

DATA CALL #66

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAV NOTE 11000 dtd 8 Dec 93

In accordance with policy set forth by the Secretary of the Navy, personnel of the Department of the Navy, uniformed and civilian, who provide information for use in the BRAC-95 process are required to provide a signed certification that states "I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief."

The signing of this certification constitutes a representation that the certifying official has reviewed the information and either (1) personally vouches for its accuracy and completeness or (2) has possession of, and is relying upon, a certification executed by a competent subordinate.

Each individual in your activity generating information for the BRAC-95 process must certify that information. Enclosure (1) is provided for individual certifications and may be duplicated as necessary. You are directed to maintain those certifications at your activity for audit purposes. For purposes of this certification sheet, the commander of the activity will begin the certification process and each reporting senior in the Chain of Command reviewing the information will also sign this certification sheet. This sheet must remain attached to this package and be forwarded up the Chain of Command. Copies must be retained by each level in the Chain of Command for audit purposes.

I certify the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

Thomas R. Darnell
(Name (Please type or print))


Signature

Commanding Officer
Title

2 July 1994
Date

Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Div.
Indianapolis
Activity

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

141

Activity Information:

Activity Name:	Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division (NAWCAD) Indianapolis
UIC:	00163
Host Activity Name (if response is for a tenant activity):	Not Applicable
Host Activity UIC:	Not Applicable

General Instructions/Background. A separate response to this data call must be completed for each Department of the Navy (DON) host, independent and tenant activity which separately budgets BOS costs (regardless of appropriation), and, is located in the United States, its territories or possessions.

1. **Base Operating Support (BOS) Cost Data.** Data is required which captures the total annual cost of operating and maintaining Department of the Navy (DON) shore installations. Information must reflect FY 1996 budget data supporting the FY 1996 NAVCOMPT Budget Submit. Two tables are provided. Table 1A identifies "Other than DBOF Overhead" BOS costs and Table 1B identifies "DBOF Overhead" BOS costs. These tables must be completed, as appropriate, for all DON host, independent or tenant activities which separately budget BOS costs (regardless of appropriation), and, are located in the United States, its territories or possessions. Responses for DBOF activities may need to include both Table 1A and 1B to ensure that all BOS costs, including those incurred by the activity in support of tenants, are identified. If both table 1A and 1B are submitted for a single DON activity, please ensure that no data is double counted (that is, included on both Table 1A and 1B). The following tables are designed to collect all BOS costs currently budgeted, regardless of appropriation, e.g., Operations and Maintenance, Research and Development, Military Personnel, etc. Data must reflect FY 1996 and should be reported in thousands of dollars.

a. **Table 1A - Base Operating Support Costs (Other Than DBOF Overhead).** This Table should be completed to identify "Other Than DBOF Overhead" Costs. Display, in the format shown on the table, the O&M, R&D and MPN resources currently budgeted for BOS services. O&M cost data must be consistent with data provided on the BS-1 exhibit. Report only direct funding for the activity. Host activities should not include reimbursable support provided to tenants, since tenants will be separately reporting these costs. Military personnel costs should be included on the appropriate lines of the table. Please ensure that individual lines of the table do not include duplicate costs. Add additional lines to the table (following line 2j., as necessary, to identify any additional cost elements not currently shown). Leave shaded areas of table blank.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

Table 1A - Base Operating Support Costs (Other Than DBOF Overhead)			
Activity Name: NAWCAD INDIANAPOLIS		UIC: N00163	
Category	FY 1996 BOS Costs (\$000)		
	Non-Labor	Labor	Total
1. Real Property Maintenance Costs:			
1a. Maintenance and Repair	-	-	-
1b. Minor Construction	-	-	-
1c. Sub-total 1a. and 1b.	-	-	-
2. Other Base Operating Support Costs:			
2a. Utilities	-	-	-
2b. Transportation	-	-	-
2c. Environmental	-	-	-
2d. Facility Leases	-	-	-
2e. Morale, Welfare & Recreation	-	-	-
2f. Bachelor Quarters	-	-	-
2g. Child Care Centers	-	-	-
2h. Family Service Centers	-	-	-
2i. Administration	-	-	-
*2j. Other (Specify)	-	-	-
	-	0	0
2k. Sub-total 2a. through 2j:	-	0	0
3. Grand Total (sum of 1c. and 2k.):	-	0	0

* This is shown under NAWCAD PAX River under P.U. 17AWC. No BS-1 exhibit was done for Indianapolis.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

b. Funding Source. If data shown on Table 1A reflects more than one appropriation, then please provide a break out of the total shown for the "3. Grand-Total" line, by appropriation:

Appropriation Amount (\$000)

