaining organizations to accomplish their missions. The following chart depicts representative support, synergistic and/or relationships between these military installations/activities.

### Representative Monterey Military Activities Support and Synergy Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POM</th>
<th>DLI</th>
<th>DMDC</th>
<th>NSAM</th>
<th>NPS</th>
<th>NRL</th>
<th>FNMOC</th>
<th>Camp Roberts</th>
<th>Fort Hunter Liggett</th>
<th>DRMI</th>
<th>OMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POM</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMDC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRL</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hunter Liggett</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Executive Summary consists of two (2) parts.* The first is this short overview of global issues. The specific Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) are summarized in Appendix 3 based on the volume of material associated with the Monterey Military Activities. The SWOT are discussed in greater detail in Section 5 of the SWOT Report that addresses the complexity of each installation/activity mission and how they support, and are supported by others and their intellectual and physical resources and mission requirements. From a SWOT perspective, the Monterey Military Activities must also be considered within the context of State SWOT since the location, environment, education, healthcare, economic, demographic, academic and other attributes of California contribute to, or inhibit, the ability to address individual installation/activity SWOT. The Team believes that California General SWOT are important considerations to ensure the proper context is used for assessing the Monterey Military Activities that are also included in Appendix 3 and discussed in greater detail in the SWOT Analysis, Section 4.

The analysis underscores strong State and regional support to Monterey Peninsula’s DoD installations and activities. Importantly, it also provides insight into the close, cooperative and powerfully-synergistic relationships between several of the activities. The SWOT Analysis can be the foundation for developing advocacy strategies.
that not only enhance the long-term sustainability of the activities, but also leverages physical assets and human capital to provide DoD and the Services greater efficiencies and increase contributions to Joint warfighters, the region and State.

The Team concludes there are numerous reasons Monterey’s Military Activities could potentially thrive, not just survive, in a future Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process, but that those reasons are unlikely to be known by a widespread audience. Many of the uninformed could be the analysts and decision makers in the next BRAC round. Simply stated, the most powerful advocacy arguments for the Peninsula’s military activities do not appear to have been developed and widely distributed. While there are institutional, organizational and structural DoD and Service challenges that must be addressed in the weaknesses and threats, the most powerful are the failure to clearly articulate the importance of the Monterey Military Activities’ missions and why they must be accomplished on the Monterey Peninsula. In previous BRAC processes, the region prevailed by developing compelling explanations “on the fly” for potentially affected activities and presenting them to a BRAC Commission Delegation. Since there is no guarantee such an ad hoc strategy will be successful in the future, developing the informational and advocacy materials — and using them to educate and influence potential staff and decision makers prior to announcement of another BRAC round appears prudent.

To assist, the Team has included recommendations in this analysis for how Monterey County, the City of Monterey, regional stakeholders and/or the leadership of Monterey’s Military Activities should cooperatively engage and collaborate to leverage strengths, mitigate weaknesses, exploit opportunities and defend against threats. A compilation of the recommendations is included in Appendix 3. While the individual recommendations are discrete executables, implementing those selected for execution requires a regional and multidiscipline organization based on the significant overlaps of interest and responsibility. Execution is further complicated by the need to integrate the interests and organizations from multiple cities and counties, the State, private sector and public stakeholders, academic institutions, installations, military departments, DoD and other Federal agencies and customers. Consideration should be given to adapting the Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) implementation model to create a “Policy Committee” guiding overall efforts aligned with a strategic vision and a “Technical Committee” of subject matter experts responsible for marshalling resources for “Working Groups” charged with executing recommendations. The number and composition of Working Groups would be dependent upon the number of recommendations selected for concurrent execution.

