



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
1000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20350-1000

1 October 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR CHAIRMAN, HEADQUARTERS & SUPPORT ACTIVITIES
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP

Subj: HEADQUARTERS AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (HSA) JOINT CROSS SERVICE
GROUP PROPOSALS #2

A staff review of your scenario proposals, provided with your 21 Sep 2004 memorandum, has been completed and initial comments are being forwarded to Col Coulson and Col Sachs by separate correspondence. The comments do not constitute a Department of the Navy position, as they have not been discussed within a Department deliberative session. The intent of the comments is to provide initial staff level reaction and is not intended to replace the deconfliction process, which OSD will coordinate in the upcoming weeks.

I agree with the overall premise of relocating from leased space to owned facilities to benefit AT/FP posture and maximize use of owned real estate. However, void of an imperative, articulation of the benefits gained from relocation to a military installation should be made part of the deliberative record.

Several of the scenario proposals are unique to one MILDEP. I will need to know very soon if the JCSG will hand-off these proposals to the respective MILDEP for consideration.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposals. Department of the Navy proposals have just begun to formulate and will be shared utilizing the OSD Scenario Tracking Tool as soon as our deliberative body, the Infrastructure Evaluation Group, has reviewed and concurs with them.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Anne R. Davis".

Anne Rathmell Davis
Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy
for Base Realignment and Closure

cc: OSD BRAC Office
HSA JCSG Principals

HSA Scenario Proposal Comments
Package #2
01 Oct 2004

Major Administrative Headquarters

- General; Several scenario proposals do not address specific DoN activities but do suggest a possibility of locating other MILDEP or 4th estate activities at DoN installations. This does not pose a concern as long as base support services are coordinated through the host to ensure maximum DoD benefit through economies of scale.
- General; Several scenario proposals suggest possibility of co-locating service components of defense agencies or like functional providers. In general, agree there is merit to this approach recognizing the value of the transformational option desire to co-locate functions and create joint campuses and centers of excellence. Anticipate more specific feedback will be provided from the Chairs of the JCSGs responsible to evaluate the specific functional areas.
- MAH-0001, Consolidate DISA Components and MAH-002, Consolidate MDA within DC Area; Minor note, NAS Annapolis should read NAVSTA Annapolis.
- MAH-0009, Co-locate Installation Management Agencies; Disagree with proposal as defined. Commander Navy Installations (CNI) is in the process of moving out of leased space and onto a military installation. Do not anticipate any gain in co-locating with one other service will out weigh a second near-term move, particularly if the move is to a location out of the DC area.
- MAH-0027, Relocate USMC HQ; Concur with the necessity to vacate FOB #2, however, not all HQMC occupants should ideally be sent to MCB Quantico. There are elements of the staff within FOB #2 which need to remain in the NCR to support CMC and his direct staff in the Pentagon.
- MAH-0032, Admin Space for Potential Pentagon Renovation Overflow; Understand the intent to get out of leased space, however, do not believe it can be successfully argued to fund a large amount of administrative space for a temporary or vague requirement. The question therefore remains, how to sufficiently protect (AT/FP) the occupants of the temporary leased space.

Correctional Facilities

- General; There is general concern about the increased distance to level I and II facilities from our Fleet Concentration Areas. Navy and Marine Corps extensively use level II facilities for pre-trial confinement. Manpower and cost to transport detainees will increase significantly as a result of some of the proposals. Travel distance and unit support concerns about the distance to level I facilities were mentioned in response to the package #1 proposals and are also applicable to several of the proposals in package #2.