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PRIORITIZATION OF ARMY STRATEGIC MOBILITY PROGRAM RESOURCES
(PASMPR)

CHAPTER 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1-1. PROBLEM. In order to maintain an emphasis on power projection, it is necessary to have objective decision support tools to assist in determining relative priorities of initiatives proposed under the Army Strategic Mobility Program (ASMP) and competing for available resources as funding increments or decrements occur.

1-2. OBJECTIVE. The aim of this study is to develop and demonstrate such a decision support tool utilizing a methodology which incorporates cost-benefit tradeoff analysis in evaluation of the various ASMP initiatives.

1-3. BACKGROUND. With the intent to improve and maintain readiness, the ASMP is a set of tasks and initiatives designed to ensure the deployment of Army forces in the fastest and most efficient manner possible. The ASMP was developed as a response to deployment lessons learned in DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM with projects scoped in conjunction with requirements from the Congressionally-mandated Mobility Requirements Study (MRS).

1-4. SCOPE

a. Scenario/Forces. The scenarios and resulting force structure of the MRS are utilized for the demonstration (proof of principle) case. However, both the methodology and resulting model are robust enough to accommodate future scenarios and force structures.

b. Theater. Southwest Asia (Iraq), as represented in the MRS scenario, is the theater chosen for the demonstration case. It was found to be a sufficiently large test case to stress the model.

c. Timeframe. This analysis mirrors the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) cycle, fiscal year (FY) 96-FY 01.

d. Model Size

(1) Variables. There are over 500 initiatives in the ASMP, currently aggregated into 37 packages. Units are also aggregated, consisting of 15 packages varying in size from brigade slices to Corps Support Command (COSCOM). For purposes of the demonstration, 15 unit packages are currently being modeled.

(2) Mixed Integer Program. The result of the aggregation and packaging of the data is a mixed integer program (MIP) with 480 noninteger variables, 704 constraints, and 338 integer variables.
1-5. LIMITATIONS

a. Funding patterns are limited to contiguous years.

b. Partial funding is not allowed.

c. Appropriations are evenly distributed over the 6-year POM cycle due to the lack of annual program data at the time the prototype was developed.

1-6. KEY ASSUMPTIONS

a. The scenarios and forces used are adequate to measure the effectiveness of candidate ASMP initiatives.

b. The relative unit importance weights are assumed to reflect decision maker positions as seen in the Time-Phased Force Deployment Data (TPFDD) for the given scenario, further structured by actual simulation results which measure outcomes as a function of arrival schedules. This analysis provides a means of modeling the effect of units with untimely arrivals.

c. The effectiveness data used will reasonably assess and express the effects of implementing the proposed ASMP initiatives on closure times of Army units, given a specific scenario and force structure.

d. Aggregation of initiatives is adequate to capture the decision space.

e. Railcars and containers are not procured until infrastructures are completed for the same location due primarily to concerns over the cost of leasing storage space.

1-7. METHODOLOGY. This methodology incorporates a value added paradigm for optimizing funding strategies across mobilization projects.

a. Identify the data needs associated with each ASMP initiative examined and those units to be affected.

b. Determine the level of aggregation required for both initiatives and units.

c. Develop a MIP to serve as the basis of a decision support tool. The resulting model utilizes cost-benefit tradeoff analyses, maximizing the benefit to affected units, subject to constraints on resource allocation, procurement quantities, funding strategies, and required unit arrival times.

d. Demonstrate the use of the methodology using the 37 initiative packages and 15 unit packages.

1-8. ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF ANALYSIS (EEA)
1-8. ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF ANALYSIS (EEA)

a. Does the proposed mathematical programming formulation satisfy the analytical requirements of this study at the required level of sensitivity? Yes. It is imperative that, when looking at dissimilar classes of ASMP initiatives, there is a common unit of measure that can be applied across all projects regardless of whether one is looking at prepositioned (PREPO) afloat or a depot railyard upgrade. The measure chosen for this analysis is the days of improvement in meeting a required closure date. This common measure of effectiveness (MOE) enables the employment of cost effectiveness tradeoff analysis as an integral feature of the formulation. The single greatest advantage of this approach is that it addresses the two major concerns of the ASMP program managers: what does the Army gain, and is the ASMP within budget? Sensitivity in this case relates to the level of aggregation at which questions may be addressed. This issue is addressed as a separate EEA (see 1-7b).

b. What level of aggregation yields results that are relevant to the issues and concerns being addressed by ASMP decision makers? As is clearly shown in the proof of principle illustrated in Chapter 4, an installation-level aggregation is not sufficiently detailed to answer the questions relevant to the ASMP decision makers. One is forced to evaluate tradeoffs among entire installation packages of ASMP projects and is not able to look at the more interesting questions of what to fund within an installation's requests. Therefore, in order to provide the best information possible, one would prefer to have data on each initiative, or as a minimum requirement, for each functional grouping of initiatives at a particular location, i.e., rail vs air. Neither course, however, was available at the time of this analysis due to the lack of data at that level of detail.

c. What is the allocation of available ASMP funds to the proposed initiatives which best enables the realization of overall force closure objectives? The proof of principle demonstrates that it is possible to use this methodology to develop a funding allocation plan for the period of the POM. Table 4-1, Chapter 4, lists the year(s) in which funding would occur during the program for each initiative.

d. If budgetary limits are relaxed or tightened, what is the allocation of ASMP funds to the proposed initiatives which best enables the realization of overall force closure objectives? The mathematical programming (MP) model is sensitive to changes in the ASMP budget and is therefore a useful tool for the evaluation of the effect budget variations have on force closure. The suggested funding allocations derived in the proof of principle for both a 60 percent and an 80 percent of budget case are also included in Table 4-1.

1-9. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

a. Due to its modular approach, the PASMPR methodology is robust. As better sources of data are found, individual modules can be modified if necessary, having a minimal impact on the optimization module. Furthermore, if the required data can be obtained, formulations have been developed that will better address the concerns of decision makers.
c. The capability to model the effect of an initiative’s relationship with another initiative has been successfully demonstrated in the solution set.

d. More detailed information is needed regarding the sequential nature of initiatives and the benefits attained by implementation of initiatives.

e. Information is needed that identifies previously made decisions. In other words, which initiatives will be funded based on factors external to this analysis? The answer to this and other such questions needs to be better defined. Less aggregate data is required to make the solution set more meaningful to decision makers.

f. The result of the aggregation of almost 500 initiatives into 37 packages and force structure for two theaters into 15 unit packages is a mixed integer program with 480 noninteger variables, 704 constraints, and 338 integer variables. This configuration runs in only a few minutes on an RS6000 model 590. The implication of this quick turnaround time is that larger, less aggregate data sets are possible, as are responsive, timely replies to the sponsors requests for excursions.

g. The results are limited by the availability and quality of data on the expected benefit of each ASMP initiative or initiative package. Overaggregation of data severely inhibits the ability of the methodology to provide level of tradeoff analyses required by decision makers.

h. Less aggregate data is required to make the solution set more meaningful to decision makers. The required information should most logically come from the installations and units themselves. SAMSONITE, a separate QRA, has been undertaken to determine the availability of this information.
CHAPTER 2

INTRODUCTION

2-1. OVERVIEW

a. The primary purpose of this chapter is to provide a discussion of the background which influenced the conduct of the PASMPR Study. Additionally, this chapter provides a discussion of the limitations and assumptions which impact this effort and a brief overview of the methodology developed and its potential uses.

b. The PASMPR Study was undertaken to provide decision support analysis and to assist Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (ODCSLOG) in developing their ASMP input to the POM. The study focused on the development of a methodology and mathematical model for producing optimal funding streams for the ASMP initiatives.

2-2. BACKGROUND

a. As of the 1990 implementation of the Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Agreement with the Soviet Union, the US Army has significantly reduced its forward-deployed force on the European continent. The resulting shift in strategy from containment by large forward-deployed forces to a smaller forward presence implies a heavy reliance on improved mobilization and deployment capability.¹

b. With the intent to improve and maintain readiness, the Army Strategic Mobility Program is a set of tasks and initiatives designed to ensure the deployment of Army forces in the fastest and most efficient manner possible. The Congressionally-mandated Mobility Requirements Study which is the basis of the ASMP suggests that “to meet the total mobility requirement” as determined in that analysis, the following components are required to achieve an integrated mobility plan:²

(1) Acquisition of additional sealift capacity.

(2) Acquisition and deployment of PREPO afloat Army combat and combat support equipment.

(3) Additional surge sealift capability.

(4) Expansion and modernization of the Ready Reserve Force (RRF).

(5) Develop new concepts to reduce the cost of required sealift capacity.

(6) Continue the C-17 program.
(7) Improve components of the continental United States (CONUS) transportation network to include such items as additional heavylift railcars and rail outloading capacity, increased use of containerization, development of a west coast ammunition loading facility, negotiation of additional berthing at loading ports, legislation to ensure required use of ports, and improved readiness of transportation terminal units (TTUs).

c. The ASMP serves as the basis for acquisition of transportation assets and systems, as well as providing for the enhancement of CONUS infrastructure crucial to timely deployability. The program supports, integrates, and builds upon the recommendations of the MRS.

2-3. PROBLEM

a. In order to maintain an emphasis on power projection, it is necessary to have objective decision support tools to assist in determining the relative priorities of the hundreds of initiatives proposed under the ASMP and competing for available resources. Recognizing that the decision maker should have the information available to be able to weigh the advantages of funding one initiative (or package of initiatives) over another, the United States Army Concepts Analysis Agency (CAA) was asked to design a methodology to assist in producing and evaluating alternative procurement plans. CAA's primary objectives in building a tool to support ODCSLOG in the POM building process were to:

(1) Design a mathematical programming model which will find the set of initiatives that is most effective at improving mobilization timelines within budgetary constraints.

(2) Determine the data requirements and coordinate with US Army Logistics Evaluation Agency (USALEA) to provide initiative, unit, and cost data.

(3) Develop a methodology to measure the relative importance of unit packages, recognizing in the model that some unit closures are more critical than others.

(4) Demonstrate the model developed using MRS Southwest Asia (SWA) data provided by USALEA.

(5) Develop the capability to support ODCSLOG, DALO-TZM, in the POM building process.

(6) Provide sensitivity analysis on the effect of budgetary constraints for demonstration data, and POM data, if available.

b. In 1994, USALEA was originally tasked by ODCSLOG (DALO-TSM), the sponsor's representative, to perform an ASMP funding prioritization and decision process study. CAA began working in conjunction with USALEA, directing efforts at developing a methodology that would address the key issues of concern to decision makers. In 1995, at the sponsor's request, a revised study directive was written, with CAA taking the lead and USALEA continuing their efforts developing the project and unit data bases.
2-4. **METHODOLOGY.** The following critical elements of the PASMPR methodology are described in detail in Chapter 3.

a. Identify the data needs associated with each ASMP initiative examined and those units to be affected.

b. Determine the level of aggregation appropriate for both initiatives and units.

c. Develop a MIP to serve as the basis of a decision support tool. The resulting model utilizes cost-benefit tradeoff analyses, maximizing the benefit to affected units, subject to constraints on resource allocation, procurement quantities, funding strategies, and required unit arrival times.

d. Demonstrate the use of the methodology using the 37 initiative packages and 15 unit packages.

2-5. **SUMMARY.** This chapter presented an overview of the issues that led to the initiation of the PASMPR Study, the objectives of the development effort, and an outline of the methodology. Chapter 3 provides a detailed explanation of the methodology. Chapter 4 describes the demonstration case and details the results of that proof of principle application of the methodology. Special attention may be given to the two appendices which illustrate the ASMP initiatives and unit packages data (see Appendix G and Appendix H).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3-1. GENERAL. This methodology incorporates a Value Added paradigm for optimizing funding strategies across mobilization projects. The approach is modular: each module performs a distinct function. Depending upon the analytical requirements established by the issue to be examined, various tools can be used to perform the required function.

Figure 3-1. Value Added Paradigm for ASMP Resourcing--Flow Diagram

a. Issue Definition Module. The purpose of the Issue Definition Module is to refine the problem and its associated elements to be studied so that the data collection and analysis efforts can be focused on the questions and issues of interest to decision makers. This process continues for the duration of the study. At a minimum, this process establishes the general context of the study, the allowable level of aggregation of both units and initiatives, as well as the timeframe and scenario of interest. As visualized, issue definition is an ongoing process. Beginning with scoping of the study and culminating in a definition of the issues and questions to be addressed, the feedback loop encourages fine tuning of the process. It is expected that as one question is answered, others will arise. Discussions with the sponsor and representatives from the Military Traffic Management Command Transportation Engineering Agency (MTMC-TEA) and USALEA determined the two major issues of concern to decision makers: the cost of the program and the expected improvement in force closure times.

(1) Program Costs. Cost estimation for construction, procurement, etc., of the various ASMP projects is not as straightforward a process as one might expect. It is observed that costs are constantly changing and therefore must be tied down at a particular point in time. Construction estimates in particular are highly variable, inevitably increasing as the project date approaches. The primary reason for this is that project designs tend to be tweaked and tuned repeatedly, very often bearing only slight resemblance to the original projects recommended by MTMC-TEA.
(2) **Force Closure Times.** Designed as a set of tasks and initiatives, ASMP projects are intended to ensure the deployment of Army forces in the fastest and most efficient manner possible. It is logical, even necessary, that any analysis of these initiatives intent on prioritizing funding include a measure of the effectiveness for procurement of an initiative. This measure must relate to time, the single most critical deployment shortcoming that the ASMP was undertaken to overcome. If the objective is force projection, an evaluation of the Army’s ability to close the force faster than a current benchmark is essential. Although it reflects a timeline based on arrival requirements, the TPFDD used in MRS SWA is reasonably used as the benchmark in this case because the requirement is tempered by the expected availability of units.

**b. Cost Module.** The Cost Module was developed by USALEA, representing the fixed or marginal cost for each initiative as appropriate. Containers, for example, may be purchased individually, whereas it was further assumed for the purpose of the demonstration case that PREPO afloat must be purchased in its entirety, with the further assumption that the cost would be distributed evenly by year. The model is robust enough to handle a variety of costing conditions once they have been identified. As mentioned in paragraph 3-1a(1), it should be noted that the costs for each type of ASMP initiative varies according to the year in which it was proposed, particularly in the case of infrastructure construction. The costs have not been converted to constant dollars. The data in Table 3-1 is a summary of the more detailed initiative data illustrated in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASMP project type</th>
<th>Cost information</th>
<th>Range (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEDRES</td>
<td>Fixed cost per exercise</td>
<td>$3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers</td>
<td>Average cost per container in container mix for each installation</td>
<td>$.006 - $.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railcars</td>
<td>Unit cost</td>
<td>$.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Fixed cost, varies by initiative</td>
<td>$.3 - 562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic seaport support</td>
<td>Unit cost</td>
<td>$9 - $16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army watercraft</td>
<td>Unit cost</td>
<td>$1.25 - $148.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement control</td>
<td>Fixed cost per receiving unit</td>
<td>$0.359 - $14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container lift kit</td>
<td>Unit cost</td>
<td>$.0078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPO afloat</td>
<td>Cost varies as program builds over time</td>
<td>$1,629 (total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. **Effectiveness Module**

(1) **Benefits**

(a) **Derivation.** The expected benefit to be achieved from funding for each initiative was determined as a result of the MTMC-TEA ASMP studies as a probability of meeting shortened ASMP mobilization timelines. In many cases, this meant that the entire group of initiatives at a particular installation were necessary to meet the required timelines with a 100 percent probability of success. However, approximately 20 percent of the infrastructure initiatives.
were described at a lower level of aggregation. The data in Table 3-2 for an all-rail deployment meeting ASMP standards at Ft. Hood is a good example of the more detailed information available for some of the installations.

