AMERICA'S ARMY:
THE STRENGTH OF THE NATION

Capacity Analyses:
Parametric vs Facility Approaches

- The Army conducted a "Facility Capacity Analysis," which showed an Army-wide excess capacity of 18% (490K AC) and 21% (450K AC) by FY19.
- The Army conducted a "Parametric Capacity Analysis," using a methodology used in 1998 and 2004 by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, as well as the Air Force. Showed Army-wide excess capacity of 33% (450K AC in FY19) and 29% (562K AC in FY12).
- Both methods have advantages & disadvantages. **Both show the Army has too much excess capacity**.

Feature	Facility Approach	Parametric Approach
Overall Method	Requirements Based. Analyzes the difference between projected quantities of facility types, to the projected requirements. Each instance where assets exceed requirements, produces an excess capacity square footage result.	Pure Capacity Based. Analyzes installations by type, using "base loading" ratios of infrastructure to force structure, and compares those to a 1989 baseline. Assumes that bases were optimally loaded in 1989. Produces a result in 'excess bases' by category
Unit of Measure	Vertical facilities (square footage) only. Analyzed 8 facility category groups (Operations, maintenance/production, RDT&E, Supply & Storage, Medical, Admin, Housing/Community, and Utilities).	Installations or bases are grouped into 9 predominant types (Admin, Depots, Other Industrial Base, Major Training – Active, Maneuver, RDT&E, etc) with a ratio using one metric of infrastructure compared to one metric of force structure.
Installations and Infrastructure Analyzed	Analyzed all installations world-wide, excluding the Army National Guard. ARNG infrastructure serves more than a Title 10 purpose and as such, is inherently dispersed, making apples-to-apples comparisons very problematic.	Limited to installations inside the US. Also excluded the ARNG for same reason as Facility Approach. Installations that did not fit into any category, were not analyzed. (EX: GOCO facilities)
Advantages	Analyzes the main facility types for all AC and USAR installations. Most BOS and SRM costs are concentrated at buildings on the cantonment areas. More realistic in how an actual BRAC would be conducted, since requirements drive many of the potential recommendations.	Recognizes that requirements change, are inherently subjective, and can sometimes be mitigated. A purer capacity analysis can help reveal how much infrastructure is being retained because of policy choices (i.e., 1+1 barracks standard and 162 SF/person admin space standard).
Limitations	Not particularly helpful in understanding excess capacity in unique facility types lacking published standards like the organic industrial base, training & testing land, medical, and RDT&E labs.	Ignoring all requirements is not realistic. Fails to properly recognize the multi-functional nature of Army installations (i.e., Ft Bragg hosts admin as well as operational units). 1989 baseline data is no longer readily available, limiting analysis options.