~~Operation & Maintenance, Navy (O&MN) \$44~~

VBC 8/23/94

NAWC-21D

c. Table 1B - Base Operating Support Costs (DBOF Overhead). This Table should be submitted for all current DBOF activities. Costs reported should reflect BOS costs supporting the DBOF activity itself (usually included in the G&A cost of the activity). For DBOF activities which are tenants on another installation, total cost of BOS incurred by the tenant activity for itself should be shown on this table. It is recognized that differences exist among DBOF activity groups regarding the costing of base operating support: some groups reflect all such costs only in general and administrative (G&A), while others spread them between G&A and production overhead. Regardless of the costing process, all such costs should be included on Table 1B. The Minor Construction portion of the FY 1996 capital budget should be included on the appropriate line. Military personnel costs (at civilian equivalency rates) should also be included on the appropriate lines of the table. Please ensure that individual lines of the table do not include duplicate costs. Also ensure that there is no duplication between data provided on Table 1A. and 1B. These two tables must be mutually exclusive, since in those cases where both tables are submitted for an activity, the two tables will be added together to estimate total BOS costs at the activity. Add additional lines to the table (following line 21., as necessary, to identify any additional cost elements not currently shown). Leave shaded areas of table blank.

Other Notes: All costs of operating the five Major Range Test Facility Bases at DBOF activities (even if direct RDT&E funded) should be included on Table 1B. Weapon Stations should include underutilized plant capacity costs as a DBOF overhead "BOS expense" on Table 1B..

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

Table 1B - Base Operating Support Costs (DBOF Overhead)			
Activity Name: NAWCAD INDIANAPOLIS		UIC: N00163	
Category	FY 1996 Net Cost From UIC/FUND-4 (\$000)		
	Non-Labor	Labor	Total
1. Real Property Maintenance Costs:			
1a. Real Property Maintenance (>\$15K)	749	2,500	3,249
1b. Real Property Maintenance (<\$15K)	-	458	458
1c. Minor Construction (Expensed)	14	-	14
1d. Minor Construction (Capital Budget)	[500]	-	[500] *
1e. Sub-total 1a. through 1d.	763	2,958	3721
2. Other Base Operating Support Costs:			
2a. Command Office	163	255	418
2b. ADP Support	6,920	3,932	10,852
2c. Equipment Maintenance	-	319	319
2d. Civilian Personnel Services	2,359		2,359
2e. Accounting/Finance	628	3,333	3,961
2f. Utilities	2,111	382	2,493
2g. Environmental Compliance	-	746	746
2h. Police and Fire	473	1,262	1,735
2i. Safety	583	1,319	1,902
2j. Supply and Storage Operations	1,357	3,689	5,046
2k. Major Range Test Facility Base Costs	-		-
**2l Other (Specify)			
Military Personnel	-	904	904
Printing and Duplication	-	441	441
Travel and Training	-	776	776
Janitorial	1,327		1,327
Audiovisual	-	459	459
Headquarters	380		380
Telephone	1,371	136	1,507
Rents/Leases	225		225
Awards	-	1,406	1,406
Other Contracts	3,051		3,051
2m. Sub-total 2a. through 2l:	20,948	19,359	40,737
3. Depreciation	11,900	-	11,900
4. Grand Total (sum of 1c., 2m., and 3.):	33,611	22,317	55,928

* NON-ADD since it represents obligational authority in the CPP Budget and the expenses for Capital Budget purchases are covered by item 3.

** Since FECA costs are not part of base operations, those are not included.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

NOTE: All amounts are from FY-96 Net Cost Form UIC/Fund-4 except Non Labor Utilities (2f) which is from IF-5A.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

2. **Services/Supplies Cost Data.** The purpose of Table 2 is to provide information about projected FY 1996 costs for the purchase of services and supplies by the activity. (Note: Unlike Question 1 and Tables 1A and 1B, above, this question is not limited to overhead costs.) The source for this information, where possible, should be either the NAVCOMPT OP-32 Budget Exhibit for O&M activities or the NAVCOMPT UIC/FUND-1/IF-4 exhibit for DBOF activities. Information must reflect FY 1996 budget data supporting the FY 1996 NAVCOMPT Budget Submit. Break out cost data by the major sub-headings identified on the OP-32 or UIC/FUND-1/IF-4 exhibit, disregarding the sub-headings on the exhibit which apply to civilian and military salary costs and depreciation. Please note that while the OP-32 exhibit aggregates information by budget activity, this data call requests OP-32 data for the activity responding to the data call. Refer to NAVCOMPTINST 7102.2B of 23 April 1990, Subj: Guidance for the Preparation, Submission and Review of the Department of the Navy (DON) Budget Estimates (DON Budget Guidance Manual) with Changes 1 and 2 for more information on categories of costs identified. Any rows that do not apply to your activity may be left blank. However, totals reported should reflect all costs, exclusive of salary and depreciation.