Table 3-2. Ft. Hood ASMP Deployment Closure Impact in Terms of Time Saved Resulting from New Deployment Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASMP Deployment requirement in days</th>
<th>Existing capability in days</th>
<th>Recommended construction projects</th>
<th>Time saved by combined improvements</th>
<th>Estimated probability of completing mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>9.6 days</td>
<td>4 loading spurs and staging</td>
<td>3.6 days</td>
<td>70-80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 loading spurs and container handling facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 loading spurs and connector track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “estimated probability of completing mission” refers to the probability of recovering the 3.6 days required to be shaved from Ft. Hood’s current deployment capability. Therefore, their first initiative, with 4 loading spurs, would provide a 70 to 80 percent likelihood of deploying in 6 days. In order to meet the required deployment objective with a 100 percent chance of success, all three initiatives must be funded. For purposes of the prototype, this information was not used. There are many potential problems associated with this type of analysis. First and foremost is the nonlinearity inherent in the probability function. Second, the expected probability never equals 100 percent. Finally, the most limiting factor is that a mere 20 percent of the infrastructure initiatives are defined in this much detail. Not one of the noninfrastructure initiatives is approached in this fashion. It is for these reasons that the prototype model aggregates the benefit information by installation, assuming that all initiatives must be utilized together to achieve the full requirement with 100 percent probability. Therefore, Ft. Hood would gain the full 3.6 days of improvement if and only if all projects at Ft. Hood are completed. These projects are thus packaged together.

(b) Application. An ASMP initiative’s effectiveness is thus measured as a function of how much faster it can get each unit (or unit package) that it affects to the theater in question. The actual unit of measure in the demonstration is “brigade days of improvement.” For example, in Table 3-3, the 1st Cavalry Division benefits from a hypothetical containerization package (Container pack 2) at Ft. Hood by 21 brigade days. This can occur as 21 days for any one brigade or 7 days for each of three brigades in the division. It is an important advantage of the MIP formulation to recognize that any particular initiative may affect more than one unit, and a specific unit may be affected by more than one initiative. The effect is cumulative in either case unless otherwise specified by constraints. The effectiveness data used in the proof of principle demonstration is provided in Appendix I.
Table 3-3. Effectiveness Module–Notional Sample Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASMP Initiative</th>
<th>Unit benefit (in brigade days of improvement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Cavalry Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container pack 1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Hood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container pack 2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Hood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container pack 3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Hood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railcars</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Hood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Hood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Global Deployment Analysis Simulation (GDAS) as a Potential Data Source.
Due to the problems in the available data discussed in paragraph 3-1c(1)(a), the GDAS model was examined as a potential source of effectiveness data. A description of the GDAS model, a list of the initiatives that can and cannot be modeled, and a brief status on this effort can be found in Appendix E.

(2) Prioritization

(a) Unit Importance. It is obvious on reflection that some units are more important than other units for a specific scenario. It is debatable, however, just which units are most important, and to what degree. Recognizing that the commander in chief (CINC) has put a great deal of time and effort into developing the TPFDD, it is assumed that the sequencing of unit arrivals in a TPFDD represents a good first cut on the priority of units in theater. A methodology was developed which allows the model to utilize the implicit importance hierarchy represented by the TPFDD. Thus, the optimization is able to consider an equal benefit of a more critical unit to provide more value, therefore having greater weight within the scenario.

(b) Risk Assessment. A detailed examination of the effect of unit arrivals in the theater was performed by CAA's Operational Capability Assessments - Southwest Asia Division. Their study, Southwest Asia Risk Analysis3 (SWA-RA), is the basis of the prioritization scheme. In simplified terms, SWA-RA examines a large number of campaign analyses to draw relationships between the number of brigade-size elements in the theater and the mix of air and ground forces to determine thresholds at which a unit’s employment changes the campaign result, i.e., a unit not meeting its designated arrival schedule may result in a draw instead of a win. Figure 3-2 is a conceptual representation of the relationship between quantities of air and ground forces employed at a particular point in time and the warfight result. If, for instance, a hypothetical 10 brigades were needed for a win in the worst case (low Air Force participation), and the 10th brigade did not arrive when scheduled, the predicted result could break the threshold, dropping from win to draw. Furthermore, if a failure of the 11th unit to arrive did not
affect the threshold, then a clear break in the priority of units would be established at that point. Thus, we are able to establish "classes" of units. These classes may be associated with prioritization levels; (1) those units needed to engage the enemy, (2) those needed to maintain a draw, (3) those needed to win, and (4) those in excess of the win--actually exceeding the best case (high Air Force participation) threshold. In an early prototype data set, the above four classes were used. The earliest arrivals demonstrated the highest importance values, fit the classification for prioritization level 1 and were given a weight of .4. Level 2 received a weight of .3, level 3 a weight of .2 and level 4 a weight of .1. The specifics of the TPFDD arrival schedule allowed for this easy breakout in each risk category, with the latest arrivals having the lowest importance values. However, this may not always be the case: the outcome is very scenario-dependent. A risk analysis or similar examination of the data is required for every scenario considered. It was decided by the sponsor that the prototype should utilize evenly weighted units, delaying use of the prioritization scheme until a full unit database was available.

**Figure 3-2. Effectiveness Module--Prioritization Thresholds**

(c) **Objective Function Coefficients.** The effectiveness module utilizes multi-attribute utility theory to derive importance measures for unit arrivals from the information obtained by the Operational Capability Assessments - Southwest Asia Division. The derived scores then become objective function coefficients for the mathematical optimization. The derivation process also identifies constraints that must be identified in the Optimization Module to assure that the value associated with each unit is linear, on a ratio scale, and additive.
3-2. MODELING ASSUMPTIONS

a. The scenarios and forces used are adequate to test the effectiveness of candidate ASMP initiatives.

b. The unit importance relationships are assumed to reflect decision maker positions as reflected in the TPFDD for the given scenario, further structured by actual simulation results which measure outcomes as a function of arrival schedules. This analysis provides a means of modeling the effect of units with untimely arrivals as well as the importance of particular units in a given scenario.

c. The effectiveness data used will reasonably assess and express the effects of implementing the proposed ASMP initiatives on closure times of Army units, given a specific scenario and force structure. This is a big assumption. At the time of this writing, a time-related measure of the effectiveness for initiatives is unavailable for approximately 80 percent of the data at an appropriate level of aggregation for the decision space. A separate quick reaction analysis (QRA) entitled Strategic Army Mobility: Survey of National Infrastructure, Technology, and Equipment (SAMSONITE) has been undertaken to determine if this data is available or can be readily derived.

d. Aggregation of initiatives is adequate to capture the decision space. This is another critical assumption, necessary in order to test the prototype, but not desirable in the long run. For the prototype, initiatives are aggregated by installation. As will be discussed in the conclusions, aggregation at a per installation level is inappropriate. The decisions to be made do not occur on an installation-by-installation level, but rather on individual ASMP initiatives. Once the determination was made to fund PREPO afloat and the Congressionally-mandated west coast (WC) ammo port, as well as the Charleston, SC PREPO maintenance facility, half of the original $4 billion had been obligated. The remaining $2 billion in the program is not sufficient to fund all proposed projects at the installations. This implies that an installation’s requests cannot be funded in their entirety; inter- rather than intrinstallation tradeoff analysis must be performed.

e. Railcars and containers are not procured until infrastructure projects are completed for the same location. This constraint was included due primarily to USALEA concerns that additional railcars would not be needed until CONUS rail improvements are made. It has since been verified that railcars may indeed be purchased prior to the infrastructure rail projects being completed. If possible, cars will be stored on nearby Department of Defense (DOD) facilities. However, storage space will be rented from commercial carriers if needed. It should be noted that the cost of storage was not included in the original cost estimates. This shortcoming needs to be corrected in future analyses.

3-3. OPTIMIZATION MODULE

a. Mixed Integer Linear Programming Model. The final determination of a recommended funding strategy requires the simultaneous consideration of many factors. The two primary
concerns discussed in the Issue Definition Module, cost and timeliness, suggest the use of a cost effectiveness approach, with some measure of timeliness determining the effectiveness of a particular initiative. The mathematical programming model as developed fits the class of capital budgeting formulations.

b. Notation

Indices:
i units
j initiatives or projects
k years
m total number of initiatives
n total number of units
p funding profile of total number of appropriation types
l appropriation type, 1=MCA, 2=OMA, 3=OPA

Variables:
\[ x_{jp} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if project j is funded with profile p} \\
0 & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases} \]

\[ y_{kp} = \text{quantity of items bought in project j in year k using profile p} \]

\[ z_i = \text{positive deviation from desired time of closure of unit i} \]

Sets:
\[ P_j = \{ p : p \text{ is an allowable funding profile for project j} \} \]

\[ K_p = \{ k : k \text{ is a funding year in profile p} \} \]

Data:
\[ \beta_{ij} = \text{difference in time of closure of unit i by procuring project j} \]

\[ \alpha_{ij} = \text{marginal difference in time of closure of unit i by procuring 1 item of project j} \]

\[ w_i = \text{importance weight for unit i} \]

\[ t_{io} = \text{present closure time of unit i} \]

\[ t_i = \text{required closure time of unit i} \]

\[ B_{ki} = \text{budget for year k and appropriation l} \]

\[ c_{kp} = \text{fixed cost of project j, year k, profile p, appropriation l} \]

\[ c_{kp} = \text{average unit cost of an item of project j, year k, profile p, appropriation l} \]

\[ Y_{kp}^{\min} = \text{minimum procurement quantity of items in project j, year k, profile p} \]

\[ Y_{kp}^{\max} = \text{maximum procurement quantity of items in project j, year k, profile p} \]

\[ Z_i = \text{maximum deviation from required closure time for unit i} \]

\[ R_{ij}^{\min} = \text{minimum required quantity of items from project j} \]

\[ R_{ij}^{\max} = \text{maximum required quantity of items from project j} \]
c. **Preferred Model.** In order to achieve deployment goals, it is critical that the Army fund the right set of ASMP projects. But what is the "right" set? We do not set out to determine this fictionally correct set, but rather, within the known constraints, to answer the question: *within available funding levels, which set of initiatives comes closest to meeting closure requirements?* This formulation simultaneously maximizes the benefit received by funding the initiatives while weighting the affected units, ensuring that the units that are required earliest in the theater, or that have the greatest impact in the theater, are given the greatest chance of receiving benefit from funded initiatives. Furthermore, the syntax of this question is important. Proper formulation provides the model with flexibility by not having to ensure that every unit arrives exactly on its closure date. Otherwise, this could be a very restrictive constraint which, given the program dollar limitations, may promote infeasibility. Figure 3-3 presents a detailed description of this formulation.

\[
\text{Minimize: } \sum_{i=1}^{n} W_i Z_i \quad \text{(obj)}
\]

\[
\text{Subject to: } \sum_{j=1}^{m} (c_{jkpl} x_{jp} + \bar{e}_{jkpl} y_{jkp}) \leq B_{kl}, \quad \forall k, l, p \tag{1}
\]

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{p \in P_j} (\beta_{ij} x_{jp} + \sum_{k \in K_p} \alpha_{ij} y_{jkp} + t_{i0} - Z_i) \leq t_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \tag{2}
\]

\[
\sum_{p \in P_j} X_{jp} \leq 1, \quad \forall j \tag{3}
\]

\[
Y_{jkp}^\text{min} x_{jp} \leq y_{jkp} \leq Y_{jkp}^\text{max} x_{jp}, \quad \forall j, p \in P_j, k \in K_p \tag{4}
\]

\[
R_i^\text{min} x_{ip} \leq \sum_{k \in K_p} y_{jkp} \leq R_i^\text{max} x_{ip}, \quad \forall j, p \in P_j \tag{5}
\]

\[
0 \leq Z_i \leq Z_i^\text{max}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \tag{6}
\]

\[
x_{jp} \text{ binary, } \quad \forall j, p \in P_j \tag{7}
\]

**Figure 3-3.** Formulation to Minimize Weighted Unit Lateness

d. **Objective Function and Constraint Definition.** The *objective function* (obj) is the sum of the weighted deviation from arrival time (lateness) for each unit considered. The deviation, $Z_i$, is derived in constraint (2) below.

(1) *The first constraint* limits the budgetary resources available in each of the POM years to the program dollars available. The model separately controls the three major types of appropriations: Military Construction, Army (MCA), Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA),
and Other Procurement, Army (OPA). A budget maximum is required for each of these funding types. We allow for both fixed and marginal costs, although at this time, the sponsor does not wish to examine the effect of partial funding packages. Nor is marginal effectiveness data available for many of the relevant initiatives.

(2) The second constraint sums the fixed and marginal improvements in closure time, adds that to the current capability, attempts to ensure that the resulting closure time should meet requirements, otherwise measures the deviation from the required closure date. This delta is then minimized in the objective function.

(3) The third constraint structures a variety of procurement options, utilizing a lookup matrix with possible procurement strategies for each type of initiative. For example, a container purchase may occur in any of 2 successive years during the 6-year POM cycle, resulting in five possible procurement options for each container initiative. Currently, the procurement options are limited to sequential years, although the model is robust enough to handle a nonsequential requirement if identified. This constraint allows only one procurement operation per initiative. However, it chooses the optimal funding stream from among the choices included in the matrix for that option.

(4) The fourth constraint is designed to observe limits in production quantities. There are instances where it is possible to procure variable quantities of an initiative over the 6-year POM cycle. For example, containers or railcars can theoretically be purchased all in 1 year or split over successive years. Therefore, minimum and maximum procurement quantities per year become relevant issues. The variable \( Y_{kp} \) provides upper and lower bounds on yearly production quantities available.

(5) The fifth constraint varies from the fourth in that it looks at total requirements for each initiative over the POM. \( R_i \) represents the corresponding upper and lower bounds on requirements for deployment initiatives.

(6) The sixth constraint requires the deviations in closure time to remain within preset bounds for each unit. For example, suppose the 1st brigade of a given division is scheduled to arrive 7 days earlier than the 3d. If it is deemed desirable to allow the 1st brigade to arrive any time between its scheduled arrival and that of the 3d, \( Z_i \) would be set equal to the 7-day difference.

(7) The seventh constraint requires that the variable \( X_{jp} \), which equals 1 if a project is funded, is a binary (0-1) variable.

