



**BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE
(BRAC)
COMMISSIONER
BRIEFING**

BACKUP MATERIALS

**BRAC COMMISSION/NAVY HEARING
MAY 17, 2005**

“We wanted to ensure that all bases were treated equally. In that regard, we sought to look at everything in a **fair and objective** way, as required by law. There were **no predecisions** in this process. And we sought to obtain like data for like types of installations so that we could **compare them fairly.**”

Hearing Transcript, Pages 4, and 5

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

“Military Value Scoring, Surface-Subsurface Function

Ranking	DoN Activity	Military Value
2	NS Norfolk, VA	67.51
3	SUBASE Kings Bay	63.51
9	SUBASE San Diego	58.29
12	SUBASE New London	50.68
Summary Mean:		50.64”

BRAC REPORT-DoN VOL IV, Appendix A, Page 1

Question: Why is SUBASE New London’s Military Value so low?

Question: Does the closure of SUBASE New London improve the Military Value of NS Norfolk or SUBASE Kings Bay?

Question: Does the closure of SUBASE New London improve the overall Military Value of the Surface-Subsurface bases?

Question: Are the 15 bases ranked below SUBASE New London also closed?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

MILITARY VALUE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

FAIR AND OBJECTIVE “EXEMPTIONS”?

“Naval Station Everett.....DoN leadership further decided that issue resolution associated with the Carrier Strike Group relocation to the Pacific theater required additional strategic analysis and discussions following the Quadrennial Defense Review and postponed any decision until post Quadrennial Defense Review”

BRAC REPORT-DoN VOL IV, Page A-5

NOTE: NS Everett and SUBASE New London Military Value Scores are exactly the same (50.68)

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

CONFIGURATION ANALYSIS CONSTRAINTS

“The initial model run included the following rules approved by the DON Analysis Group:

One strategic nuclear submarine homeport per coast

Two ports on each coast capable of cold iron berthing a nuclear powered carrier”

BRAC REPORT-DoN VOL IV, Page A-4

Question: Were these constraints in fact “pre-decisions”?

Question: Did these rules “red shirt” certain bases?

Question: Were these constraints replicated elsewhere in the Military Value Evaluation?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

CRUISER EQUIVALENT (CGE) QUESTIONS

“SURFACE-SUBSURFACE CAPACITY DATA

<u>Active Homeports</u>	<u>Capacity (CGE)</u>
NEW LONDON	16.25
KINGS BAY	13.5
BANGOR	7.75”

BRAC REPORT-DoN VOL IV, Appendix A, Page 2

Question: How was CGE calculated at New London, Kings Bay, and Bangor?

Question: Did the use of CGE again bias the Base Capacity analysis against SUBASE New London as in BRAC 1993?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

MILITARY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

“SEA-4. What is the combined total linear feet of berthing for you piers/wharves in the following categories: Adequate Linear Feet, Substandard Linear Feet, Inadequate Linear Feet?”

SEA-5. What is the combined total linear feet of berthing for your piers/wharves which completed construction on or after 1 Jan 1990?”

BRAC REPORT – DoN VOL IV, Appendix A, Page 1

Question: Why did SUBASE New London get a score of zero (0) for question SEA-4 and a score of 1.01 for question SEA-5?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

MILITARY VALUE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

“SEA-7a-c. What is the relative value of the on-base Intermediate Maintenance (IM) facility in terms of capability and capacity?”

BRAC REPORT-DoN VOL IV, Appendix A, Page 3

Question: How did Kings Bay rank third among all bases (just behind NSY Portsmouth NH and NSY Norfolk, VA)?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

MILITARY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

“SEA-13. Does the activity have specialized security/emergency service capabilities?”

BRAC REPORT DoN VOL IV, Appendix A, Page 5

Question: Why were three of the four “Capability” categories of the question only tailored to nuclear weapons?

Question: Why was three fourths of the scoring (.75 out of a possible 1.0) tailored to nuclear weapons...including SSBNs?

Question: Was the form and substance of this question designed to enhance the Military Value of a specific base?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

MILITARY VALUE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

“SEA-14. List and describe any unique capabilities or missions performed by your activity. Unique is defined as a capability or mission performed at no other location.

SEA-22. List any unique operational training facilities (defined as a facility that exists at no other location)”

BRAC REPORT-DoN VOL IV, Appendix A, Pages 6 and 9

Question: Why were these questions deleted so late (Sep04)?

Question: Is the unique mission of Naval Submarine School performed other than at SUBASE New London?

Question: Are the unique Seawolf and Virginia Class operational trainers at any location other than SUBASE New London?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 - 4 MILITARY VALUE

MILITARY VALUE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

"SEA-36. What is the distance to the nearest Explosive Ordnance Detachment support?"

BRAC REPORT-DoN VOL IV, Appendix A, Page 14

Question: Why is the evaluation parameter "distance"?

Question: Wouldn't a "fairer" parameter have been "response time"?

Question: Did this question bias the evaluation toward bases that currently have EOD on site?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

MILITARY VALUE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

"SEA-38. What percent of the week was your harbor's operations limited due to dredging or other restrictions, not including dredging?"

BRAC REPORT-DoN VOL IV, Appendix A, Page 16

Question: Does Kings Bay require annual maintenance dredging? (YES)

Question: Does New London harbor require annual maintenance dredging? (NO)

Question: How did Kings Bay and SUBASE New London both receive the same score to this question?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

MILITARY VALUE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

“ENV-7a. Do current Endangered Species/Marine Mammal Protection Act restrictions affect shore/in- water operations.....

ENV-7b. Does the existence of marine sanctuaries restrict operations.....

ENV-7c. Has the presence of coral reefs, marine mammals....or other sensitive marine zones resulted in restrictions....?”

BRAC REPORT-DoN VOL IV, Appendix A, Page 26

Question: What are the endangered species (manatees) at Kings Bay and at SUBASE New London?

Question: What information was requested in the Data Calls?

Question: How were the Kings Bay (.86) and SUBASE New London (1.15) scores determined?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

MILITARY VALUE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

“PS-10. For the top five sea intensive ratings in the principle warfare community your base supports, provide rating, #sea billets in local area, and # shore billets in local area.”

BRAC REPORT-DoN VOL IV, Appendix A, Page 34

Question: Why was this question limited to the “top five sea intensive ratings”?

Question: Why was the Evaluation process changed to “number of shore billets/CGE ratio”?

Question: How did Kings Bay score twice as high as SUBASE New London ?

BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA 1 – 4 MILITARY VALUE

MILITARY VALUE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

“IJCSG SUMMARY MILITARY VALUE REPORT FOR SHIPYARD IMA

<u>RANK</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>MIL. VAL. SCORE</u>
2	TRIREFFAC KINGS BAY	0.5801
4	SIMA NORFOLK	0.4905
8	NSSF NEW LONDON	0.2961”

IJCSG FINAL REPORT, MILITARY VALUE REPORT, PAGE 1

Question: NSSF New London maintains and repairs 18 SSNs,
and TRIREFFAC Kings Bay supports 5 SSBNs.
How were these Military Value scores determined?

Question: With 0.2961 Shipyard IMA Military Value Score, how
did NSSF New London get 0.0001 Maintenance IMA
Military Value scores?