

Preparation of this report/study cost the Department of Defense a total of approximately \$778,000 in Fiscal Years 2011 - 2012.

Generated on 2012Apr03 1716 RefID: 1-6CB43A8

Submitted by the Secretary of Defense Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness)





### **Foreword**

This is the ninth *Sustainable Ranges Report (SRR) to Congress*, which details how the Department of Defense's (DoD's) actions provide for the long-term sustainability of its training ranges. The Department's Sustainable Ranges Initiative (SRI) is the mechanism by which DoD manages sustainability of its ranges. Although this report focuses on DoD training ranges only, the SRI's efforts are much broader in scope.

In December 2001, the Deputy Secretary of Defense directed the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)), in partnership with the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment (DUSD(I&E)), the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E), and the Military Departments, to form an Integrated Product Team (IPT). The IPT was to act as the coordinating body for all encroachment issues affecting DoD ranges, operating areas (OPAREAs), and other locations where the military trains, tests, or evaluates new weapons and sensors. The result was a broad-based, multi-faceted initiative, now known as the SRI. The goal of the SRI is to address encroachment and range sustainment through policy formulation, programming activities, leadership and organization structuring, legislative and regulatory initiatives, compatible land use activities, engagement and partnering efforts, and comprehensive reporting to Congress.

The SRI reflects DoD's recognition that access to military installations, ranges, OPAREAs, and other lands, seaspace, airspace, and frequency spectrum is essential. Having access to these areas provides soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, and their associated equipment, with the realistic training and testing environments needed to prepare them for the diverse peacetime and wartime missions they support around the globe.

Access to live training and testing resources has been increasingly challenged by several factors, such as urban sprawl, frequency spectrum competition, changing climatic conditions, and national energy needs. These and other factors, collectively known as encroachment, have increasingly impeded the military's ability to use its installations, ranges, airspace, and other OPAREAs to conduct effective and unencumbered training and testing over the past several decades.

Working under the direction of the Senior Readiness Oversight Council (SROC), DoD established the Overarching Integrated Product Team (OIPT). The OIPT is tri-chaired by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Readiness (DASD(R)), the DUSD(I&E), and the Principal Deputy, Operational Test and Evaluation. Its members include senior officials from all of the Military Departments and other related offices within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD). The Working Integrated Product Team (WIPT) is the staff-level working body that supports the OIPT by coordinating and communicating ongoing sustainment activities.

Over the past 10 years, this SROC-led initiative has succeeded in numerous efforts including:

 Issuing new and updated range sustainment policies and guidance

- Developing and implementing an assessment methodology to gauge the health of military ranges in terms of capability attributes and encroachment factors
- Obtaining conservation partnership authority and annual Congressional funding for compatible land use buffers under the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI) program (10 U.S.C. 2684(a))
- ▶ Establishing broad-based partnerships for sustainable planning, including the Southeast Regional Partnership for Planning and Sustainability (SERPPAS) and the Western Regional Partnership (WRP)
- Facilitating the sharing of geographic information systems (GIS) and decision-support information to foster community-driven planning and compatible land use partnerships
- Establishing a DoD Siting Clearinghouse to facilitate fully-coordinated Department positions on the compatibility of proposed projects for energy developers, government agencies, and other concerned parties

Currently, seven specific focus areas established by the OIPT and affirmed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense guide the activities of the SRI. These seven focus areas are:

- Mitigating pressures on training and test activities from competing landspace and seaspace uses
- Addressing frequency spectrum competition
- Meeting military airspace challenges
- Managing increasing military demand for range lands
- Addressing impacts from new energy infrastructure and renewable energy initiatives
- Anticipating climate change initiatives
- Managing current and emerging environmental issues

These focus areas are specifically addressed in Chapter 4, Military Services' Goals and Milestones. As the SRI evolves, it will continue to address DoD's abilities to train, test, and focus on the direction provided by the DASD(R) to sustain the required capabilities.