(8) Additional constraints that represent the sequential and dependent nature of many of the initiatives are handled through the inclusion of clique constraints. Not only do these additions better define the problem, requiring real relationships to be maintained, they have the added benefit of reducing the size of the feasible region, thus tightening the linear relaxation. Examples of these constraints include such relationships as requiring that all infrastructure improvements at
a particular location are completed before railcar buys for the same location are completed. This assumes that the railcars would not be required if a portion of that incomplete infrastructure is for rail improvements. Another relational constraint is one that captures the requirement for two or more initiatives to be completed simultaneously, or conversely, that two initiatives can be mutually exclusive. A large number of these relationships can be exploited in the model as they become identified. A few examples of such constraints follow:

\[ X_{1p} + X_{2p} = 1 \quad \text{(mutually exclusive)} \]
\[ X_{1p} - X_{2p} = 0 \quad \text{(fund both or none)} \]
\[ X_{1p} - X_{2p} \geq 0 \quad \text{(fund neither, both, or } X_{1p} \text{ only but not } X_{2p} \text{ only)} \]

e. Alternative Model. This formulation is designed to determine the minimum cost expenditure on ASMP initiatives necessary to guarantee that required closure objectives are met. Therefore, the alternative objective function minimizes the fixed and marginal cost of funding an initiative. Unlike the preferred formulation, no variance from the closure objective is allowed; thus the variables \( Z_i \) and \( Z_j \) are no longer needed. Although the model is minimizing cost, it will cost more in ASMP program dollars to ensure that the Army can absolutely meet the timeline. Therefore, the budget ceiling is lifted, removing a possible impediment to feasibility. Figure 3-4 presents a detailed description of this formulation.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Minimize:} & \quad \sum_{l=1}^{q} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k \in K_p} \sum_{p \in P_j} (c_{jkip} x_{jp} + \bar{c}_{jkip} y_{jkp}) \\
\text{Subject to:} & \quad \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{p \in P_j} \sum_{k \in K_p} (\beta_{ij} x_{jp} + \alpha_{ij} y_{jkp}) + t_{ij} \leq t_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n) \\
& \quad \sum_{p \in P_j} x_{jp} \leq 1, \quad \forall j \\
& \quad y_{jkp}^{\min} x_{jp} \leq y_{jkp} \leq y_{jkp}^{\max}, \quad \forall j, \quad p \in P_j, \quad k \in K_p \\
& \quad r_{ij}^{\min} x_{jp} \leq \sum_{k \in K_p} y_{jkp} \leq r_{ij}^{\max} x_{jp}, \quad \forall j, \quad p \in P_j, \\
& \quad x_{jp} \text{ binary, } \quad \forall j, \quad p \in P_j
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 3-4. Formulation to Minimize Cost of Meeting Closure Time

f. Prototype Model. The prototype model was designed to accommodate aggregate effectiveness data due to the unavailability of effectiveness data for each initiative. With the funding impact measured on an installation-by-installation basis, it is no longer reasonable to look at the lateness of individual units, but rather the cumulative improvement in arrival times. This
formulation addresses a slightly different question than in the original formulation: *within available funding, what set of initiatives results in the greatest time savings across all units?*

**g. Prototype Variations from Preferred Model.** The original formulation gets at the crux of the main issue—planners do not want units to arrive late. The prototype model does not address this issue well for two reasons. First, the functionally allowable lateness of some units is ignored. If two units were weighted equally, one with zero tolerance for lateness, and the other with a 7-day tolerance and all other data equivalent, the model would be indifferent as to which unit receives improved deployment initiatives. Perhaps a more important concern is the fact that this formulation can allow a particular unit to overachieve, i.e., to arrive early. It is possible that the dollars spent to achieve this excess in capability could have been better spent on initiatives that would reduce the lateness of other units. However, the model seeks the greatest absolute improvement and is not concerned in this instance about late vs early. Second, the fact that early arrivers can crowd the ports and severely tax the intratheater transportation network is another disadvantage of the prototype formulation. Figure 3-5 presents a detailed description of this formulation. This formulation is used only for illustrative purposes with the intention of demonstrating the usefulness of this type of analytical tool. It is a starting point for future development as both the sponsor and CAA attempt to acquire the data needed to populate the preferred model described in paragraph 3-3c above. The results of this demonstration using the prototype model are detailed in Chapter 4.

Maximize:  
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{p \in P_j} (\beta_{ij}W_iX_{jp} + \sum_{k \in K} \alpha_{ij}W_iY_{jkp}) \]

Subject to:  
\[ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{p \in P_j} (c_{jkp}X_{jp} + \bar{c}_{jkp}Y_{jkp}) \leq B_{kl}, \ \forall k, l, p \]

\[ \sum_{p \in P_j} X_{jp} \leq 1, \ \forall j \]

\[ Y_{jkp} \leq X_{jp} \leq \bar{Y}_{jkp}, \ \forall j, p \in P_j, k \in K_p \]

\[ R_{j} \leq \sum_{k \in K_p} Y_{jkp} \leq R_{j} \]

\[ X_{jp} \text{ binary, } \ \forall j, p \in P_j \]

**Figure 3-5. Formulation to Maximize the Weighted Time Improvement**
CHAPTER 4

PROTOTYPE RESULTS

4-1. **OVERVIEW.** The PASMPR Study was undertaken to provide decision support analysis and to assist ODCSLOG in developing their ASMP input to the POM. The study focuses on the development of a methodology and mathematical model for producing optimal funding streams for the ASMP initiatives. Chapter 2 provides the background information which framed this analysis and which comprises the guiding as well as limiting factors in model development. Chapter 3 is a detailed discussion of the proposed methodology and resulting models.

4-2. **PURPOSE.** The primary purpose of this chapter is to provide a discussion on the possible uses for and the implementation of the PASMPR methodology. Optimal funding strategies for various levels of funding were developed based on the best available data. This chapter further provides a discussion of the limitations in the use of this methodology due to significant aggregation in the available data.

4-3. **RESULTS.** This analysis has been performed at several funding levels, making the assumption that expected funding levels are rarely stable and seldom as expected. The intention is to vary the funding parameter and provide a set of alternative funding streams for each variation. This method allows decision makers to choose a likely budget level to evaluate the resulting ASMP funding stream. For purposes of this prototype, the budgetary limit for the base case is equivalent to 100 percent of the total cost of all initiatives. This total was then distributed evenly among the 6 years considered. Obviously, in future usage of the model, it would be preferable to use actual yearly MCA, OMA, and OPA projections. Unfortunately, such projections for ASMP were not available in time to execute the prototype. Two funding alternatives, 80 and 60 percent of the base case, are provided to demonstrate the variances that can occur in results at reduced funding levels. These two alternatives demonstrate the most meaningful variances and are deemed sufficient for illustrative purposes of the prototype model.

   **a. Suggested Funding Profiles.** An advantage of the approach taken in this methodology is that the model is allowed to choose the most cost effective funding profile for each initiative while maintaining the identity of the type of allocation involved (MCA, OMA or OPA). As we reduce the amount of funding available, it is common for an initiatives funding profile, i.e., the years in which it is funded, to vary. As illustrated in the prototype results (Table 4-1), several initiatives with large costs are found to “slip” in the solution, delaying their procurement by 1 or more years. This is the case with the OPA-funded railcars for Ft. Stewart. As total program dollars available were decreased to 80 percent of the original, the funding profile was actually accelerated by 1 year. Then, with an additional 20 percent decrease in OPA funds available, the Ft. Stewart railcar buy was pushed back 2 years from the base case profile. Also of interest at the 60 percent level is that the railcars scheduled for Ft. Hood were no longer competitive in the solution due to their high total cost and were thus eliminated. Although the base case represents a fully funded (100 percent) program, the funds were evenly distributed over the 6 year period. Therefore, in any given year, funds may not be available to fully fund all programs.
b. Alternative Solution Sets. Another possible outcome of reduced funding is that some initiatives are no longer affordable at 100 percent of their stated implementation cost and leave the solution set. As a result, other initiatives may actually rise in the solution set, entering the solution for the first time, or, more commonly, obtain funding over an earlier time period as other initiatives slip or leave the set altogether. This can be seen in Table 4-1 below. When PREPO afloat is no longer funded at its full implementation (as in the 80 percent case), a large quantity of funding of a particular procurement type (OMA) is now available to be spent on other initiatives with that type of procurement. Therefore, other initiatives of the same procurement type that were previously precluded now have room to enter the solution: containerization for the sustainment base, and OMA infrastructure for the miscellaneous category “other.”

Table 4-1. Prototype Generated Alternative Funding Profiles for ASMP Initiatives, 1996 - 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Fully funded 6-year cost</th>
<th>80% Funded 6-year cost</th>
<th>60% Funded 6-year cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDRES Savannah</td>
<td>96-01 $6 Mil</td>
<td>96-01 $6 Mil</td>
<td>96-01 $6 Mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDRES Beaverton</td>
<td>96-01 9</td>
<td>96-01 9</td>
<td>96-01 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDRES Jacksonville</td>
<td>96-01 6</td>
<td>96-01 6</td>
<td>96-01 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers, Ft. Hood, 13 COSCOM</td>
<td>2000 2.054</td>
<td>2001 2.054</td>
<td>2001 2.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers, Ft. Bragg, XVIII Corps</td>
<td>99 2.67</td>
<td>99 2.67</td>
<td>98 2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers, Ft. Bliss, 3 ACR</td>
<td>99 2.745</td>
<td>99 2.745</td>
<td>99 2.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers, Spt and Sustainment Base</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>2000 18.576</td>
<td>97 18.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers, Other Divisions</td>
<td>96 11.648</td>
<td>99 11.648</td>
<td>99 11.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Containers, USMC</td>
<td>97 2.76</td>
<td>96 2.76</td>
<td>96 2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railcars, Ft. Benning</td>
<td>98-99 15.2</td>
<td>98-99 15.2</td>
<td>2000-01 15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railcars, Ft. Hood</td>
<td>2000-01 47.9</td>
<td>2000-01 47.9</td>
<td>- 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railcars, Ft. Bliss</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railcars, USMC</td>
<td>96-97 3.2</td>
<td>96-97 3.2</td>
<td>96-97 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railcars, AAP and Depots</td>
<td>96-97 21.5</td>
<td>96-97 21.5</td>
<td>96-97 21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMA Infrastructure, Ft. Bliss</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMA Infrastructure, Other</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>97-98 22</td>
<td>97-98 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA Infrastructure, Ft. Bliss</td>
<td>97-99 96.4</td>
<td>97-99 96.4</td>
<td>97-99 96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA Infrastructure, Ft. Campbell</td>
<td>96-98 21</td>
<td>96-98 21</td>
<td>96-98 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA Infrastructure, Ft. Stewart</td>
<td>97-99 36.5</td>
<td>96-98 36.5</td>
<td>97-99 36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA Infrastructure, Ft. Benning</td>
<td>97-99 42.6</td>
<td>96-98 42.6</td>
<td>96-98 42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA Infrastructure, Ft. Bragg</td>
<td>97-99 51.5</td>
<td>97-99 51.5</td>
<td>96-98 51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA Infrastructure, Ft. Hood</td>
<td>96-98 87.3</td>
<td>96-98 87.3</td>
<td>99-01 87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA Infrastructure, Charleston</td>
<td>98-2000 35.1</td>
<td>97-99 35.1</td>
<td>99-01 35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA Infrastructure, WC Ammo Port</td>
<td>98-2000 55</td>
<td>97-99 55</td>
<td>97-99 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA Infrastructure, Other</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPO Afloat, Ship Lease/Readiness</td>
<td>96-01 1629</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>- 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPO Outload Facility Charleston</td>
<td>96-01 56.7</td>
<td>96-01 56.7</td>
<td>96-01 56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPO Outload Facility WC Ammo Port</td>
<td>96-01 43.3</td>
<td>96-01 43.3</td>
<td>96-01 43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>2345.733</td>
<td>757.309</td>
<td>709.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj value (total benefit)</td>
<td>227.98</td>
<td>226.98</td>
<td>190.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. **Effect of Clique Constraints on Profiles.** Since the railcar procurements are the only use of OPA funds, they provide the clearest demonstration of the effect a particular initiative’s relationship with another initiative has on the solution set. The most typical relationships modeled include simultaneous or sequential timing, and mutually exclusive inclusion in the solution set. For example, as the budget decreases to the 80 percent level, the same set of railcar initiatives is funded; however, the profiles vary. The primary reason is that the infrastructure initiatives, to which the railcar initiatives are tied, also varied. Railcar procurement is constrained to occur in the same or subsequent years as infrastructure initiatives at identical locations. Therefore, as infrastructure at Ft. Stewart becomes funded in earlier years at the 80 percent level, railcars at Ft. Stewart may also be funded earlier.

**d. Effect of Weighting Objective Coefficients.** The objective function utilized for the prototype model maximizes the weighted fixed and marginal benefit realized from procurement of a particular initiative, where $w_i$ is the importance weight for unit i, and $\beta_{ij}$ and $\alpha_{ij}$ represent the fixed and marginal benefits, respectively, for unit i and project j (see paragraph 3-3g).

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} (\beta_{ij} w_i x_{jp} + \sum_{k \in K_p} \alpha_{ij} w_i y_{jkp})$$

As part of this analysis, the effect of changes in the importance weights was evaluated to assure they behaved functionally as anticipated. Indeed, all else being equal, as higher weights were applied to units, their associated initiatives were funded, and often funded earlier. Conversely, when a weight was decreased to zero, i.e., indifferent to the lateness of that unit, the affected initiatives did not appear in the solution set. This interaction between the objective function and constraints occurred as planned. The methodology for developing the unit weights is discussed in paragraph 3-1c(2)(b). The values used for both unit weights and benefits are located in Appendix H and Appendix I, respectively. For purposes of the prototype, units were aggregated into 15 packages, a level comparable to the installation perspective used for initiatives (see paragraph 4-4 below). For this reason, the data used is more notional than useful beyond the scope of this proof of principle.

**e. Marginal Value Analysis.** Due to the nature of mixed integer programming, it is not possible to evaluate the marginal values traditionally associated with variables and constraints in a strict linear programming application. Once one iteratively branches away from the linear relaxation, the marginal values, shadow costs, no longer exist.

**4-4. EFFECTS OF AGGREGATION**

a. **Aggregated Units.** Rather than the brigade size units originally anticipated, units were aggregated into unit packages, with package elements varying in size from brigade to division to COSCOM. Although the 15 packages represented in Figure 4-1 are currently being modeled, the model is not limited to that level of aggregation, with 30 to 40 packages seen as a likely range for
the future. Comparing an entire corps and a brigade, especially when applying weights to those units, is less than desirable. However, USALEA was not able to provide the unit data needed in time for execution of the prototype. By necessity, some degree of aggregation is necessary. Should the smallest unit considered be a company, brigade, or battalion? After much discussion with the sponsor and USALEA, it was determined that units would continue to be packaged, with an emphasis on trying to evaluate benefits to brigade-sized units, both combat and combat support/combat service support (CS/CSS) where possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Bde, 82d Airborne</th>
<th>24th Mechanized Div</th>
<th>2d Bde, 101st</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2d Bde, 82d Airborne</td>
<td>3d ACR</td>
<td>Sep Bde, Heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII CORPS</td>
<td>1st Cavalry Div</td>
<td>Sustainment Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 COSCOM</td>
<td>III CORPS</td>
<td>Other US Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Bde, 101st</td>
<td>13th COSCOM</td>
<td>General Readiness Forces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4-1. Aggregate Unit Packages**

b. **Initiatives.** There are over 500 initiatives in the ASMP currently aggregated into 37 packages, looking primarily at fort-to-port initiatives, with a few exceptions. Figure 4-2 displays the aggregate initiatives and illustrates actual rollups for two of those aggregates.
c. Efﬁcacy of Aggregated Data. In accord with one of the key assumptions of this study, the effectiveness data is expected to reasonably assess and express the effects of implementing the proposed ASMP initiatives on closure times of Army units. Unfortunately, the data available at the time required for execution of the prototype (a compilation of the MTMC-TEA ASMP studies) considered the initiatives on most installations as an aggregate whole, as seen in the Ft. Stewart and Ft. Hood examples above. Due to the large numbers of initiatives grouped together in the effectiveness data, the type of analysis possible is severely limited. Tradeoffs exist only as installation-by-installation decisions and are not possible at the individual initiative level. Rather than having the capability of answering the question, should the Army fund railcars at Ft. Hood or improve their staging capability or build phase I of their railyard upgrade or...? the capability is limited to addressing the question, should we fund railcars or all infrastructure at Ft. Hood? Yet another complicating factor is the large numbers of units affected identically by those initiatives— all units passing through those installations! Not all units will deploy using the same mode of transport, yet all are affected to the same degree by each aggregate of initiatives. These weaknesses in the data need to be addressed before meaningful tradeoff analysis can occur.