Recommend the City and County of Monterey develop a regional support group to oversee and manage the execution of recommendations selected for implementation. The organization must be able to represent the multiple jurisdictions and stakeholders’ interests necessary to execute the selected recommendations. (I)

Purpose

The City of Monterey (“City”) contracted with Public Private Solutions Group, Inc. (“PPSG/Contractor”) to perform a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis of Monterey County, CA (“County”) military installations and activities. The City initiated the contract to promote the military and economic related interests of the Monterey region.
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Methodology

PPSG considered previous analyses performed for the State of California during an approximate 3½ year work effort following the BRAC 1995 Commission process and support to the City during the BRAC 1995 process and an approximate 10-year period culminating in support during the 2005 BRAC process. The analysis considered:

- **Strengths** as attributes that increased the “military value” (MV), the most important evaluation criteria set for DoD analysis. Four (4) of the eight (8) selection criteria used in previous BRAC assessments were designed to permit a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the relative MV of DoD installations. The strengths identified for California and each of Monterey Military Activities are not all-inclusive, but highlight those that the Team feels are significant in contributing to a future MV analysis.

- **Weaknesses** as those characteristics or conditions that act opposite to strengths in that they can possibly offset or reduce the strong characteristics of its military installations. As with the strengths, the weaknesses are not all inclusive, but do include the most significant considerations based on the assumption a future BRAC process – like all of the former ones – will adopt selection criteria similar to those used in the preceding BRAC rounds.

- **Opportunities** as actions that can be taken by the State, County and City of Monterey, Monterey Military Activities and academic and private sector partners to leverage strengths and mitigate weaknesses. In most cases, the opportunities are installation/activity-specific; however, there are those that can apply individually or collectively to Monterey Military Activities.

- **Threats** as DoD policies, Congressional actions, organizational structure and anticipated changes, economic, philosophical and any internal or external considerations that represent significant pressures on the sustainability of missions or installations/activities. Unaddressed, the identified threats could serve as the foundation for closure or realignment actions.

The current SWOT analysis assessed the potential impacts of proposed force structure adjustments included in the Administration’s budget submissions; current National Security Strategy policies and priorities; DoD force structure, weapon systems, budget projections and vision for the future of military installations; emphasis areas of DoD’s investments and strategic vision, including organizational streamlining and reductions in civilian manpower; California’s business, demographic and educational environments; private sector business trends; and compatibility of additional DoD missions with those assigned to the Monterey region. DoD data and analytical tools were used to ensure the SWOT was prepared from a “DoD perspective.” The SWOT analysis addresses only those issues the Team identified as possibly affecting a high level of DoD and/or Service decision making. While there are numerous local issues that arise periodically, capture public attention and generate strong emotions, most are not significant enough to impact DoD or Service decision making.

The research and analysis focused on the missions, capacity, and applicable SWOT based on currently available information. The assessment is intended to provide cold-eye, objective observations of the installation’s SWOT; therefore, advocacy and informational documents prepared to support missions or installations/activities were considered, but not used as foundational materials for the analysis.
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Context

The operational and fiscal environments for DoD activities and installations have changed significantly since the 1990s and the completion of BRAC 2005 actions in September 2011. In recent years, the types and rates of change in military missions and installations accelerated as DoD focused on transforming its force structure while simultaneously conducting Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) that were essentially ended in Iraq, but subsequently increased to address the Islamic State of Iraq (ISIS) threat, and reduced to very low levels in Afghanistan. The reductions in OCO activities and the Nation’s financial crisis that began in late 2008 have caused significant reductions in current and projected DoD budget resources, and all Military Departments are completing actions to reduce force structure, weapon systems and expenditures.

In an environment of declining budgets and personnel; shifting strategic focus and rebalancing force structure; reorganization of combat units; and recapitalization of equipment and weapons systems, DoD and Service leaders are increasingly receptive to “new ideas,” that may offer opportunities to forward thinking states, regions and communities. The future impacts from the give-and-take of defense priorities and investments cannot be reliably projected, but engaging the Services and DoD in ways that help them address difficult and complex challenges is essential to sustaining Monterey County’s military installations as “go-to activities” for the Services and DoD.

Organization


In addition to the installation/activity SWOT, the Consultant Team (“Team”) identified California General SWOT. A series of tables in Appendix 3 identifies and summarizes both the California General and the installation/activity specific SWOT. They are organized with the California SWOT first (“California SWOT”) followed by the installation/activity SWOT.
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