Table 2 - Services/Supplies Cost Data	
Activity Name: NAWCAD INDIANAPOLIS	UIC: N00163
Cost Category	FY 1996 Projected Costs (\$000)
Travel:	8,154
Material and Supplies (including equipment):	51,839
Industrial Fund Purchases (other DBOF purchases):	505
Transportation:	15
Other Purchases (Contract support, etc.):	63,658
Total:	124,171

NOTE: Total ties to Indianapolis's IF-4 submission as follows:

IF4 TOTAL COSTS	299,036
LESS: CIV PERS	162,061
MIL PERS	904
DEPRECIATION	11,900
TOTAL	124,171

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

3. Contractor Workyears.

a. On-Base Contract Workyear Table. Provide a projected estimate of the number of contract workyears expected to be performed "on base" in support of the installation during FY 1996. Information should represent an annual estimate on a full-time equivalency basis. Several categories of contract support have been identified in the table below. While some of the categories are self-explanatory, please note that the category "mission support" entails management support, labor service and other mission support contracting efforts, e.g., aircraft maintenance, RDT&E support, technical services in support of aircraft and ships, etc.

Table 3 - Contract Workyears	
Activity Name: NAWCAD INDIANAPOLIS	UIC: N00163
Contract Type	FY 1996 Estimated Number of Workyears On-Base
Construction:	13
Facilities Support:	80
Mission Support:	89
Procurement:	0
Other:*	3
Total Workyears:	185

* **Note:** Provide a brief narrative description of the type(s) of contracts, if any, included under the "Other" category.

* **Other** is programming of corporate information systems.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

b. Potential Disposition of On-Base Contract Workyears. If the mission/functions of your activity were relocated to another site, what would be the anticipated disposition of the on-base contract workyears identified in Table 3.?

1) Estimated number of contract workyears which would be transferred to the receiving site (This number should reflect the number of jobs which would in the future be contracted for at the receiving site, not an estimate of the number of people who would move or an indication that work would necessarily be done by the same contractor(s)):

152

Mission support, facilities and "Other" related to transferred functions, people, and support systems.

2) Estimated number of workyears which would be eliminated:

33

Minor construction, maintenance and repair for buildings, and accounts payable computer programming support.

3) Estimated number of contract workyears which would remain in place (i.e., contract would remain in place in current location even if activity were relocated outside of the local area):

0

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

c. **"Off-Base" Contract Workyear Data.** Are there any contract workyears located in the local community, but not on-base, which would either be eliminated or relocated if your activity were to be closed or relocated? If so, then provide the following information (**ensure that numbers reported below do not double count numbers included in 3.a. and 3.b., above**):

No. of Additional Contract Workyears Which Would Be Eliminated	General Type of Work Performed on Contract (e.g., engineering support, technical services, etc.)
5	Safety, Environmental, and Photo Services

No. of Additional Contract Workyears Which Would Be Relocated	General Type of Work Performed on Contract (e.g., engineering support, technical services, etc.)
147	Engineering and Manufacturing Support and Corporate Information Systems Support/Programming

NAWCAD
INDIANAPOLIS

DATA CALL 66
BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (if applicable)

BARTON D. STRONG
NAME (Please type or print)

Barton D. Strong
Signature

COMMANDER
Title

11 July 1994
Date

NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER AIRCRAFT DIVISION PATUXENT RIVER, MD
Activity

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (if applicable)

W. E. NEWMAN, RADM, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

W E Newman
Signature

COMMANDER
Title

7/18/94 WEN
Date 8/24/94

NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER
Activity

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

W. C. BOWES, VADM, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

W C Bowes
Signature

COMMANDER
Title

22 AUG 94
Date

NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Activity

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DEPUTY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS (LOGISTICS)
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF (INSTALLATIONS & LOGISTICS)

W. A. EARNER
NAME (Please type or print)

W Earner
Signature

Title

89/1/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

EFFECTED LOCATION(S):

DPS-Wide

DATA CALL BEING CERTIFIED:

BRAC-95 Data Call #66

Per SECNAV NOTE 11000 dtd 8 Dec 93

"I certify that the information contained herein for the following location(s) is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief."