4-5. PROTOTYPE LESSONS LEARNED

a. A capital budgeting MIP can be used to evaluate the prioritization and funding stream for ASMP initiatives.

b. To be successful, aggregation of initiatives should be held to a minimum.

c. If required, aggregation should occur according to functional, mission-oriented categories, i.e., airﬁelds, warehousing, rail upgrades, etc.

d. Due to the vast array of units that could be considered, including reserve and guard units, future work should continue to utilize unit packaging, with the emphasis on brigade-sized combat and CS/CSS unit rollups.

e. The short run time of the prototype model, less than 4 minutes, implies larger problems are possible.
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STUDY DIRECTIVE

MEMORANDUM THRU

DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR LOGISTICS, 500 ARMY PENTAGON,
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DIRECTOR OF THE ARMY STAFF, 202 ARMY PENTAGON, WASHINGTON,
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FOR

DIRECTOR, U.S. ARMY CONCEPTS ANALYSIS AGENCY, 8120 WOODMONT
AVENUE, BETHESDA, MD 20814-2797

COMMANDER, U.S. ARMY LOGISTICS EVALUATION AGENCY,
NEW CUMBERLAND, PA 17070-5007

COMMANDER, MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND, ATTN: MTPL,
5611 COLUMBIA PIKE, FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041-5050

SUBJECT: Study Directive: Prioritization of Army Strategic Mobility Program (ASMP) Resources

1. References:
   a. Memorandum, HQDA (DALO-TSM), 21 Dec 93, subject: Routine Task: Prioritization of Army Strategic Mobility Program (ASMP) Resources (Encl 1).
   b. Memorandum, HQDA (DALO-TSM), 11 May 94, SAB (Encl 2).
   c. In-Process Review (IPR) meeting, 2 Sep 94.

2. Reference 1a tasked the U.S. Army Logistics Evaluation Agency (USALEA) to oversee the development of a decision support system for the prioritization of ASMP resources. Reference 1b requested U.S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency (CAA) develop, validate, and demonstrate initial application of an ASMP Decision Support Model to assist in the allocation of ASMP funding resources in an optimal manner. Reference 1c was an IPR at which study status, strategy startup, and future direction of study were discussed.

3. This memorandum supersedes the original study directive and tasker to reflect changes in responsibilities that emerged following reference 1c.
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SUBJECT: Study Directive: Prioritization of Army Strategic Mobility Program (ASMP) Resources

4. STUDY DIRECTIVE: Request that the U.S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency (CAA) develop, validate, and demonstrate initial application of an ASMP Decision Support Model to assist in the allocation of ASMP funding resources in an optimal manner. This directive establishes objectives and provides guidance for the conduct of the required study.

5. BACKGROUND: The Department of the Army has allocated money for short- and long-term improvements in the Army’s strategic mobility capabilities based on requirements delineated in the ASMP. With an emphasis on power projection, it is necessary to have objective decision support tools to assist in determining relative priorities of initiatives proposed under the ASMP that are competing for available resources. Support tools would assist in resource allocation when either funding increases or decrements occur.

6. STUDY SPONSORS AND STUDY DIRECTOR:

   a. The Director of Transportation, Energy and Troop Support, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (DALO-TSZ) is the study sponsor. The study sponsor’s representatives are Mr. Roy Wallace and Mrs. Cecilia Fox (DALO-TSM).

   b. USALEA will collaborate with CAA in the ASMP Decision Support Model Study covered by this directive. USALEA action officers are Mr. Gene Markel and Mrs. Irene Mangle.

   c. Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC) will provide analytical results and data from completed ASMP Infrastructure Analyses and other published data as requested in support of the prioritization model project and future POM development. MTMC contacts are Ms. Ursula Loy, MTPL, and Mr. Tom Lefebure, MTMC Transportation Engineering Agency (MTMCTEA).

   d. The Study Director for CAA is Ms. Patricia Murphy.


8. TERMS OF REFERENCE:

   a. Purpose. The purpose of this study is to develop, validate, and demonstrate application of an analytic methodology to assist in managing defined ASMP requirements, proposed enhancements, and available resources in a cost

   2
effective way. The resulting mathematical model and analytic methodology will identify optimal ASMP investment strategies, maximizing the "value added" from proposed ASMP initiatives to improve the Army's posture for achieving anticipated strategic deployment objectives within applicable resource constraints. The ultimate purpose is to aid in the preparation of the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) and budget decision processes.

b. Definitions:

(1) **Value added** is the marginal return on investment, based on the effectiveness of various initiatives proposed under ASMP to improve some aspect of strategic mobility, relative to the costs of the initiatives.

(2) An **ASMP initiative** is a defined infrastructure improvement, resource acquisition, capability enhancement, or other similar action that uses funding resources to enhance deployability of a specified Army force element.

c. Scope:

(1) Baseline program is President's Budget Fiscal Year (FY) 95 and the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) (FY 96), or the latest appropriate funding document.

(2) The analysis will examine the funding stream associated with ASMP.

(3) Approximately 500 ASMP initiatives, representing large dollar amounts in current and future projects, will be included. Inclusion of any particular initiative is subject to the ability to effectively represent that initiative in terms of data and modeling capability. ASMP initiatives will be aggregated as necessary and appropriate.

(4) Scenarios and forces. The scenario and force structure employed for the draft Total Army Analysis (TAA) 2003 (TAA03) will be used for initial model development and validation purposes. The end product model and methodology will be flexible to accommodate varying scenarios and force structures.
d. Proposed Methodology. A mathematical programming model will be developed based upon CAA's Value Added Analysis paradigm. The model will be used to analyze candidate ASMP initiatives with respect to costs and benefits, and will generate recommendations regarding funding priorities and funding levels for proposed ASMP initiatives.

e. Objectives:

(1) Identify objectives, capabilities, and requirements to perform subject analysis. In particular, develop a mathematical modeling formulation and determine data requirements to populate the resulting model.

(2) Implement the modeling formulation. Test with notional data, making corrections, improvements, and modifications as necessary. This effort will be in collaboration with USALEA and will be performed concurrently with USALEA data collection effort and MTMCTEA furnishing analytical results and data from completed ASMP Infrastructure Analyses. CAA will ensure consistency between data and model.

(3) Test and continue the development effort using the data collected by USALEA and analytical results and data from completed ASMP Infrastructure Analyses furnished by MTMCTEA.

(4) Conduct a demonstration of the refined model. This will use the best available data obtained from authoritative sources. Results of this analysis will form the Base Case for this study.

(5) Support DALO-TSM in the POM building process as necessary.

f. Timeframe. Initial use is for fiscal obligation analysis timeframe POM period FY 98 through FY 03.

g. Limitations. The optimization model will initially be installed at CAA because the hardware and software required are currently available only at CAA. CAA will provide the developed capability, both data and tools, to the sponsors, USALEA, and MTMCTEA for their use in internal analyses.
h. Assumptions:

(1) The scenarios and forces used in the study will be adequate to measure the effectiveness of candidate ASMP initiatives.

(2) The measures of effectiveness (MOE) used for purposes of this study accurately assess and express the effects of implementing the proposed ASMP initiatives on the closure times of Army units.

i. Essential Elements of Analysis (EEA):

(1) Does the proposed mathematical programming formulation satisfy the analytic requirements of this study at the required level of sensitivity?

(2) Taking force closure times as the primary MOE in determining effectiveness of the candidate ASMP initiatives, what allocation of available ASMP funds to the proposed initiatives best enables the realization of overall force closure objectives?

(3) What ASMP initiatives, in what relative order of priority, are recommended in the Demonstration Case for procurement in the Army POM?

9. RESPONSIBILITIES:

a. ODСSLOG (DALO-TSM) will:

(1) Provide a study sponsor representative and study guidance.

(2) Assist in data collection required to conduct the study.

b. USALEA will:

(1) Provide a study representative.

(2) Collaborate in the development of the funding prioritization model, primarily in an advisory or consultive capacity.

(3) Acquire and provide existing data from sources for the performance of the study, specifically:
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(a) In the short-term, collect and provide data, in the form of the difference in unit deployment days as effected by each current ASMP initiative, from subject matter experts.

(b) In the long-term, collect and provide data, when available, from existing models in the same format described in 9b(3)(a).

(c) Provide methodology of conversion of data from Force to model for inclusion in model development.

c. MTMCTEA will:

(1) Provide a study representative.

(2) Provide analytical results and data for completed ASMP Infrastructure Analyses as input to the prioritization model development and future POM development.

d. CAA will:

(1) Conduct the ASMP funding prioritization modeling study and analysis.

(2) Designate a study director and provide the study team.

(3) Provide periodic in-process reviews (IPR) as requested by the study sponsors.

10. REFERENCES: The Army Program Value Analysis (90-97) (CAA-SR-91-9) and Army Program Value Analysis (94-99) (CAA-SR-92-10) Reports provide the basis for the methodology and approach to this study. Other references include the President's FY 95 Budget.

11. ADMINISTRATION:

a. Support:

(1) Funds for travel and/or per diem will be provided by the parent organizations of the individuals traveling.

(2) ADP support will be provided by CAA.
DALO-TSM
SUBJECT: Study Directive: Prioritization of Army Strategic Mobility Program (ASMP) Resources

(3) Secretarial support, reports, and publication will be provided by CAA.

b. Key Milestones and Milestone Schedule.

Began Model Development .............................. 1 Feb 94
Completed Prototype Model ................................ 14 Feb 94
Completed Prototype Testing ............................. 28 Mar 94
Full Scale Development Began ........................... 1 Apr 94
Completed Base Case Demonstration ..................... 2 Sep 94
Complete Data Collection ................................. 15 Jan 95
Model Demonstration/IPR .................................. 15 Feb 95
Preparation Complete to Support POM Development ... 1 May 95
Technical Effort Completed/Final IPR ................... 30 Jun 95
Documentation Completed and Delivered ................. 30 Jul 95

c. Control Procedure. The study sponsors' representatives will coordinate and communicate within the HQDA staff and between the ARSTAF and the study agency.

2 Encls

MARIO F. MONTERO, JR.
Brigadier General, GS
Director of Transportation, Energy and Troop Support
MEMORANDUM THRU ASSISTANT DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR LOGISTICS

FOR COMMANDER, U.S. ARMY LOGISTICS EVALUATION AGENCY,
NEW CUMBERLAND, PA 17070-5007

SUBJECT: Routine Task: Prioritization of Army Strategic Mobility Program (ASMP) Resources

1. Request the following routine task be accomplished by the U.S. Army Logistics Evaluation Agency (USALEA):


   b. Description: USALEA will oversee the development and institutionalization of a decision support model and process to determine how best to invest ASMP incremental funding (or how best to absorb funding decrements) to maximize total system throughput in a contingency theater deployment.

   c. Purpose: To enable the Army to manage its ASMP funding requirements and resources in a cost effective way. This will aid the program objective memorandum (POM) and budget decision processes.

2. Background: The Department of the Army has allocated money for short- and long-term improvements of strategic mobility capabilities based on requirements delineated in the ASMP. With an emphasis on power projection, it is necessary to have objective decision support tools to assist in determining relative priorities of projects competing for available funds, and to assist in determining how best to allocate funding increments or decrements as they occur.

3. Benefits: This effort will assist the Army in making cost-effective decisions regarding the allocation of available funding resources to defined ASMP tasks and initiatives. If funding reductions are imposed, it also will assist in determining how they should be distributed so as to minimize negative effects on strategic mobility. The net result is the development of capability and structure to ensure deployment of Army forces in the fastest and most efficient manner possible.
4. Technical approach:

   a. Phase I: Identify objectives and requirements to be met by the proposed funding prioritization process. Determine factors that need to be considered, and develop a conceptual overview of the capability needed. Survey and review potentially relevant existing models and capabilities. Based upon the conceptual overview, an assessment of models already available, and in collaboration with the U.S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency (USACAA), define the requirements and conceptual design of a decision process model to assist in determining optimal investments of ASMP funds. Begin prototype development.

   b. Phase II: Employ the rationale and prototype elements of the conceptual process model to assist in prioritizing ASMP initiatives for the Army's next POM build. Review and evaluate the conceptual prototype application, and incorporate lessons learned to revise/improve the concept and design as needed.

   c. Phase III: Based upon results and recommendations from Phases I and II, provide general oversight of combined LEA and CAA efforts for full scale development of the decision model and process.

   d. Phase IV: Use developed capability to support future POM processes as required.

5. Project Requirement:

   a. Proposed task completion dates:

   (1) Phase I: Research, project definition, and concept development. - Jan 1994

   (2) Phase II: Support POM build. Review and evaluate POM experience for lessons learned. - Apr 1994

   (3) Phase III: Full scale model development. - Nov 1994

   (4) Phase IV: Ongoing support of future POMs.

   b. In-process reviews with the Assistant Director for Transportation.
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6. Administrative details:

a. ODCSLOG (DALO-TSM) action officers: Mrs. Cecilia Fox, DSN 224-6610, and Mr. Roy Wallace, DSN 224-6620.

b. USALEA action officers: Mr. Gene Markel, DSN 977-7629, and Mrs. Irene Mangle, DSN 977-6901.

c. USACAA action officers: Mr. Steve Siegel, DSN 295-5289, and LTC Andy Loerch, DSN 295-1546.

[Signature]
NORMAN E. WILLIAMS
Brigadier General, GS
Director of Transportation,
Energy and Troop Support
MEMORANDUM THRU

DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR LOGISTICS, 500 ARMY PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, DC 20310-0500

F. DIRECTOR OF THE ARMY STAFF, 202 ARMY PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, DC 20310-0202

FOR DIRECTOR, U.S. ARMY CONCEPTS ANALYSIS AGENCY, 810 WOODMONT AVENUE, BETHESDA, MD 20814-2797

SUBJECT: Study Directive: Prioritization of Army Strategic Mobility Program (ASMP) Resources

1. STUDY DIRECTIVE: Request that the U.S. Army Concepts Analysis Agency (CAA) develop, validate, and demonstrate initial application of an ASMP Decision Support Model to assist in the allocation of ASMP funding resources in an optimal manner. This directive establishes objectives and provides guidance for the conduct of the required study.

2. BACKGROUND: The Department of the Army has allocated money for short- and long-term improvements in the Army's strategic mobility capabilities based on requirements delineated in the ASMP. With an emphasis on power projection, it is necessary to have objective decision support tools to assist in determining relative priorities of initiatives proposed under the ASMP and competing for available resources as funding increments or decrements occur. The U.S. Army Logistics Evaluation Agency (USALEA) has been tasked by this office to perform an ASMP funding prioritization and decision process study. This directive tasks CAA to develop and implement a mathematical programming methodology to perform cost-benefit and trade-off analyses needed in support of the USALEA study plan.

3. STUDY SPONSORS AND STUDY DIRECTOR:

   a. The Director of Transportation, Energy and Troop Support, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics (DALO-TSZ) is the study sponsor.

   b. USALEA will perform the parent ASMP Funding Prioritization Study and will collaborate with CAA in the ASMP Decision Support Model Study covered by this directive.
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c. The study sponsor's representatives are Mr. Roy Wallace and Ms. Cecelia Fox (DALO-TSM).

d. USALEA action officers for this study and the parent USALEA study are Mr. Gene Markel and Mrs. Irene Mangle.

e. The Study Director for CAA is Ms. Patricia Murphy.