## **Table of Contents**

| For | reword  | i              |
|-----|---|----------------|
|     |   |                |
| Cha | apter 1: Introduction   | 1              |
| 1.1 | Background  | 2              |
| 1.2 | Legislative Requirements and GAO Comments to the 2011 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges  | 2              |
| 1.3 | Linking the 2012 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges to Other Reporting Requirements   | 3              |
| Cha | apter 2: Current and Future Training Requirements   | 5              |
| 2.1 | Assessing Current and Future Requirements   |                |
| 2.2 | DoD Training Transformation Program   | 8              |
| 2.3 | DoD Training Range and OPAREA Requirements  2.3.1 Army Requirements  2.3.2 Marine Corps Requirements  2.3.3 Navy Requirements  2.3.4 Air Force Requirements | 10<br>15<br>17 |
| Cha | apter 3: Adequacy of Existing Range Resources to Meet Training Requirements   | 23             |
| 3.1 | Assessment Methodology and Examples   | 23<br>24       |

#### **Table of Contents**

| 3.2 | Asses   | ssment Results and Discussions                          | 28  |
|-----|---------|---|-----|
|     | 3.2.1   | Army Assessment Results                                 | 29  |
|     | 3.2.2   | Marine Corps Assessment Results                         | 83  |
|     |         | Navy Assessment Results                                 |     |
|     | 3.2.4   | Air Force Assessment Results                            | 245 |
| 3.3 | Summ    | nary and Conclusion                                     | 387 |
| Cha | noter 4 | 1: Department of Defense's Comprehensive                |     |
|     |         | Training Range Sustainment Plan                         | 389 |
| 4.1 | Mana    | gement Structure  | 389 |
|     |         | Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD)                |     |
|     |         | The Military Services                                   |     |
| 4.2 | Goals   | , Actions, and Milestones                               | 390 |
| 4.3 | Fundi   | ng Requirements   | 403 |
| 4.4 | Partn   | ering and Outreach Initiatives                          | 406 |
|     |         | The Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative   |     |
|     | 4.4.2   | Office of Economic Adjustment Compatible Use Program    | 407 |
|     | 4.4.3   | Education and Engagement                                | 407 |
|     | 4.4.4   | Regional Partnerships                                   | 408 |
|     |         | Engagement for Energy Infrastructure Compatibility      |     |
|     | 4.4.6   | Military Service-Specific Stakeholder Engagement        | 409 |
| 4.5 | Overv   | iew of Legislative and Regulatory Initiatives           | 411 |
| 4.6 |         | ness Reporting Improvements                             |     |
|     |         | The Defense Readiness Reporting System Enterprise       |     |
|     |         | Relationship with Other Readiness Systems               |     |
|     | 4.6.3   | Range Assessment as a Component of DRRS                 | 412 |
| 4.7 | Share   | d Information Enterprise                                | 414 |
| 4.8 | Range   | e Inventory Summary                                     | 414 |
|     |         | Army Range Inventory Description                        |     |
|     |         | Marine Corps Range Inventory Description                |     |
|     |         | Navy Range Inventory Description                        |     |
|     | 4.8.4   | Air Force Range Inventory Description                   | 416 |
| Cha | pter !  | 5: The Way Ahead  | 417 |
| 5.1 | The S   | ustainable Ranges Initiative                            | 417 |
| 5.2 | Comn    | atible Land, Airspace, and Sea Space Use and            |     |
|     |         | gement and Partnering Activities                        | 417 |
| 53  | Usen    | f Range Inventory and Encroachment and Canability Tools | 418 |

| Appendix A: | National Defense Authorization Act Language   | 419 |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Appendix B: | Service Mission Area Descriptions and Definitions   | 421 |
| Appendix C: | Maps and Inventory of Ranges, Range Complexes,<br>Military Training Routes, and Special Use Areas | 425 |
| Appendix D: | Acronym List  | 527 |
| Appendix E: | DoD and Service Sustainable Ranges Policy and Guidance  | 539 |

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank.