WILLIAM J. PORTER

NAME (Please type or print)


Signature

Acting Director

Title

8/15/94
Date

DPS Headquarters

Activity

Enclosure (1)

DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES

161

Activity Information:

Activity Name:	DBO Indianapolis
UIC:	43635
Host Activity Name (if response is for a tenant activity):	Naval Air Warfare Center Indianapolis
Host Activity UIC:	00163

I

**DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

Table 1A - Base Operating Support Costs (Other Than DBOF Overhead)			
Activity Name: Defense Printing Service			UIC: AT 43635
Category	FY 1996 BOS Costs (\$000)		
	Non-Labor	Labor	Total
1. Real Property Maintenance Costs:			
1a. Maintenance and Repair			
1b. Minor Construction			
1c. Sub-total 1a. and 1b.			
2. Other Base Operating Support Costs:			
2a. Utilities			
2b. Transportation			
2c. Environmental			
2d. Facility Leases			
2e. Morale, Welfare & Recreation			
2f. Bachelor Quarters			
2g. Child Care Centers			
2h. Family Service Centers			
2i. Administration			
2j. Other (Specify)			
2k. Sub-total 2a. through 2j:			
3. Grand Total (sum of 1c. and 2k.):			

N/A (DPS is DBOF)

**DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

b. Funding Source. If data shown on Table 1A reflects more than one appropriation, then please provide a break out of the total shown for the "3. Grand-Total" line, by appropriation:

<u>Appropriation</u>	<u>Amount (\$000)</u>
----------------------	-----------------------

N/A

c. Table 1B - Base Operating Support Costs (DBOF Overhead). This Table should be submitted for all current DBOF activities. Costs reported should reflect BOS costs supporting the DBOF activity itself (usually included in the G&A cost of the activity). For DBOF activities which are tenants on another installation, total cost of BOS incurred by the tenant activity for itself should be shown on this table. It is recognized that differences exist among DBOF activity groups regarding the costing of base operating support: some groups reflect all such costs only in general and administrative (G&A), while others spread them between G&A and production overhead. Regardless of the costing process, all such costs should be included on Table 1B. The Minor Construction portion of the FY 1996 capital budget should be included on the appropriate line. Military personnel costs (at civilian equivalency rates) should also be included on the appropriate lines of the table. Please ensure that individual lines of the table do not include duplicate costs. Also ensure that there is no duplication between data provided on Table 1A. and 1B. These two tables must be mutually exclusive, since in those cases where both tables are submitted for an activity, the two tables will be added together to estimate total BOS costs at the activity. Add additional lines to the table (following line 21., as necessary, to identify any additional cost elements not currently shown). Leave shaded areas of table blank.

Other Notes: All costs of operating the five Major Range Test Facility Bases at DBOF activities (even if direct RDT&E funded) should be included on Table 1B. Weapon Stations should include underutilized plant capacity costs as a DBOF overhead "BOS expense" on Table 1B..

Table 1B - Base Operating Support Costs (DBOF Overhead)

Activity Name: DBO Indianapolis		UIC: 43635	
Category	FY 1996 Net Cost From UC/FUND-4 (\$000)		
	Non-Labor	Labor	Total
1. Real Property Maintenance Costs:			
1a. Real Property Maintenance (>\$15K)			
1b. Real Property Maintenance (<\$15K)	\$6		\$6
1c. Minor Construction (Expensed)			
1d. Minor Construction (Capital Budget)			
1c. Sub-total 1a. through 1d.	\$6		\$6
2. Other Base Operating Support Costs:			
2a. Command Office			
2b. ADP Support			
2c. Equipment Maintenance			
2d. Civilian Personnel Services			
2e. Accounting/Finance			
2f. Utilities	\$4		\$4
2g. Environmental Compliance			
2h. Police and Fire			
2i. Safety			
2j. Supply and Storage Operations			
2k. Major Range Test Facility Base Costs			
2l. Other (Specify) HRO	\$24		\$24
2m. Sub-total 2a. through 2l:	\$28		\$28
3. Depreciation			
4. Grand Total (sum of 1c., 2m., and 3.) :	\$34		\$34

**DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

Table 2 - Services/Supplies Cost Data	
Activity Name: DBO Indianapolis	UIC: 43635
Cost Category	FY 1996 Projected Costs (\$000)
Travel:	\$0
Material and Supplies (including equipment):	\$108
Industrial Fund Purchases (other DBOF purchases):	\$0
Transportation:	\$0
Other Purchases (Contract support, etc.):	\$668
Total:	\$776

**DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

Table 3 - Contract Workyears	
Activity Name: Defense Printing Service	UIC: MT 43635
Contract Type	FY 1996 Estimated Number of Workyears On-Base
Construction:	
Facilities Support:	
Mission Support:	
Procurement:	
Other:*	
Total Workyears:	

N/A (DPS has tenants only; do not support installations)

**DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

b. Potential Disposition of On-Base Contract Workyears. If the mission/functions of your activity were relocated to another site, what would be the anticipated disposition of the on-base contract workyears identified in Table 3.?