5. TERMS OF REFERENCE:

a. Purpose. The purpose of this study is to develop, validate, and demonstrate application of an analytic methodology to assist in managing defined ASMP requirements, proposed enhancements, and available resources in a cost effective way. The resulting mathematical model and analytic methodology will identify optimal ASMP investment strategies, maximizing the "value added" from proposed ASMP initiatives to improve the Army's posture for achieving anticipated strategic deployment objectives within applicable resource constraints. The ultimate purpose is to aid in the preparation of the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) and budget decision processes.

b. Definitions:

(1) Value added is the marginal return on investment, based on the effectiveness of various initiatives proposed under ASMP to improve some aspect of strategic mobility, relative to the costs of the initiatives.

(2) An ASMP initiative is a defined infrastructure improvement, resource acquisition, capability enhancement, or other similar action that uses funding resources to enhance deployability of a specified Army force element.

c. Scope:

(1) Baseline program is President's Budget fiscal year (FY) 94 and the U.S. Program Force (FY 95), or the latest appropriate funding document.

(2) The analysis will examine the funding stream associated with ASMP.
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(3) Approximately 500 ASMP initiatives, representing large dollar amounts in current and proposed programs, will be included. Inclusion of any particular initiative is subject to the ability to effectively represent that initiative in terms of data and modeling capability. ASMP initiatives will be aggregated as necessary and appropriate.

(4) Scenarios and forces. The scenario and force structure employed for the initial Mobility Requirements Study (MRS) will be used for initial model development and validation purposes. The end product model and methodology will be flexible to accommodate varying scenarios and force structures.

d. Proposed Methodology. A mathematical programming model will be developed based upon CAA's Value Added Analysis paradigm. The model will be used to analyze candidate ASMP initiatives with respect to costs and benefits, and will generate recommendations regarding funding priorities and funding levels for proposed ASMP initiatives.

e. Objectives:

(1) To assist USALEA in identification of objectives, capabilities, and requirements to perform the subject analysis. In particular, develop a mathematical modeling formulation and determine data requirements to populate the resulting model.

(2) To develop a prototype implementation of the modeling formulation. Test the prototype with notional data, making corrections, improvements, and modifications as necessary. This effort will be in collaboration with USALEA and will be performed concurrently with their data collection effort to ensure consistency between data and model.

(3) Test and continue the development effort using the data collected and developed by USALEA.

(4) Conduct a demonstration of the refined model. This will use the best available data obtained from authoritative sources. Results of this analysis will form the Base Case for this study.

(5) Support DALO-TSM in the POM building process as necessary.
f. Timeframe. Fiscal obligation analysis timeframe: POM period FY 96 through FY 01.

 g. Limitations. The optimization model will initially be installed at CAA because the hardware and software required are currently available only at CAA. Efforts will be made to provide as much as possible of the developed capability, both data and tools, to the sponsors and to USALEA for their use in internal analyses.

 h. Assumptions:

 (1) The scenarios and forces used in the study will be adequate to measure the effectiveness of candidate ASMP initiatives.

 (2) The measures of effectiveness (MOE) used for purposes of this study accurately assess and express the effects of implementing the proposed ASMP initiatives on the closure times of Army units.

 i. Essential Elements of Analysis (EEA):

 (1) Does the proposed mathematical programming formulation satisfy the analytic requirements of this study at the required level of sensitivity?

 (2) Taking force closure times as the primary MOE in determining effectiveness of the candidate ASMP initiatives, what allocation of available ASMP funds to the proposed initiatives best enables the realization of overall force closure objectives?

 (3) What ASMP initiatives, in what relative order of priority, are recommended in the Base Case for procurement in the Army POM?

 6. RESPONSIBILITIES:

 a. ODCSLOG (DALO-TSM) will:

 (1) Provide a study sponsor representative and study guidance.

 (2) Provide support to the analysis for data required to conduct the study.
b. USALEA will:
   (1) Provide a study representative and study guidance.
   (2) Collaborate in the development of the funding prioritization model, primarily in a directive, advisory, or consultive capacity.
   (3) Acquire, develop, and provide data required for performance of the study.

c. CAA will:
   (1) Conduct the ASMP funding prioritization modeling study and analysis.
   (2) Designate a study director and provide the study team.
   (3) Provide periodic in-process reviews (IPR) as requested by the study sponsors.

7. REFERENCES: The Army Program Value Analysis (90-97) (CAA-SR-91-9) and Army Program Value Analysis (94-99) (CAA-SR-92-10) Reports provide the basis for the methodology and approach to this study. Other references include the President's FY 94 Budget.

8. ADMINISTRATION:
   a. Support:
      (1) Funds for travel and/or per-diem will be provided by the parent organizations of the individuals traveling.
      (2) ADP support will be provided by CAA.
      (3) Secretarial support, reports, and publication will be provided by CAA.

b. Key Milestones and Milestone Schedule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begin Model Development</td>
<td>1 Feb 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Prototype Model</td>
<td>14 Feb 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Prototype Testing</td>
<td>28 Mar 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Scale Development Begins</td>
<td>1 Apr 94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Complete Base Case Demonstration .................. 15 May 94
Preparation Complete to Support POM Development 1 Jun 94
Technical Effort Completed/Final IPR ............... 30 Jun 94
Documentation Completed and Delivered ............ 15 Sep 94

C. Control Procedure. The study sponsors' representatives will coordinate and communicate within the HQDA staff and between the ARSTAF and the study agency.

[Signature]
NORMAN E. WILLIAMS
Brigadier General, GS
Director of Transportation,
Energy and Troop Support

CF:
CDR, LEA
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APPENDIX E

PROPOSED USE OF GLOBAL DEPLOYMENT ANALYSIS SIMULATION (GDAS) MODEL

E-1. MODEL DESCRIPTION. GDAS is a transportation model that performs transportation analysis of large- or small-scale force deployments including mode planning, port selection, routing, scheduling, and simulation. The global transportation network model schedules from CONUS origins to intratheater destinations using intermodal, multi-theater transport by air, sea, and land. GDAS includes integrated data base, query, world map display, chart graphics, simulation modeling, scheduling, analysis, and reporting capabilities. Special modeling features of GDAS include tracking of individual ship and aircraft locations, shortest path routing with node constraints for all modes, port facility throughput limitations with queuing, integrated air/sea/ motor/rail mode selection, and time-phased dependency links between different movement requirements. GDAS operates on microcomputers using MS-DOS.

E-2. PURPOSE. In order to be able to evaluate initiatives individually rather than aggregated at the installation level, it is necessary to have a tool to evaluate the effect of funding each initiative. GDAS is being examined as a candidate tool. It may be used to evaluate the ASMP initiatives that are expected to improve the capability to transport equipment, materiel, and personnel.

a. ASMP Requirements Studies. Data currently available from the MTMC-TEA ASMP requirements studies include information on the ability of a facility to meet its mission if certain initiatives are funded. This can be translated to benefits derived from implementation, and that is what was done for the prototype. However, the data aggregates initiatives together for each installation and was not derived in such a way as to allow information to be broken out for each individual initiative. In fact, only 20 percent of the initiatives have useful data for this source.

b. Applicable Initiatives. The initiatives that require the acquisition of vehicles (railcars) and containers can be evaluated using GDAS. Those that improve the outload capability of a facility (railhead, container terminal, ocean terminal, airfield) can also be evaluated using the GDAS Model. These types of initiatives provide an improvement in capability that can be measured in short tons or measurement tons processed per day.

c. Unsuitable Initiatives. Several types of initiatives included in the ASMP program are unsuitable for evaluation using GDAS. Initiatives related to the maintenance of existing facilities, automated systems, and training do not provide a clear, measurable improvement in capability, i.e., an increase in short tons or measurement tons processed per day. Tables E-1 through E-3 list those projects that were included in the ASMP program during the conduct of this study. The potential applicability of the GDAS Model in estimating their effectiveness is shown in the first column. There is a separate table for each appropriation type—MCA, OMA, and OPA.
E-3. STATUS. As of this writing, the data bases required to build the GDAS network for 13 major installations have been developed. As this is the first attempt at developing a CONUS network, debugging this complex structure has turned out to be extremely time-consuming and is not yet complete.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GDAS applies</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Impact location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Center Wharf Expansion</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>West Coast Ammo Port</td>
<td>Concord, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT Bragg, Personnel Holding Facility</td>
<td>FT Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Repair Airfield Runway Lighting</td>
<td>FT Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>West Coast Ammo Piers</td>
<td>Concord, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT Bragg, Heavy Drop Rig Facility</td>
<td>FT Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>A/DAAG Staging Complex</td>
<td>FT Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>FT Bliss, Rail Deployment Facility Complex</td>
<td>FT Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Stewart, Rail Yard Expansion</td>
<td>FT Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Rail Yard Expansion</td>
<td>FT Carson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Sill, Rail System/Container Facility</td>
<td>FT Sill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Extend AFB (Fixed Wing Aircraft Parking)</td>
<td>FT Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dredge Channel</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>PAX Process FAC CAAF</td>
<td>FT Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT Bliss, Air Deployment Facility</td>
<td>FT Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Hood, Rail Phase I (4 Spurs/Container Facility)</td>
<td>FT Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Campbell, Hopkinsville Bypass</td>
<td>FT Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Upgrade Main Pier</td>
<td>FT Eustis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ammo Upload Facility</td>
<td>FT Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Contingency Warehouse</td>
<td>FT Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Campbell, Add Rail Tracks</td>
<td>FT Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT Bragg, Ammo Hold Facility</td>
<td>FT Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Repair AF Taxiways/Aprons</td>
<td>FT Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Repair Runway</td>
<td>FT Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Green Ramp Phase I</td>
<td>FT Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Contingency Stock Warehouse</td>
<td>FT Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Hood, Rail Phase II (3 Spurs/Stage Area)</td>
<td>FT Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Rail Assembly Yard</td>
<td>Hawthorne AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Hood, Rail Phase III (4 Spurs/Track)</td>
<td>FT Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Stewart, Rail Marshaling Yard</td>
<td>FT Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Additions To Wharf A</td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Standard Taxiways/Aprons</td>
<td>FT Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Benning, Rail Loading &amp; Container Facility</td>
<td>FT Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Long-term Holding Facility</td>
<td>Sierra AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Construct DAAG Facilities</td>
<td>FT Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Polk, Rail Transfer Loading Facility</td>
<td>FT Polk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT Bliss, Ammo Hot Load Area</td>
<td>FT Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>CADS Pad Upgrade</td>
<td>McAlester AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>PREPO Container Road</td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Container DOL Warehouse</td>
<td>FT Sill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Airfield Parking Apron</td>
<td>FT Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Railcar Holding Area</td>
<td>Crane AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Deployment Isolation Facility</td>
<td>FT Lewis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E-1. GDAS Candidate List for MCA-funded Initiatives
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GDAS applies</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Impact location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Upgrade Ammo Pads</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Deployment Training Facility</td>
<td>FT Eustis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Blue Grass AD, Container Rail Load Sites</td>
<td>Blue Grass AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>River Road Improvements</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Renovate Deployment Hangar</td>
<td>FT Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mobilization Warehouse</td>
<td>FT Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Deployment Facility McChord AFB</td>
<td>FT Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ammo Storage Facility</td>
<td>FT Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Wharf A Marshaling Area</td>
<td>Charleston, SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>FT Stewart, Expand Access to Ammo Storage</td>
<td>FT Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mobilization Materiel Warehouse</td>
<td>FT Carson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Fixed Wing Runway</td>
<td>FT Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unit Movement Facility</td>
<td>FT Sill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Runway Extension Lawson AAF</td>
<td>FT Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>FT Stewart, Rail Pass Track</td>
<td>FT Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Road Network Improvements</td>
<td>Iowa AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Crane</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rail Track Repair</td>
<td>McAlester AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Contingency Storage Facility</td>
<td>FT Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Roadway Repair</td>
<td>McAlester AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Crane AAP, Container Transfer Facility</td>
<td>Crane AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Flight Control Tower</td>
<td>FT Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Igloo Door Modifications</td>
<td>Blue Grass AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Equipment Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>Camp Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Canopy For Cargo Transfer</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Crane AAP, Container Stuffing Facility</td>
<td>Crane AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>General Purpose Warehouse</td>
<td>FT Sill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Igloo Repairs</td>
<td>Milan AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>FT Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Barge Loading Ramp</td>
<td>FT Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Stuffing</td>
<td>Anniston AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Enlarge Ammo Dock (Container Pad)</td>
<td>Red River AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Loading Docks &amp; Ramps</td>
<td>FT Carson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ammo Holding Facility Lawson AAF</td>
<td>FT Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Spur Track</td>
<td>McAlester AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>Camp Grayling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Container Repair Facility</td>
<td>Iowa AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Container Repair Facility Access Road</td>
<td>Iowa AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDAS applies</td>
<td>Item description</td>
<td>Impact location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Igloo Door Modifications</td>
<td>Blue Grass AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>RO/RO Ships (Start, O&amp;S, Maintenance)</td>
<td>Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LMSR Ships I (Start, O&amp;S, Maintenance)</td>
<td>Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LASH Ships (Start, O&amp;S, Maintenance)</td>
<td>Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LMSR Ships II (Start, O&amp;S, Maintenance)</td>
<td>Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Ships (Start, O&amp;S, Maintenance)</td>
<td>Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Install Blocks II And III DAMMS-R</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>HLPS Ship I (Start, O&amp;S, Maintenance)</td>
<td>SPOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>HLPS Ship II (Start, O&amp;S, Maintenance)</td>
<td>SPOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LMSR Ships III (Start, O&amp;S, Maintenance)</td>
<td>Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rail Track Upgrades (FORMAP)</td>
<td>FORSOM installations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TACS Ship (Start, O&amp;S, Maintenance)</td>
<td>SPOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maintain Operational AALPS/TCACCIS</td>
<td>All CONUS sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phase II Track</td>
<td>Hawthorne AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Upgrade Track</td>
<td>McAlester AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Sierra AD, Force Provider</td>
<td>Sierra, AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, FT Bragg, 82d Abn Div</td>
<td>FT Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>SEDRes At Port of Beaumont</td>
<td>Port of Beaumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Kaiserslautern, Germany</td>
<td>aiserslautern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Install Blocks II And III DAMMS-R, Active</td>
<td>CONUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Install Blocks II And III DAMMS-R, Reserve</td>
<td>CONUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Install Blocks II And III DAMMS-R, National Guard</td>
<td>CONUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Install Blocks II And III DAMMS-R</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Repair Rails on Wharves</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, XVIII Abn Corps and 1st COSCOM</td>
<td>FT Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Indian Reservation Track Repairs (Phase I)</td>
<td>Hawthorne AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Road Repairs</td>
<td>Hawthorne AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>Blue Grass AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Hawthorne AAP, CADS Facility</td>
<td>Hawthorne AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Anniston AD, Container Facility</td>
<td>Anniston AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, FT Stewart, 24th ID (Mech)</td>
<td>FT Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Hawthorne AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Upgrade Track</td>
<td>Anniston AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>SEDRes at Port Of Savannah</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>SEDRes at Port Of Jacksonville</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rail Repair</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Integrate AALPS/TCACCIS on Std Hardware</td>
<td>All CONUS sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Upgrade Track (Includes Container Support Facility)</td>
<td>Tooele AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, FT Campbell, 101st ASSL Div</td>
<td>FT Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, FT Richardson, 6th ID (Lt)</td>
<td>FT Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Incoming Rail Yard</td>
<td>Blue Grass AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDAS applies</td>
<td>Item description</td>
<td>Impact location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>Red River AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Annual Maintenance Dredging</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Repair Fenders</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Camp Darby, Italy</td>
<td>CP. Darby, IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, FT Hood, III Corps and 13th COSCOM</td>
<td>FT Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, FT Lewis, 7th Inf Div (Lt)</td>
<td>FT Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, FT Hood, 1st Cav Div</td>
<td>FT Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>FT Eustis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Schofield Barracks, 25th ID (Lt)</td>
<td>Schofield Barracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USAR Units (Unspecified)</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, FT Bliss, 3d ACR</td>
<td>FT Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>FT Sill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>Seneca AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Rail Upgrade</td>
<td>FT Chaffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Operate Joint Strategic Deployment Training Center</td>
<td>Universal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Roadway Repair</td>
<td>Milan AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, FT Drum, 10th Mountain Div (Lt)</td>
<td>FT Drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Develop IDP-4 for TCACCIS</td>
<td>All CONUS Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Implement Phase II In-transit Visibility (ITV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Strategic Deployment Analysis</td>
<td>Ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Bad Kreuznach Germany</td>
<td>Bad Kreuznach GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Hawthorne AAP</td>
<td>Hawthorne AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Schweinfurt Germany</td>
<td>Schweinfurt GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Wuerzburg Germany</td>
<td>Wuerzburg GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Renovate S-12 Pier</td>
<td>MOTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Baumholder Germany</td>
<td>Baumholder GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Vicenza It</td>
<td>Vicenza IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Crane AAP</td>
<td>Crane AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Anniston Army Depot</td>
<td>Anniston AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, McAlester AAP</td>
<td>McAlester AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Lexington - Blue Grass Army Depot</td>
<td>Lexington - Blue Grass AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Milan AAP, Track Repairs</td>
<td>Milan AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Darmstadt Germany</td>
<td>Darmstadt GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Sierra Army Depot</td>
<td>Sierra AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Army Containerization Integration Office</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Milan AAP</td>
<td>Milan AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 7th Special Forces Gp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Savannah Army Depot, Railroad Repairs</td>
<td>Savanna AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Letterkenny Army Depot</td>
<td>Letterkenny AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Red River Army Depot</td>
<td>Red River AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, SOIC WDSTAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDAS applies</td>
<td>Item description</td>
<td>Impact location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Missile Sheds</td>
<td>Red River AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Arterial Road</td>
<td>Red River AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Extend Docks</td>
<td>Red River AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>MTMC Warfighter Deployment Interface Program</td>
<td>Ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Tooele AAP</td>
<td>Tooele AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Seneca Army Depot</td>
<td>Seneca AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 528th SOS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Grafenwoehr Germany</td>
<td>Grafenwoehr GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 351 CA (Res)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 352 CA (Res)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 358 CA (Res)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 361 CA (Res)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, SOIC WC3JAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 353 CA (Res)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 12th Special Forces Gp (Res)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 5th Special Forces Gp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tiger Teams for Port Opening</td>
<td>Ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Full Time Presence At Strategic Ports</td>
<td>Ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 112th Signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 96th CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 4th PSYOP Gp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, Savannah Army Depot</td>
<td>Savannah AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 2nd PSYOP Gp (Res)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Containers, USASOC, 7th Special Forces Gp (Res)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDAS applies</td>
<td>Item description</td>
<td>Impact location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, FT Bliss</td>
<td>FT Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, FT Hood</td>
<td>FT Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, FT Campbell</td>
<td>FT Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, FT Benning</td>
<td>FT Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, FT Stewart</td>
<td>FT Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Complete FOC TCACCIS</td>
<td>All CONUS sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Hawthorne AAP</td>
<td>Hawthorne AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Field TCACCIS IDP-4</td>
<td>All CONUS sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, US Marine Corps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Crane AAP</td>
<td>Crane AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Anniston Army Depot</td>
<td>Anniston AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, McAlester AAP</td>
<td>McAlester AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Lexington-Blue Grass Army Depot</td>
<td>Blue Grass AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Lift Device, 82&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Airborne Div</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Lift Device, 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Mountain Div (Lt In)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Lift Device, 101&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Air Asslt Div</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Lift Device, 24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Inf Div (Mech)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Lift Device, 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Cav Div</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Lift Device, 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Inf Div (Mech)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Lift Device, 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Armor Div</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Lift Device, 25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Inf Div (Lt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Lift Device, 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Armor Div</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Container Lift Device, 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Inf Div (Mech)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Sierra Army Depot</td>
<td>Sierra AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Milan AAP</td>
<td>Milan AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>TCACCIS Connectivity, FTs to CONUS Ports</td>
<td>All CONUS sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Red River Army Depot</td>
<td>Red River AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Letterkenny Army Depot</td>
<td>Letterkenny AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GDAS applies</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Impact location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Stewart</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Bragg</td>
<td>Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Campbell</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Hood</td>
<td>Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Carson</td>
<td>Carson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Drum</td>
<td>Drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Lewis</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Benning</td>
<td>Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Sill</td>
<td>Sill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Polk</td>
<td>Polk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Bliss</td>
<td>Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Riley</td>
<td>Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Irwin</td>
<td>Irwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Anniston</td>
<td>Anniston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Bluegrass</td>
<td>Bluegrass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Charleston</td>
<td>Charleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Crane</td>
<td>Crane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Hawthorne</td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Letterkenny</td>
<td>Letterkenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE McAlester</td>
<td>McAlester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Red River</td>
<td>Red River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>CHE Tooele</td>
<td>Tooele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Tooele AAP</td>
<td>Tooele AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Seneca Army Depot</td>
<td>Seneca AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Railcars, Savannah Army Depot</td>
<td>Savannah AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