## **List of Tables**

| Table 2-1  | Live, Virtual, and Constructive Training                       | 9   |
|------------|--|-----|
| Table 2-2  | Next Generation Army Digital Ranges                            | 12  |
| Table 2-3  | Army Mission Areas   | 15  |
| Table 2-4  | Marine Corps Mission Areas                                     | 17  |
| Table 2-5  | Navy Fleet Response Training Plan Phases                       | 18  |
| Table 2-6  | Navy Mission Areas   | 19  |
| Table 2-7  | Air Force Mission Areas  | 21  |
| Table 3-1  | Army Capability Assessment Data Summary                        | 30  |
| Table 3-2  | Army Encroachment Assessment Data Summary                      | 30  |
| Table 3-3  | Army Range Capability and Encroachment Assessment Comparison   | 80  |
| Table 3-4  | Army Range Mission Description                                 | 82  |
| Table 3-5  | Marine Corps Capability Assessment Data Summary                | 84  |
| Table 3-6  | Marine Corps Encroachment Assessment Data Summary              | 84  |
| Table 3-7  | Marine Corps Capability and Encroachment Assessment Comparison | 126 |
| Table 3-8  | Navy Capability Assessment Data Summary                        | 128 |
| Table 3-9  | Navy Encroachment Assessment Data Summary                      | 128 |
| Table 3-10 | Navy Range Capability and Encroachment Assessment Comparison   | 242 |
| Table 3-11 | Air Force Capability Assessment Data Summary                   | 246 |
| Table 3-12 | Air Force Encroachment Assessment Data Summary                 | 246 |
| Table 3-13 | Air Force Range Capability and Encroachment                    | 384 |

| Table 4-1         | Responsible Training Range Offices within OSD         | 000   |
|-------------------|---|-------|
|                   | and the Military Departments                          |       |
| Table 4-2         | Encroachment Actions and Milestones                   | 391   |
| Table 4-3         | Frequency Spectrum Actions and Milestones             | 394   |
| Table 4-4         | Airspace Actions and Milestones                       | 395   |
| Table 4-5         | Range Space Actions and Milestones                    | 396   |
| Table 4-6         | Energy Actions and Milestones                         | 399   |
| Table 4-7         | Climate Actions and Milestones                        | 401   |
| Table 4-8         | Environmental Stewardship Actions and Milestones      | 401   |
| Table 4-9         | DoD Sustainable Ranges Initiative Funding Categories  | 403   |
| <b>Table 4-10</b> | DoD Training Range Sustainment Funding (\$M)          | 404   |
| <b>Table 4-11</b> | Corrected 2011 Air Force funding projections (\$M)    | 405   |
| Table C-1         | Training Range Complex Inventory                      | 437   |
| Table C-2         | Military Training Route (MTR) Inventory               | 461   |
| Table C-3         | Special Use Airspace (SUA) Inventory                  | 497   |
| Table E-1         | Overarching DoD Range Sustainment Policy and Guidance | 539   |
| Table E-2         | Army Range Sustainment Policy and Guidance            | 540   |
| Table E-3         | Marine Corps Range Sustainment Policy and Guidance    | 540   |
| Table E-4         | Navy Range Sustainment Policy and Guidance            | 541   |
| Table E-5         | Air Force Range Sustainment Policy and Guidance       | . 541 |

viii | **2012** Sustainable Ranges Report May 2012

# **List of Figures**

| Figure 2-1  | Training Requirement and Range Requirement  Development Process            | 6    |
|-------------|--|------|
| Figure 2-2  | Planned DoD 2015 UAS Locations   | 7    |
| Figure 2-3  | Current U.S. JTEN Sites  | 8    |
| Figure 2-4  | The LVC Training Environment   | . 10 |
| Figure 2-5  | Framework for Developing Air Force Infrastructure Requirements             | .20  |
| Figure 2-6  | Linking Training Activities to Air Force Range Infrastructure Requirements | .20  |
| Figure 3-1  | Example Assessment and Analysis  | .26  |
| Figure 3-2  | Army Capability Chart and Scores   | . 31 |
| Figure 3-3  | Army Encroachment Chart and Scores   | . 31 |
| Figure 3-4  | Army Capability Assessments by Range                                       | .32  |
| Figure 3-5  | Army Encroachment Assessments by Range                                     | .32  |
| Figure 3-6  | Army Capability Assessment by Attributes                                   | .32  |
| Figure 3-7  | Army Encroachment Assessment by Factors                                    | .32  |
| Figure 3-8  | Army Capability Assessment by Mission Areas                                | . 32 |
| Figure 3-9  | Army Encroachment Assessment by Mission Areas                              | .32  |
| Figure 3-10 | Army Capability and Encroachment Assessment Detail                         | .36  |
| Figure 3-11 | Marine Corps Capability Chart and Scores                                   | .84  |
| Figure 3-12 | Marine Corps Encroachment Chart and Scores                                 | .84  |
| Figure 3-13 | Marine Corps Capability Assessments by Range                               | .85  |
| Figure 3-14 | Marine Corps Encroachment Assessments by Range                             | .85  |
| Figure 3-15 | Marine Corps Capability Assessment by Attributes                           | .85  |