1) Estimated number of contract workyears which would be transferred to the receiving site (This number should reflect the number of jobs which would in the future be contracted for at the receiving site, not an estimate of the number of people who would move or an indication that work would necessarily be done by the same contractor(s)):

N/A

2) Estimated number of workyears which would be eliminated:

N/A

3) Estimated number of contract workyears which would remain in place (i.e., contract would remain in place in current location even if activity were relocated outside of the local area):

N/A

**DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES**

c. "Off-Base" Contract Workyear Data. Are there any contract workyears located in the local community, but not on-base, which would either be eliminated or relocated if your activity were to be closed or relocated? If so, then provide the following information (ensure that numbers reported below do not double count numbers included in 3.a. and 3.b., above):

No. of Additional Contract Workyears Which Would Be Eliminated	General Type of Work Performed on Contract (e.g., engineering support, technical services, etc.)
N/A	N/A

No. of Additional Contract Workyears Which Would Be Relocated	General Type of Work Performed on Contract (e.g., engineering support, technical services, etc.)
N/A	N/A

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (if applicable)

NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Title

Date

Activity

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (if applicable)

NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Title

Date

Activity

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

R. M. MOORE, RADM, SC, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

R M Moore
Signature

AUG 24 1994

COMMANDER
Title

Date

NAVAL SUPPLY SYSTEMS COMMAND
Activity

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DEPUTY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS (LOGISTICS)
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF (INSTALLATIONS & LOGISTICS)

W. A. EARNER

NAME (Please type or print)

W Earner
Signature

8/30/94

Title

Date

**CAPACITY ANALYSIS:
DATA CALL #4 WORK SHEET FOR
TECHNICAL CENTER or LABORATORY: NAWC AD Indianapolis**

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Historical and Projected Workload	2
2. Current Class 2 Assets	12
3. Class 2 Space Available for Expansion	22
4. Class 1 Space Available for Expansion	25
5. Base Infrastructure Capacity	33
6. Ship Berthing Capacity	33
7. Operational Airfield Capacity	33
8. Depot Level Maintenance Capacity	33
9. Ordnance Storage Capacity	33

TAB A: Ship Berthing Capacity

TAB B: Operational Airfield Capacity

TAB C: Depot Level Maintenance Capacity

TAB D: Ordnance Storage Capacity

*****If any responses are classified, attach a separate classified annex.*****

1. Historical and Projected Workload. Use Tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 & 1.4 below to provide historical and currently projected workload data for your activity in terms of funding and workyears. Assume previous BRAC closures and realignments are implemented on schedule. Dollar amounts should be in then-year dollars. Workyears should be separated for in-house government efforts and on-site contractor work.

- a. Use Table 1.1 to provide data on your site.
- b. Use Table 1.2 to provide data on your Detachments that did not receive this Data Call directly. Compile the information from all of these Detachments into one table. Attach a list of the titles & UIC's of the Detachments included in the table.
- c. For FY's 1993 thru 1997 provide a breakout of the "Total Funds Budgeted" line showing the appropriation and amounts of funding budgeted from your major customers. Major resource Sponsors are defined as, but not limited to, all systems commands, ONR, SSPO, CNO, FLT CINCs, Other DON, Other DOD by Department, Other Federal Government, All other. Use Table 1.3 to report this breakout for your site. Use Table 1.4 to report this breakout for your compiled Detachments that did not receive this Data Call directly. Provide separate tables for FY's 1993 thru 1997.

The Naval Avionics Center Detachment at Wright-Patterson AFB is the only detachment funded via direct funds. This detachment will be disestablished at the end of FY94.

Use the following definitions when providing data for the tables below:

Workyears: Consistent with those used in the preparation of inputs to the President's budget.

In-House government efforts or In-House workyears: Includes both military and civil servant employees

On-Site Contractor workyears: Actual or estimated workyears performed by support contractors with workyears defined consistent with the definition used in the President's budget.

On-site Contractors: Those contractors that occupy space directly on the site on nearly a full time basis.

Total Funds Budgeted: The funds used as inputs to the President's Budget.

Civilian Personnel On-Board: Full Time Permanent employees (FTP).