PASMPR OPTIMIZATION MODEL FOR PROTOTYPE

F-1. MODEL DESCRIPTION. The optimization model developed for the PASMPR prototype formulation interfaces with the IBM Optimization Subroutine Library (OSL). The formulation that it implements is identified in Figure 3-5.

F-2. THE FORTRAN CODE. The following model is a matrix generator and post-processor, written in FORTRAN 77, which provides information concerning variables, constraints, coefficients, and the objective function in a manner which is proscribed by OSL:

```fortran
C (PASMPR2)
C*******************************************************************************
C
C
C*******************************************************************************
C
program asmpop
C*******************************************************************************
C *** Input Variable Definitions
C*******************************************************************************
C *** NUNITS.................(I) number of unit packages
C *** NINIT...................(I) number of ASMP initiatives or aggregated initiatives
C *** NYR.....................(K) number of years in study, generally the pom cycle
C *** NAPP.....................(I) number of appropriation types, i.e., OMA, OPA, MCA
C *** NOPT.....................total number of procurement options combinations
C *** X(I).....................holds the index of funded initiatives
C *** JPROC(NOPT, NYR)........0 if no procurement (y) for opt p, in year k
C *** .................1 if yes procurement (y) for init j, in year k
C *** JPONZ.....................proc zero elements
C *** PINIT(I)................place location of initiative j
C *** LOPTYR(P)................last yr of procurement for init j
C *** FCOST(NINIT, NAPP).......fixed cost of init, by appropriation type
C *** VCOST(NINIT, NAPP).......variable cost of init, by appropriation type
C *** B(NYR, NAPP)...............yearly budget, by approprop
C *** MEFFB(NUNIT, NINIT).......marginal effectiveness beta, fixed delta in closure of
C *** unit i, given j is procured
C *** MEFFA(NUNIT, NINIT).......marginal effectiveness beta, delta in closure of i given 1
C *** increment of j
C *** WUNIT(NUNIT).............weight or priority of unit
C *** PCLOSE(NUNIT)............present closure time of unit
C *** RCLOSE(NUNIT)............required closure time of unit
C *** MAXDEV(NUNIT)............max deviation in closure time allowed for unit i
C *** MINQ(NINIT, NYR).........min procurement of j in yr k
C *** MAXQ(NINIT, NYR).........max procurement of j in yr k
C *** TMINQ(NINIT)...............total min procurement of j, for all years
C *** TMAXQ(NINIT)...............total min procurement of j, for all years
C*******************************************************************************
C *** Decision Variable Definitions
C*******************************************************************************
C *** X(P, I)....................1, if option p of init j is funded; 0, otherwise
C *** Y(P, I, K)..................quantity of init j procured in year k by option p
C *** Z(I).......................positive deviations in closure time of unit i
```
C*------------------------------------------------------------------------*
C *** Define Problem Variables
C*------------------------------------------------------------------------*
C Include the OSL definitions
INCLUDE (OSLR)
INCLUDE (OSLI)
INCLUDE (OSLN)
IMPLICIT NONE
INTEGER*4 NINIT, NUNIT, NYR, NAPP, MAXIN, MAXUN, MAXTYP, 
& MAXOPT, MAXYR, MAXAPP 
& PARAMETER (MAXIN=50, MAXUN=50, MAXYR=6, MAXAPP=3, 
& MAXTYP=6, MAXOPT=200)
INTEGER*4 JPROC(MAXOPT, MAXYR), 
& MINQ(MAXIN, MAXYR), 
& MAXQ(MAXIN, MAXYR), 
& MINQ(MAXIN), 
& MAXQ(MAXIN), 
& APPTYP(MAXIN, MAXAPP), 
& JINDX, 
& UNINDX, 
& BEGIND(MAXTYP), 
& ENDIND(MAXTYP), 
& IOPT, 
& NTYPE, 
& TYPINIT(MAXTYP), 
& TINIT(MAXIN), 
& QIND(MAXIN), 
& NOPT, 
& TOTYR(MAXOPT), 
& LOPTYR(MAXOPT), 
& PMINDX, 
& NDXPTR(MAXOPT), 
& NROW, 
& J01, 
& J02, 
& J0, 
& I, M, L, J, K, 
& NINITS, 
& IDUMYR, 
& IFLAG, 
& J1, 
& ISUMVC, 
& PYR(MAXOPT, MAXYR), 
& OPT(MAXOPT), 
& JPNONZ, 
& NINCNR, 
& XI(MAXIN), 
& PINIT(MAXIN), 
& NPMETH
REAL*8 FCOST(MAXIN, MAXAPP), 
& VCOST(MAXIN, MAXAPP), 
& MEFFB(MAXUN, MAXIN), 
& MEFFA(MAXUN, MAXIN), 
& WUNIT(MAXUN), 
& PCLOSE(MAXUN), 
& RCLOSE(MAXUN), 
& MAXDEV(MAXUN)
SUMWU,
B(MAXYR,MAXAPP),
OBJARR(MAXIN),
TOTOBJ,
COSTARR(MAXIN,MAXYR,MAXAPP),
YCAPP(MAXYR,MAXAPP),
TCAPP(MAXAPP),
TCYEAR(MAXYR),
TINCAPP(MAXIN,MAXYR)

CHARACTER*8 CINIT(MAXIN),
CLINIT,
DUMRED,
UNNAME(MAXIN)

C**************************************************************************
C *** Define Decision Variables
C**************************************************************************
C
INTEGER*4 X(MAXOPT),
Y(MAXOPT,MAXYR)
REAL*8 Z(MAXIN)

C**************************************************************************
C *** Define OSL Variables
C**************************************************************************
INTEGER*4 IRL, ICL, IEL, NUMX, IRU, IDELS, NINTS, NSETS,
IVCNTR, NUMY, NUMZ, NCOL, NEL, ITYPE, RTCOD,
MXSPACE
PARAMETER (IRL = 5000, ICL = 5000, IEL = 12000,
MXSPACE = 135000000, ITYPE = 1)
REAL*8 DRLO(IRL), DRUP(IRL), DCLO(ICL), DCUP(ICL),
DOB(ICL), DELS(IEL), DSPACE(MXSPACE),
DNPCOST, UPPCOST
INTEGER*4 IA(IEL), JA(IEL), MINT(500), NTSIZE, PRI(1),
IMDLTP(1), NSETIN(1), NSSETS(1), ANSWER(66)

C**************************************************************************
C *** Initialize Arrays
C**************************************************************************
C *** For problem variables: **********************************************
C
READ(15,*) NINIT, NUNIT, NYR, NTYPE, NAPP

DO 10 J = 1, NINIT
DO 20 K = 1, NYR
JPROC(J,K) = 0
MINQ(J,K) = 0
MAXQ(J,K) = 0
DO 30 L = 1, NAPP
FCOST(J,L) = 0.0D0
VCOST(J,L) = 0.0D0
30 CONTINUE
20 CONTINUE
10 CONTINUE

DO 40 K = 1, NYR
DO 50 L = 1, NAPP
B(K,L) = 0.0D0
50 CONTINUE
CONTINUE  
C
DO 60 I = 1, NUNIT
   DO 70 J = 1, NUNIT
      MEFFB(I,J) = 0.00D0
      MEFFA(I,J) = 0.00D0
   CONTINUE
70 CONTINUE
60 CONTINUE
C
*** For OSL Variables: ****************************
C
DO 80 M = 1, IRL
   DRLO(M) = 0.00D0
   DRUP(M) = 0.00D0
80 CONTINUE
C
DO 81 M = 1, ICL
   DCLO(M) = 0.00D0
   DCUP(M) = 0.00D0
   DOBJ(M) = 0.00D0
81 CONTINUE
C
DO 82 M = 1, NINIT
   MINT(M) = 0
82 CONTINUE
C
DO 83 M = 1, IEL
   IA(M) = 0.00D0
   JA(M) = 0.00D0
   DELS(M) = 0.00D0
83 CONTINUE
C
IRU = 0
IDELS = 0
C
**************************************************************************
C
*** Read input variables, beginning with JPROC matrix, so that
C
*** comparisons can be made back to jproc to see if there is
C
*** an expected entry for that init-year combo expected.
C
**************************************************************************
C
ISUMVC = 0
   J1=0
   IFLAG = 0
   DO 110 J = 1, NUNIT
      READ (16,*) JINDX, TINIT(J), CINIT(J),
      & (APPTYP(J,L,L=1,NAPP),TMINQ(J)),
      & (TMAXQ(J), (FCOST(J,L), L = 1,NAPP),
      & (VCOST(J,L), L = 1,NAPP), QIND(J), PINIT(J))
C
   for the short term, until better data is available, set the yearly min
C max to TMAXQ respectively, later in the constraints, the model will determine
C how much it will put in each year. based on a 10% variance +/- that we allow from the max divided by total years in the option choosen.
C
DO 111 K = 1, NYR
   MINQ(J,K) = TMAXQ(J)
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MAXQ(J,K) = TMAXQ(J)
111 CONTINUE
110 CONTINUE

120 READ (20,*) JINDX, UNINDX, MEFFA(UNINDX,JINDX),
& MEFFB(UNINDX,JINDX), DUMRED

IF ( MEFFA(UNINDX,JINDX) .NE. 0.0D0 .AND. QIND(JINDX) .EQ. 0 ) THEN
WRITE(6,* ) 'INIT', JINDX, ' UNIT ',UNINDX, ' HAS MEFFA W/O X.'
IFLAG = 1
ENDIF
IF ( DUMRED .EQ. ' ' ) GO TO 120

C *** read budget limits by yr and appropriation type
WRITE(8,* ) 'BUDGET LIMITS BY YEAR AND APPROPRIATION'
DO 140 K = 1, NYP
    READ (17,*) IDUMYR, ( B(K,L), L = 1, NAPP)
    WRITE (8,* ) 'YEAR ', IDUMYR, ( B(K,L), L = 1, NAPP)
140 CONTINUE
C
SUMWU = 0.0
DO 160 L = 1, NUNIT
    READ (18,*) UNINDX, UNNAME(I), WUNIT(I)
    SUMWU = SUMWU + WUNIT(I)
160 CONTINUE
C
C *** Check to see that unit weights (priorities) do not sum to more than 1.0.
C
IF ( SUMWU .GT. 1.0 ) WRITE (7,* ) 'UNIT WEIGHT',
& ' (PRIORITIES) EXCEED ALLOWABLE TOTAL OF 1.0 AS ',
& ' OF UNIT', I

160 CONTINUE
C
C *** Read table of possible procurement methods, and lookup table cross-
C reference for which methods are used for which init types.