| Figure 3-16 | Marine Corps Encroachment Assessment by Factors             | 85  |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Figure 3-17 | Marine Corps Capability Assessment by Mission Areas         | 85  |
| Figure 3-18 | Marine Corps Encroachment Assessment by Mission Areas       | 85  |
| Figure 3-19 | Marine Corps Capability and Encroachment Assessment Detail  | 88  |
| Figure 3-20 | Navy Capability Chart and Scores                            | 129 |
| Figure 3-21 | Navy Encroachment Chart and Scores                          | 129 |
| Figure 3-22 | Navy Capability Assessments by Range                        | 130 |
| Figure 3-23 | Navy Encroachment Assessments by Range                      | 130 |
| Figure 3-24 | Navy Capability Assessment by Attributes                    | 130 |
| Figure 3-25 | Navy Encroachment Assessment by Factors                     | 130 |
| Figure 3-26 | Navy Capability Assessment by Mission Areas                 | 131 |
| Figure 3-27 | Navy Encroachment Assessment by Mission Areas               | 131 |
| Figure 3-28 | Navy Capability and Encroachment Assessment Detail          | 136 |
| Figure 3-29 | Air Force Capability Chart and Scores                       | 247 |
| Figure 3-30 | Air Force Encroachment Chart and Scores                     | 247 |
| Figure 3-31 | Air Force Capability Assessments by Range                   | 248 |
| Figure 3-32 | Air Force Encroachment Assessments by Range                 | 248 |
| Figure 3-33 | Air Force Capability Assessment by Attributes               | 249 |
| Figure 3-34 | Air Force Encroachment Assessment by Factors                | 249 |
| Figure 3-35 | Air Force Capability Assessment by Mission Areas            | 249 |
| Figure 3-36 | Air Force Encroachment Assessment by Mission Areas          | 249 |
| Figure 3-37 | Air Force CSE Airspace Status as of 8 August 2011           | 251 |
| Figure 3-38 | Air Force Flight Scheduler Process Flow                     | 251 |
| Figure 3-39 | Air Force Capability and Encroachment Assessment Detail     | 254 |
| Figure 4-1  | REPI Funds Leveraged through 2011                           | 406 |
| Figure 4-2  | Planned RAM Cross Domain Solution in DRRS                   | 412 |
| Figure 4-3  | Title 10 and Policy Drivers for Range Readiness Reporting   | 413 |
| Figure C-1  | DoD Regional Range Complexes: Northeast                     | 427 |
| Figure C-2  | DoD Regional Range Complexes: Mid-Atlantic                  | 428 |
| Figure C-3  | DoD Regional Range Complexes: Southeast                     | 429 |
| Figure C-4  | DoD Regional Range Complexes: Northwest                     | 430 |
| Figure C-5  | DoD Regional Range Complexes: Southwest                     | 431 |
| Figure C-6  | DoD Regional Range Complexes: Midwest                       | 432 |
| Figure C-7  | DoD Regional Range Complexes: Alaska                        | 433 |
| Figure C-8  | DoD Regional Range Complexes: Hawaii                        | 434 |
| Figure C-9  | DoD Regional Range Complexes: Europe                        | 435 |
| Figure C-10 | DoD Regional Range Complexes: West Pacific and Indian Ocean | 436 |