**Table 1.1 Historical and Projected Workload for NAWC AD Indpls
(UIC 00163)**

Fiscal Year	Total Funds Budgeted (\$K)	Total Funds Received w/o Direct Cite (\$K)	Direct Cite Funds Received (\$K)	Budgeted Wkys	Actual In-House Wkys	Actual Onsite Contract Wkys
86	203,192	186,336	378,628	2,801	3,068	(1)
87	124,496 (2)	182,955	343,342	3,025	3,135	(1)
88	224,993	242,213	412,551	3,054	3,239	(1)
89	276,940	238,403	307,822	3,241	3,344	(1)
90	258,844	258,605	296,772	3,328	3,474	(1)
91	253,275	241,440	293,987	3,314	3,406	(1)
92	310,521	351,407	202,951	3,383	3,363	23
93	320,910	321,530	255,763	3,159	3,212	31
94	275,000			3,031		
95	289,000			2,766		
96	303,000			2,766		
97	299,000			2,736		

(1) Data not available

(2) FY87 receipts exceeded budget due to unexpectedly high APN receipts. "Total funds budgeted" was reduced by \$20M due to NAVCOMPT required rebate.

**Note: Budgeted WKYRS = Civilian WKYRS
Actual In-House WKYRS = Actual In-House Civilian WKYRS**

**Table 1.2 Historical and Projected Workload for Detachments of NAWC AD Indpls
(UICs 47796, 48576, 48865, Station Number 595600)**

Fiscal Year	Total Funds Budgeted (\$K)	Total Funds Received w/o Direct Cite (\$K)	Direct Cite Funds Received (\$K)	Budgeted Wkys	Actual In-House Wkys	Actual Onsite Contract Wkys
86	0	0	0	0	0	0
87	81	81	0	1	1	0
88	84	84	0	1	1	0
89	90	90	0	1.67	1.67	0
90	87	87	0	3	3	0
91	92	92	0	4.25	4.25	0
92	99	99	0	5.75	5.75	0
93	119	119	0	8	8	0
94	92			7.5		
95	0			6		
96	0			6		
97	0			6		

<u>Detachment Title</u>	<u>UIC</u>
Naval Advisory Group for Combat Systems Support	47796
NAWCAD Indianapolis FIT Detachment Dalghren, VA	48576
NAWCAD Indianapolis FIT Detachment Alameda, CA	48865
Naval Avionics Center Detachment Wright Patterson Air Force Base, OH	595600 (Station Number)

**TABLE 1.3 FY 1994 BREAKOUT OF FUNDS BUDGETED for NAWC AD INDPLS
(UIC N00163)**

SPONSOR	RDT&E(N) \$K							Other RDT&E	Other Appropriation \$K						
	6.1	6.2	6.3a	6.3b	6.4	6.5	6.6		OMN	APN	OPN	WPN	SCN	Other Navy	All Other
Air Force	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,153
Army	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
NAVAIR	0	0	1,975	2,458	16,100	17	4,169	0	21,064	65,506	14,286	4,547	17	0	5,900
NAVSEA	0	0	0	129	0	189	0	0	607	0	30,961	513	12	0	202
NAVSUP	0	0	3,534	0	0	0	0	0	135	0	0	0	0	0	428
OCNR	0	0	0	0	0	13	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,580
Other DOD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,546
Other Government	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	60	0	0	0	2,332
Other Navy	0	0	0	3,187	0	0	3,107	0	4,625	5,657	486	0	0	47,791	945
Private Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	233
SPAWAR	0	0	0	0	4,574	0	2,974	0	273	1,402	7,419	0	11	0	27
SSPO	0	0	0	0	171	0	0	0	628	0	0	4,194	0	0	1,900
Total	0	0	5,509	5,773	20,845	219	10,384	0	27,337	72,565	53,211	9,254	41	48,171	21,690

**TABLE 1.3 FY 1993 BREAKOUT OF FUNDS BUDGETED for NAWC AD INDPLS
(UIC N00163)**

SPONSOR	RDT&E(N) \$K							Other RDT&E	Other Appropriation \$K						
	6.1	6.2	6.3a	6.3b	6.4	6.5	6.6		OMN	APN	OPN	WPN	SCN	Other Navy	All Other
Air Force	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,680
Army	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	517
NAVAIR	0	0	2,305	2,868	18,788	20	4,865	0	24,581	76,442	16,671	5,307	20	0	6,885
NAVSEA	0	0	0	150	0	220	0	0	709	0	36,130	599	14	0	236
NAVSUP	0	0	4,124	0	0	0	0	0	157	0	0	0	0	0	500
OCNR	0	0	0	0	0	15	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,345
Other DOD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	444	1,804
Other Government	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	70	0	0	0	2,721
Other Navy	0	0	0	3,719	0	0	3,626	0	5,397	6,601	567	0	0	55,769	1,104
Private Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	272
SPAWAR	0	0	0	0	5,337	0	3,470	0	319	1,636	8,658	0	13	0	32
SSPO	0	0	0	0	200	0	0	0	733	0	0	4,894	0	0	2,217
Total	0	0	6,429	6,737	24,325	255	12,118	0	31,901	84,679	62,095	10,799	47	56,213	25,311