READ(19,* ) NPMETH
WRITE(6,* ) 'NPMETH = ',NPMETH
DO 165 L = 1, NPMETH
    READ(19,* ) PMINDX,(PYR(PMINDX,K),K = 1,NYP)
    WRITE(6,* ) PMINDX,(PYR(PMINDX,K),K = 1,NYP)
165 CONTINUE
WRITE(6,* ) 'TYPE INFORMATION'
DO 166 L = 1, NTYP
    READ (19,* ) TYPINIT(L), BEGIND(TYPINIT(L)),ENDIND(TYPINIT(L))
    WRITE(6,* ) TYPINIT(L), BEGIND(TYPINIT(L)),ENDIND(TYPINIT(L))
166 CONTINUE

WRITE(6,* ) 'INIT INFORMATION'
DO 170 J = 1,NINIT
    WRITE(6,* ) J, BEGIND(TINIT(J)),ENDIND(TINIT(J))
    DO 171 IOPT = BEGIND(TINIT(J)),ENDIND(TINIT(J))
        NOPT = NOPT + 1
        OPT(NOPT) = J
        NDXPCTR(NOPT) = IOPT
    DO 172 K = 1, NYP
        IF ( PYR(NDXPCTR(NOPT),K) .EQ. 1 ) THEN
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LOPTYR(NOPT) = K
TOTYR(NOPT) = TOTYR(NOPT) + 1
ENDIF

172 CONTINUE
WRITE(6,*) IOPT, NOPT, OPT(NOPT), LOPTYR(NOPT)
& TOTYR(NOPT)
171 CONTINUE
170 CONTINUE

C *** set up jproc from pyr matrix:

DO 175 J0 = 1, NOPT
    J = OPT(J0)
    WRITE(6,*) J, BEGIND(TINIT(J)), ENDIND(TINIT(J))
    DO 177 K = 1, NYR
        JPROC(J0,K) = PYR(NDXPTR(J0),K)
    177 CONTINUE
175 CONTINUE

C******************************************************************************************
C *** Set upper and lower bounds of decision variables and number the nonzero
C *** elements of jproc.
C******************************************************************************************

C*** for debug purposes, print contents of jproc before renumbering occurs:
WRITE (6,*) 'PRIOR TO RENUMBERING JPROC.'
WRITE (6,*) 'J0', 'OPT(J0)', 'TINIT', 'JPROC'

DO 178 J0 = 1, NOPT
    WRITE (6,*) J0, OPT(J0), TINIT(OPT(J0)), (JPROC(J0,K), K = 1, NYR)
178 CONTINUE

C *** For the binary elements in jproc:
JPNONZ = 0
IVCNTR = NOPT
DO 180 J0 = 1, NOPT
    MINT(J0) = J0
    DCLO(J0) = 0.0D0
    DCUP(J0) = 1.0D31
    DO 200 K = 1, NYR
        IF (JPROC(J0,K) .EQ. 1) THEN
            JPNONZ = JPNONZ + 1
            JPROC(J0,K) = JPNONZ + NOPT
        ELSE
            IVCNTR = IVCNTR + 1
            MINT(IVCNTR) = JPROC(J0,K)
            DCLO(JPNONZ+NOPT) = 0.0D0
            DCUP(JPNONZ+NOPT) = 1.0D31
        ENDIF
    200 CONTINUE

C*** for debug purposes, print contents of jproc after renumbering occurs:
WRITE (6,*) 'AFTER RENUMBERING JPROC.'
WRITE (6,*) 'JPROC OF J0('',J0,'') = ', (JPROC(J0,K), K = 1, NYR)
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180  CONTINUE
NINTS = IVCNTR
WRITE(6,*)'NONZEROS ',JNONZ+NOPT,' INTS ',IVCNTR,
& ' NONINT ',NINCNTR
C******************************************************************************
C *** For each constraint, convert coefficients for non-zero elements, rhs, and lhs
C *** into dspace matrix.
C******************************************************************************
C *** Constraint set 1 -- Budget constraints
C
WRITE (6,*) 'CONRAIN SET 1: IDELS ',IDEELS, ' IRU ',IRU
WRITE(8,*) 'BUDGET CONSTRAINT ENTRIES'
DO 220 K = 1, NYR
   DO 230 L = 1, NAPP
      IRU = IRU + 1
   DO 240 J0 = 1, NOPT
C *** if variable cost exist:
   IF (JPROC(J0,K) .NE. 0 ) THEN
      IF ((QIND(OPT(J0)) .EQ. 1) .AND.
         & (VCOSt(OPT(J0),L) .NE. 0.0D0)) THEN
         WRITE(8,*) 'OPT ',J0,
         & ' INIT ',OPT(J0), ' YEAR ',K,' APP ',L
         & , VCOSt(OPT(J0),L)*DCUP(JPROC(J0,K)),
         & DCUP(JPROC(J0,K),QIND(OPT(J0)))
         IDEELS = IDEELS + 1
         IA(IDEELS) = IRU
         JA(IDEELS) = JPROC(J0,K)
         DELS(IDEELS) = VCOSt(OPT(J0),L)
      ELSEIF ((QIND(OPT(J0)) .EQ. 0) .AND.
         & (FCOSt(OPT(J0),L) .NE. 0.0D0)) THEN
         WRITE(8,*) 'OPT ',J0,
         & ' INIT ',OPT(J0), ' YEAR ',K,' APP ',L
         & , DCUP(JPROC(J0,K))*FCOSt(OPT(J0),L)
         & / TOTYR(J0),QIND(OPT(J0))
         IDEELS = IDEELS + 1
         IA(IDEELS) = IRU
         JA(IDEELS) = JPROC(J0,K)
         DELS(IDEELS) = FCOSt(OPT(J0),L)/ TOTYR(J0)
   ENDIF
   ENDIF
240  CONTINUE
C
C *** Rhs:
   DRLO(IRU) = 0.0D0
   DRUP(IRU) = B(K,L)
230  CONTINUE
220  CONTINUE
C******************************************************************************
C *** Constraint set 2 -- only 1 procurement method may be used per init
C
WRITE (6,*) 'CONRAIN SET 2: IDELS ',IDEELS, ' IRU ',IRU
C
DO 250 J = 1,NINIT
   IRU = IRU + 1
   DO 260 J0 = 1, NOPT
      IF ( OPT(J0) .EQ. J ) THEN
         ...
IDELS = IDELS + 1
IA(IDELS) = IRU
JA(IDELS) = JO
DELS(IDELS) = 1.0D0
ENDIF
260 CONTINUE
C *** Rhs:
DRLO(IRU) = 0.0D0
DRUP(IRU) = 1.0D0
250 CONTINUE
C
C********************************************************************************************************
C *** Constraint set 3 -- Yearly Procurement min and max quantities:
C
WRITE (6,*) 'CONSTRAINT SET 3: IDELS, IDELS, IRU, IRU'
C
DO 280 JO = 1, NOPT
   DO 290 K = 1, NYR
      IF (JPROC(JO,K) .NE.0.AND.
         & QIND(OPT(JO),.EQ.1) THEN
         IRU = IRU + 1
         IDELS = IDELS + 1
         IA(IDELS) = IRU
         JA(IDELS) = JO
         DELS(IDELS) = (-MAXQ(OPT(JO),K) / TOTYR(JO)) * 1.1D0
      IDELS = IDELS + 1
      IA(IDELS) = IRU
      JA(IDELS) = JPROC(JO,K)
      DELS(IDELS) = 1.0D0
      DRLO(IRU) = (MINQ(OPT(JO),K) / TOTYR(JO)) * 0.9D0 -
      & (MAXQ(OPT(JO),K) / TOTYR(JO)) * 1.1D0
      DRUP(IRU) = 0.0D0
      ENDIF
290 CONTINUE
280 CONTINUE
C
C********************************************************************************************************
C *** Constraint set 4 -- Total Procurement quantities:
C
WRITE (6,*) 'CONSTRAINT SET 4: IDELS, IDELS, IRU, IRU'
C
DO 320 JO = 1, NOPT
   IF(QIND(OPT(JO),.EQ.1) THEN
      IRU = IRU + 1
C *** binary piece:
      IDELS = IDELS + 1
      IA(IDELS) = IRU
      JA(IDELS) = JO
      DELS(IDELS) = -TMAXQ(OPT(JO))
C
DO 330 K = 1, NYR
   IF (JPROC(JO,K) .NE.0) THEN
C *** non-binary piece:
      IDELS = IDELS + 1
      IA(IDELS) = IRU
      JA(IDELS) = JPROC(JO,K)
      DELS(IDELS) = 1.0D0
320 CONTINUE
330 CONTINUE
ENDIF
330    CONTINUE
C *** to make an equality constraint, make up and lo both 0.
       DRLO(IRU) = 0.0D0
       DRUP(IRU) = 0.0D0
ELSE
C *** The variables are integer and must have the same value as the opt variable
   DO 325 K = 1, NFR
      IF (TOPC(JO,K) .NE. 0) THEN
         IRU = IRU + 1
         IDELS = IDELS + 1
         JA(IDELS) = IRU
         JA(IDELS) = J0K
         DELS(IDELS) = -1.0D0
         IDELS = IDELS + 1
         JA(IDELS) = IRU
         JA(IDELS) = J0
         DELS(IDELS) = 1.0D0
         DRLO(IRU) = 0.0D0
         DRUP(IRU) = 0.0D0
      ENDIF
   END DO 325
   CONTINUE
   CONTINUE
C******************************************************************************
C *** clique constraints -- insure that infrastructure for an installation must be in its
C *** final year of procurement before the rail or container buys can be made.
C *** therefore, if 2 opts in same loc, want to prevent lastyr of j02 from being greater
C *** than lastyr of j01, so constrain it such. z3 + z2 <= 1

WRITE (6,*) 'CLIQUE CON SET 1: IDELS ',IDELS, ' IRU ',IRU

DO 335 J01 = 1, NOPT
   IF (( TINIT(OPT(J01)) .EQ. 2) .OR.
       (TINIT(OPT(J01)) .EQ. 3)) THEN
      DO 336 J02 = 1, NOPT
C *** check if second init is an infrastructure, and if in the same place as the 1st.
       IF ((TINIT(OPT(J02)) .EQ. 4 .OR. TINIT(OPT(J02)) .EQ. 5)
           .AND. (PINIT(OPT(J01)) .EQ. PINIT(OPT(J02)))) THEN
C *** last year of procurement for option1 should be after infra is complete
          IF (LOPTYR(J01) .LT. LOPTYR(J02)) THEN
             IRU = IRU + 1
             IDELS = IDELS + 1
             JA(IDELS) = IRU
             JA(IDELS) = J01
             DELS(IDELS) = 1.0D0
             IDELS = IDELS + 1
             JA(IDELS) = IRU
             JA(IDELS) = J02
             DELS(IDELS) = 1.0D0
             DRLO(IRU) = 0.0D0
             DRUP(IRU) = 1.0D0
          ENDIF
       ENDIF
   END DO 336
   CONTINUE
  ENDIF
335  CONTINUE
C *** This temporary code forces in infrastructure projects.
DO 340 J = 1,NINIT
   IF(TINIT(J).EQ.0) THEN
      IRU = IRU + 1
   DO 342 J0 = 1,NOPT
      IF(OPT(J0).EQ.J) THEN
         IDELS = IDELS + 1
         IA(IDELS) = IRU
         JA(IDELS) = J0
         DELS(IDELS) = 1.0D0
      ENDIF
      CONTINUE
   DRLO(IRU) = 1.0D0
   DRUP(IRU) = 1.0D0
   CONTINUE
340 CONTINUE
C
C*******************************************************************************
C *** Objective function: SUM BetaX + AlphaY

DO 360 I = 1, NUNIT
   DO 370 J0 = 1, NOPT
      C *** assume that effects are assessed at end of last year of procurement:
      DOBJ(J0,PROC(J0,LOPTYR(J0))) =
         MEFFA(I,OPT(J0))
         + MEFFB(I,OPT(J0))
         + DOBJ(J0,PROC(J0,LOPTYR(J0)))
   CONTINUE
370 CONTINUE
360 CONTINUE
DO 369 J0 = 1, NOPT
   WRITE(6,*) 'DOBJ ','JO,PROC(J0,LOPTYR(J0))',
   DOBJ(J0,PROC(J0,LOPTYR(J0)))
369 CONTINUE
C*******************************************************************************
C *** OSL Specific Variables:
C
NROW = IRU
NCOL = IVCNTR + NICNTR
NEL = IDELS
NSETS = 0
C*******************************************************************************