**TABLE 1.3 FY 1995 BREAKOUT OF FUNDS BUDGETED for NAWC AD INDPLS
(UIC N00163)**

SPONSOR	RDT&E(N) \$K							Other RDT&E	Other Appropriation \$K						
	6.1	6.2	6.3a	6.3b	6.4	6.5	6.6		OMN	APN	OPN	WPN	SCN	Other Navy	All Other
Air Force	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,314
Army	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
NAVAIR	0	0	2,076	2,583	16,920	18	4,381	0	22,137	68,841	15,013	4,779	18	0	6,201
NAVSEA	0	0	0	135	0	198	0	0	638	0	32,537	539	13	0	212
NAVSUP	0	0	3,714	0	0	0	0	0	142	0	0	0	0	0	450
OCNR	0	0	0	0	0	13	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,814
Other DOD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400	1,625
Other Government	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	63	0	0	0	2,450
Other Navy	0	0	0	3,349	0	0	3,265	0	4,861	5,945	511	0	0	50,224	993
Private Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	245
SPAWAR	0	0	0	0	4,807	0	3,125	0	287	1,473	7,797	0	12	0	28
SSPO	0	0	0	0	180	0	0	0	660	0	0	4,407	0	0	1,997
Total	0	0	5,790	6,067	21,907	230	10,913	0	28,729	76,259	55,920	9,725	43	50,623	22,794

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**Page 7 of 33
UIC 00163**

**TABLE 1.3 FY 1996 BREAKOUT OF FUNDS BUDGETED for NAWC AD INDPLS
(UIC N00163)**

SPONSOR	RDT&E(N) \$K							Other RDT&E	Other Appropriation \$K						
	6.1	6.2	6.3a	6.3b	6.4	6.5	6.6		OMN	APN	OPN	WPN	SCN	Other Navy	All Other
Air Force	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,474
Army	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	488
NAVAIR	0	0	2,176	2,708	17,739	19	4,593		23,209	72,176	15,741	5,010	19	0	6,501
NAVSEA	0	0	0	142	0	208	0	0	669	0	34,113	565	13	0	222
NAVSUP	0	0	3,894	0	0	0	0	0	149	0	0	0	0	0	472
OCNR	0	0	0	0	0	14	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,047
Other DOD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419	1,703
Other Government		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	66	0	0	0	2,569
Other Navy	0	0	0	3,511	0	0	3,423	0	5,096	6,233	535	0	0	52,657	1,041
Private Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	257
SPAWAR	0	0	0	0	5,040	0	3,277	0	301	1,545	8,174	0	13	0	30
SSPO	0	0	0	0	189	0	0	0	692	0	0	4,621	0	0	2,093
Total	0	0	6,070	6,361	22,968	241	11,441	0	30,121	79,953	58,629	10,197	45	53,076	23,899

**TABLE 1.3 FY 1997 BREAKOUT OF FUNDS BUDGETED for NAWC AD INDPLS
(UIC N00163)**

SPONSOR	RDT&E(N) \$K							Other RDT&E	Other Appropriation \$K						
	6.1	6.2	6.3a	6.3b	6.4	6.5	6.6		OMN	APN	OPN	WPN	SCN	Other Navy	All Other
Air Force	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,429
Army	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	482
NAVAIR	0	0	2,148	2,672	17,505	19	4,532	0	22,903	71,223	15,533	4,944	19	0	6,415
NAVSEA	0	0	0	140	0	205	0	0	660	0	33,663	558	13	0	219
NAVSUP	0	0	3,842	0	0	0	0	0	147	0	0	0	0	0	466
OCNR	0	0	0	0	0	14	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,980
Other DOD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	413	1,681
Other Government	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	65	0	0	0	2,535
Other Navy	0	0	0	3,465	0	0	3,378	0	5,029	6,151	528	0	0	51,962	1,028
Private Party	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	253
SPAWAR	0	0	0	0	4,973	0	3,233	0	297	1,524	8,067	0	12	0	29
SSPO	0	0	0	0	186	0	0	0	683	0	0	4,560	0	0	2,066
Total	0	0	5,990	6,277	22,665	238	11,290	0	29,723	78,898	57,855	10,062	44	52,375	23,583

**TABLE 1.4 FY 1993 BREAKOUT OF FUNDS BUDGETED for DETACHMENTS OF NAWC AD INDPLS
(UIC_N00163)**

SPONSOR	RDT&E(N) \$K							Other RDT&E	Other Appropriation \$K						
	6.1	6.2	6.3a	6.3b	6.4	6.5	6.6		OMN	APN	OPN	WPN	SCN	Other Navy	All Other
NAVAIR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59.8	0	0	0	0	0
Navy Stock Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59.8	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59.8	0	0	0	59.8	0