DO 800 I = 1, NCOL
   WRITE(6,*) 'LL ','DCL0(I),' UL ','DCUP(I),' VAR ','I
800 CONTINUE
C *** OSL Model Setup:
C
C *** Describe application and specify that there is 1 model:
   CALL EKKDSCE (RTCOD, DSPACE, MXSPACE, 1)
   IF ( RTCOD.GT.0 ) CALL CHKRT ('EKKDSCE', RTCOD)
C
C *** Set messages to be used with SMAP:
   CALL EKKMSET (RTCOD, DSPACE,83,0,270,0,0,0,83,0)
   IF ( RTCOD.GT.0 ) CALL CHKRT ('EKKMSET', RTCOD)
C
C *** Describe the model:
   CALL EKKDSCM (RTCOD, DSPACE,1,1)
   IF ( RTCOD.GT.0 ) CALL CHKRT ('EKKDSCM', RTCOD)
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C
C *** Specify minimization problem:
    CALL EK2RGET ( RTCOD, DSPACE, OSLR, OSLRLN )
    IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ('EK2RGET', RTCOD )
C *** specify a maximization:
    RMAXMIN = -1.00D0
    RMUNIT = 1000.00D0
    RTOLPINF = 10.00D-7
C
    CALL EK2RSET( RTCOD, DSPACE, OSLR, OSLRLN )
    IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ('EK2RSET', RTCOD )
C
C *** Specify the integer variables:
    CALL EK2IGET ( RTCOD, DSPACE, OSLI, OSLILN )
    IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ('EK2IGET', RTCOD )
C
    IMAXINTS = 5000
    IMAXROWS = 1000000
    CALL EK2ISET ( RTCOD, DSPACE, OSLI, OSLILN )
    IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ('EK2ISET', RTCOD )
C
C *** Pass the model the new matrix stored by indices:
C
    CALL EK2KLMDL ( RTCOD, DSPACE, ITYPE, NROW, NCOL, NEL,
                   & OBJ, DRLO, DRUP, DCLO, DCUP, IA, JA,DELS )
    IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ('EK2KLMDL', RTCOD )
    NSETS = 0
C
    CALL EK2IGET ( RTCOD, DSPACE, OSLI, OSLILN )
    IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ('EK2IGET', RTCOD )
C
    CALL EK2KIMDL(RTCOD,DSPACE,NINTS,MINT,NSETS,IMDLTP,
                   & PRI,NTSIZE,NSETIN,NSSETS,DNP,UPPCOST)
    IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT('EK2KIMDL,RTCOD')
C
C**********************************************************************************************
C *** OSL Debug output:
C
    DO 500, I = 1, IDELS
       WRITE (8,*)', ' IA = ',IA(I)', ' JA = ', JA(I)', ' DELS = ',DELS(I)
500   CONTINUE
C
    WRITE (8,*) 'ROW BOUNDS'
    DO 510, I = 1, IRU
       WRITE (8,*) ', DRLO = ', DRLO(I), ', DRUP = ', DRUP(I)
510   CONTINUE
C
    WRITE (8,*) 'COLUMN BOUNDS'
    DO 520, I = 1, NCOL
       WRITE (8,*) ', DCLO = ', DCLO(I), ', DCUP = ', DCUP(I)
520   CONTINUE
C
    WRITE (8,*) 'OBJ FUNCTION'
    DO 530, I = 1, NCOL
       WRITE (8,*) ', OBJ = ', OBJ(I)
530   CONTINUE
C
    WRITE (8,*) 'INTEGER VARIABLES'
C
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DO 540, I = 1, NINTS
   WRITE (8,*) I, ' MINT=', MINT(I)
540   CONTINUE
C
C *** Set the quantity of output to produce:
   CALL EKKMSET( RTCOD, DSPACE, 87, 0, -1, 0, 0, 102, 0 )
   IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ( 'EKKMSET', RTCOD )
C
C *** Print problem statistics:
C
   CALL EKKSTAT(RTCOD, DSPACE)
   IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ( 'EKKSTAT', RTCOD )
C
C *** Scale the coefficient matrix:
C
   CALL EKKSCAL(RTCOD, DSPACE)
   IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ( 'EKKSCAL', RTCOD )
C
C *** Solve the mip, will assume simplex to be used for linear relaxation:
C *** Unit 10 is for matrix info, unit 11 is for basis info; type 1 implies start from
C *** the beginning, whereas a 2 would mean to restart:
C
   CALL EKKSSLV(RTCOD, DSPACE, 1, 1)
   CALL EKKMRE(RTCOD, DSPACE, 1)
   IF (RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ( 'EKKMRE', RTCOD )
   CALL EKKMSLV(RTCOD, DSPACE, 1, 10, 11)
   IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ( 'EKKMSLV', RTCOD )
C
C *** Call the routine to print the answer:
   CALL EKKPRTS(RTCOD, DSPACE)
   IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ( 'EKKPRTS', RTCOD )
C
   CALL EKKIGET ( RTCOD, DSPACE, OSLI, OSLILN )
   IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ( 'EKKIGET', RTCOD )
C
C *** Call the routine to get location of solution arrays in DSPACE:
   CALL EKKNGET ( RTCOD, DSPACE, ANSWER, 66)
   IF ( RTCOD .GT. 0 ) CALL CHKRT ( 'EKKNGET', RTCOD )
C
C**********************************************************************************************
C *** Convert OSL solution to accessible output:
C
C *** Initialize decision arrays to store output variables:
C
   DO 600, JO = 1, NOPT
      X(JO) = 0
   C
   DO 610, K = 1, NYR
      Y(JO,K) = 0
610   CONTINUE
600   CONTINUE
C
   DO 620, I = 1, NUNIT
      Z(I) = 0.0D0
620   CONTINUE
C
C**********************************************************************************************
C *** Get answers out of DSPACE, note that answer(7) is pointing to 1st element
C *** of solution (column activities):
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C
DO 700, J0 = 1, NOPT
   IF((DSPACE(ANSWER(7) + J0-1),GE.0.995D0) X(J0) = 1
      WRITE(9,*) J0, ' X(\', J0, ')= ', X(J0)
C
DO 710, K = 1, NYR
   IF(JPROC(J0,K),NE.0) THEN
      IF((DSPACE(ANSWER(7)+JPROC(J0,K)-1),LT.0.995D0) THEN
         Y(J0,K) = 0.0D0
         WRITE(9,*) J0, ' \(', J0, ', \', K, ')= ', Y(J0,K)
      ELSEIF((DSPACE(ANSWER(7)+JPROC(J0,K)-1),GE.0.995D0)
         \AND.
         (DSPACE(ANSWER(7)+JPROC(J0,K)-1),LE.1.005D0)) THEN
         Y(J0,K) = 1
         WRITE(9,*) J0, ' \(', J0, ', \', K, ')= ', Y(J0,K)
      ELSE
         Y(J0,K) = DSPACE(ANSWER(7)+JPROC(J0,K)-1)
         WRITE(9,*) J0, ' \(', J0, ', \', K, ')= ', Y(J0,K)
      ENDIF
   ENDIF
710 CONTINUE
700 CONTINUE
C
DO 730 J = 1, NINIT
   DO 740 J0 = 1, NOPT
      IF((J .EQ. OPT(J0)) .AND. (X(J0) .EQ. 1)) THEN
         X(J) = 1
         WRITE(9,*) J, 'INIT', X(J), 'PROC',
            (Y(J0,K),K=1,NYR)
      ENDIF
740 CONTINUE
730 CONTINUE
C *** calculate the objective function value
C Put OBJ values in array for each initiative
C
DO 750 J0 = 1, NOPT
   IF(X(J0) .EQ. 1) THEN
      DO 760 I = 1, NUNIT
         OBJARR(OPT(J0)) = OBJARR(OPT(J0)) + MEFFA(I,OPT(J0)) +
         MEFFB(I,OPT(J0))
      ENDIF
    TOTOBJ = TOTOBJ + OBJARR(OPT(J0))
    WRITE(9,*) 'OPT(J0)',OPT(J0),'OBJARR','
       OBJARR(OPT(J0))','TOTOBJ','TOTOBJ
760 CONTINUE
750 CONTINUE
C *** calculate and print the cost for each initiative by year, appropriation
C *** and totals
   WRITE(9,*) 'YEARY TOTALS BY APPROPRIATION:'
   DO 770 K = 1, NYR
DO 780 L = 1, NAPP
    DO 790 J0 = 1, NOPT
        IF (X(J0) .EQ. 1) THEN
            IF (QIND(OPT(J0)) .EQ. 1) THEN
                COSTARR(OPT(J0),K,L) = Y(J0,K) * VCO(TOPT(J0),L)
            ELSE
                COSTARR(OPT(J0),K,L) = Y(J0,K) * FC(TOPT(J0),L)
            ENDIF
            YCAPP(K,L) = YCAPP(K,L) + COSTARR(OPT(J0),K,L)
        ENDIF
    CONTINUE
    TCAPP(L) = TCAPP(L) + YCAPP(K,L)
    CONTINUE
    WRITE(9,1040) (YCAPP(K,L),L = 1,NAPP)
    CONTINUE
1040 FORMAT(1X,6(F8.3,',',1X))

WRITE(9,*),'DEBUG TO CROSSCHK QTY AND COSTS:'
DO 765 J0 = 1, NOPT
    DO 766 K = 1, NYR
        DO 767 L = 1, NAPP
            TINCAPP(OPT(J0),K) = TINCAPP(OPT(J0),K) +
                COSTARR(OPT(J0),K,L)
        CONTINUE
    CONTINUE
    WRITE(9,1050) OPT(J0), (Y(J0,K),K = 1,NYR)
    WRITE(9,1051) (TINCAPP(OPT(J0),K),K = 1, NYR)
ENDIF
765 CONTINUE
1050 FORMAT(1X,13,',',1X,6(I8,',',1X))
1051 FORMAT(1X,6(F8.3,',',1X))

WRITE(9,*),'YEARLY COST TOTALS (TCYEAR):'
DO 792 L = 1, NAPP
    DO 791 K = 1, NYR
        TCYEAR(K) = TCYEAR(K) + YCAPP(K,L)
    CONTINUE
    WRITE(9,1300) (TCYEAR(K),K = 1, NYR)
792 CONTINUE
1300 FORMAT(1X,6(F8.3,',',1X))

WRITE(9,*),'COST OF INIT NUMS BY APPROP AND YEAR (COSTARR):'
DO 795 J = 1, NINIT
    WRITE(9,1250) J, CINIT(J)
    DO 796 L = 1, NAPP
        WRITE(9,1200) (COSTARR(J,K,L),K = 1,NYR)
    CONTINUE
795 CONTINUE
796 CONTINUE
1200 FORMAT(1X,6(F8.3,',',1X))
1250 FORMAT(1X,13,1X,A8)
C Print out the objective values and quantities of each INITIATIVE
WRITE(9,*),'OBJECTIVE ARRAY'
DO 820 J = 1,NINIT
    WRITE(9,1100) J, CINIT(J), OBJARR(J)
820 CONTINUE
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1100 FORMAT(1X, 13, 1X, A8, 1X, F8.3)

C *** print out values in dspace for debug:
   WRITE(*,3) 'IPROBSTAT = ', IPROBSTAT, ' OBJ VALUE = ', TOTOBJ
C DO 861 I=ANSWER(7),ANSWER(8)
C   WRITE(*,1002) I,DSPACE(I)
C 1002 FORMAT(1X,'I = ',I7,5X,'DSPACE ',F10.2)

C
C *** print the cost of each init funded and the total by appropriation and year:

STOP
END

C**********************************************************************************************/

C *** This subroutine prints out an error message when an OSL subroutine returns
C *** an error code.
C
SUBROUTINE CHKRT (RTNAME, RTCOD)
  CHARACTER*7 RTNAME
  INTEGER*4 RTCOD
C
  WRITE (7,10) RTNAME, RTCOD
  10 FORMAT (1X,'%*X',' ',A7, ' RETURN CODE OF ','14, '*********')
     IF (RTCOD .GT. 200 ) STOP 16
     RETURN
END

C**********************************************************************************************/
## APPENDIX G

### INITIATIVES INPUT FILE

**G-1. USAGE.** The following data is the prototype initiative input file for the PASMPR optimization model. The types of initiatives used include SEDRES exercises, 20-foot to 80-foot container purchases, railcar purchases, infrastructure improvements, and PREPO readiness facilities and ships. The definitions of these initiatives are defined in great detail in the Army Strategic Mobility Plan. Two types of costs are possible for each initiative, fixed (FC) or variable (VC). There are three appropriation types possible as a source of funding for each initiative: MCA, OMA, or OPA. The minimum and maximum procurement quantity possible for each initiative is represented by MINQ and MAXQ, respectively. VFLG is a variable that indicates whether an initiative has an associated variable or fixed cost. The location of an initiative is given in the LOC field. A key to these locations follows the file.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Init</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>MCA</th>
<th>OMA</th>
<th>OPA</th>
<th>MINQ</th>
<th>MAXQ</th>
<th>MCAF</th>
<th>OMAF</th>
<th>OPAF</th>
<th>MCAVC</th>
<th>OMAVC</th>
<th>OPAVC</th>
<th>VFLG</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SEDRESP1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SEDRESP2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SEDRESP2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CONICSCM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.007569</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CONIDIVN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.007482</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CONICORP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.007154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON2CORP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.007715</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON2DIVN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON2CSCM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00815</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON3MCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.007295</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON3ASL7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00745</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON3ASL9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.008243</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON3ASL9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3056</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON2ORS7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON2ORS7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RAILCAR3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RAILCAR6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RAILCAR9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RAILCAR4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RAILCAR3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RAILCAR7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RAILCAR3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TNFRMA5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TNFRMA4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TNFRM16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TNFRMC5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TNFRMC4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TNFRMC3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TNFRMC5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TNFRMC4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TNFRMC3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TNFRMC10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TNFRMC11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TNFRMC16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TESTREAD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TREPGL10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TREPGL11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

G-1
G-2. **FIELD LOCATIONS.** The location codes below allow the model to put constraints on initiatives either coming from the same “location”, or effecting the same "location"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ft Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ft Bragg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ft Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ft Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ft Bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ft Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Port of Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Port of Beaumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Port of Jacksonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>General readiness, near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>General readiness, far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Support and sustainment base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>USAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>USMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>All other infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>AAPs and Depots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PREPO Readiness facility, Charleston, SC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

UNITS INPUT FILE

**USAGE.** The following data is the prototype units input file for the PASMPR optimization model. The purpose of this file is to tie the index number and an importance weight to a particular unit description. Due to the sensitivity of the data, the weights in this file have been set to 1.0 for all units. For purposes of the prototype, the weights are meaningful only in that the model has been demonstrated to be sensitive to the weights applied, and initiatives that affect heavier weighted units are preferred over others, all else being the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit index</th>
<th>Unit identifier</th>
<th>Importance weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>'HD13CSCM'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'HD1STCAV'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>'HD3CORPS'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>'BG18CORP'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>'BG82ABNI'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>'BG82ABN2'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>'BG1STCSM'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>'ST24MECH'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>'1BDE101S'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>'3RDACREG'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>'2BDE101S'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>'HVSEPBDE'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>'SUSTBASE'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>'OTRFORCE'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>'GENRDNSS'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

EFFECTIVENESS INPUT FILE

**USAGE.** The following data is the prototype unit input file for the PASMPR optimization model. More than one unit can be affected by the same initiative. More than one initiative can affect the same unit. Marginal effectiveness relates to initiatives that can be procured in varied amounts and have an associated marginal cost. Effectiveness is measured in days of improvement. For initiative 4, a 7 in effectiveness denotes a 7-day decrease in the time required to deploy unit 1 if initiative 4 is procured. Note that at the time the demo was performed, no effectiveness estimates were available for initiatives 23 and 24. The sponsor decided to include them with zero days of improvement. Fixed effectiveness relates to initiatives that are buy or no-buy decisions and have only a fixed cost component. The empty quotes at the end of the file signify the end of the record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative index</th>
<th>Affected unit</th>
<th>Marginal effectiveness</th>
<th>Fixed effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

`enddata`
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# Glossary

## 1. Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Short Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Army ammunition point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASMP</td>
<td>Army Strategic Mobility Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>US Army Concepts Analysis Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINC</td>
<td>commander in chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONUS</td>
<td>continental United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSCOM</td>
<td>corps support command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS/CSS</td>
<td>combat support/combat service support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Department of the Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEA</td>
<td>essential element(s) of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITV</td>
<td>in-transit visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIP</td>
<td>mixed integer program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>Military Construction, Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>measure(s) of effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTSU</td>
<td>Military Ocean Terminal, Sunny Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>mathematical programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS</td>
<td>Mobility Requirements Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS BURU</td>
<td>Mobility Requirements Study Bottom-Up Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTMC-TEA</td>
<td>Military Traffic Management Command Transportation Engineering Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ODCSLOG  Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics
OMA      Operation and Maintenance, Army
OPA      Other Procurement, Army
OSL      Optimization Subroutine Library
POM      Program Objective Memorandum
PREPO    prepositioned
QRA      quick reaction analysis
RRF      Ready Reserve Force
SEDRES  seaport emergency deployment readiness exercise
SWA      Southwest Asia
TETS     Directorate of Transportation, Energy, and Troop Support
TPFDD    Time-Phased Force Deployment Data
TTU      transportation terminal unit
USALIA   United States Army Logistic Integration Agency
USAR     United States Army Reserve
USMC     United States Marine Corps
WC       west coast

2. TERMS UNIQUE TO THIS STUDY

PASMPR   Prioritization of Army Strategic Mobility Program Resources
SAMSONITE Strategic Army Mobility: Survey of National Infrastructure, Technology, and Equipment

Glossary-2
3. MODELS, ROUTINES, AND SIMULATIONS

GDAS
Global Deployment Analysis System. GDAS is a transportation model that performs transportation analysis of large- or small-scale force deployments including mode planning, port selection, routing, scheduling, and simulation. The global transportation network model schedules from CONUS origins to intratheater destinations using intermodal, multi-theater transport by air, sea, and land. GDAS includes integrated data base, query, world-map display, chart graphics, simulation modeling, scheduling, analysis, and reporting capabilities. Special modeling features of GDAS include tracking of individual ship and aircraft locations, shortest path routing with node constraints for all modes, port facility throughput limitations with queuing, integrated air/sea/motor/rail mode selection, and time-phased dependency links between different movement requirements. GDAS operates on microcomputers using MS-DOS.

4. DEFINITIONS

value added
The marginal return on investment, based on the effectiveness of various initiatives proposed under ASMP to improve some aspect of strategic mobility, relative to the costs of the initiatives.

ASMP initiative
A defined infrastructure improvement, resource acquisition, capability enhancement, or other similar action that uses funding resources to enhance deployability of a specified Army force element.