**TABLE 1.4 FY 1994 BREAKOUT OF FUNDS BUDGETED for DETACHMENTS OF NAWC AD INDPLS
(UIC N00163)**

SPONSOR	RDT&E(N) \$K							Other RDT&E	Other Appropriation \$K						
	6.1	6.2	6.3a	6.3b	6.4	6.5	6.6		OMN	APN	OPN	WPN	SCN	Other Navy	All Other
NAVAIR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.4	0	43.6	0	0	0	0	0
Navy Stock Fund	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43.6	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.4	0	43.6	0	0	0	43.6	0

2. Current Class 2 Assets. Complete Tables 2.1 thru 2.6 below as directed. Tables 2.1, 2.2 & 2.3 will define the Class 2 property owned or leased by your activity (less Detachments). Tables 2.4, 2.5 & 2.6 will define the combined Class 2 assets owned or occupied at your Detachment sites which did not receive this Data Call directly. Report space holdings and assignments as of 31 March 1994. Provide numbered notes to explain imminent changes, additions & deletions such as previous BRAC realignments, MILCON (including BRAC related MILCON) & Special Projects that are currently programmed in the FYDP. Give the project number & title, cost, short description, quantity of additional square footage, award date, estimated/actual construction start date and estimated BOD. Square footage of space is to be reported in "Gross Floor/Building Area" (GF/BA) as defined in NAVFAC P-80. Many of the P-80 Category Code Numbers (CCN's) have assets that are reported in units of measure other than square feet (SF). The only unit of measure desired for this Data Call is SF. Only report the assets in each CCN that are normally reported in SF.

For your Site:

a. Use Table 2.1 below to indicate the total amount of Class 2 space at your site for which you are the plant account holder as of 31 March 1994.

b. Use Table 2.2 below to indicate the total amount of your Class 2 space reported in Table 2.1 that is assigned to your tenant commands and/or independent activities at your site as of 31 March 1994.

c. Use Table 2.3 below to indicate the total amount of Class 2 space, for which you are not the plant account holder, but which is utilized/leased by you (less Detachments). Provide numbered notes to identify the title and UIC of the plant account holder/lessor, quantity of leased space and the associated lease cost.

Table 2.1 Main Site Class 2 Assets of NAWC AD Indpls (UIC N00163)

Building type	NAVFAC (P-80) category code	Gross Floor/Building Area (KSF)			
		Adequate	Sub-standard	In-adequate	Total
Operational & Training	100	22.5			22.5
Maintenance & Production	200	408.3	11.0		419.3 (1)(2)
Science labs	310	95.4			95.4
Aircraft labs	311	6.4			6.4
Missile and Space labs	312	2.2			2.2
Ship and Marine labs	313	0			0
Ground Transportation labs	314	0			0
Weapon and Weapon Systems labs	315	0			0
Ammunition, Explosives, & Toxics labs	316	0			0
Electrical Equip. labs	317	144.6			144.6
Propulsion labs	318	0			0
Miscellaneous labs	319	18.2			18.2
Underwater Equip. labs	320	0			0
Technical Services labs	321	20.9			20.9
Supply Facilities	400	59.5	10.0		69.5
Hospital & other Medical	500	3.6			3.6
Administrative Facilities	600	109.5			109.5
Housing & Community	700	41.0			41.0
Utilities & Grounds	800	34.6			34.6
Other		0			0
Totals		966.7	21.0		987.7 (3)*

(1) S.P. C-8-92 Construct Warehouse will increase this number by 9,600 sq. ft.

(2) MILCON P-028 Chemical Processes Facility will construct a facility for maintenance and production and increase this number 46,000 sq. ft. This project is currently programmed for FY-97.

(3) MILCON P-046, Sonobuoy Quality Assurance Lab at St. Croix will be completed this fiscal year and will add 5,600 sq. ft. The St. Croix complex is in the process of being transferred to another government agency.

* This number differs from the P-164 database due to the removal of leased space. Table 2.1 includes only those assets which NAWC AD Indpls is the plant account holder as of 31 March 1994. This does not include leased space. The P-164 does include leased space.

d. In accordance with NAVFACINST 11010.44E, an Inadequate facility cannot be made Adequate for its present use through "economically justifiable means". For all the categories above where Inadequate facilities are identified provide the following information:

- (1) FACILITY TYPE/CODE:
- (2) WHAT MAKES IT INADEQUATE?
- (3) WHAT USE IS BEING MADE OF THE FACILITY?
- (4) WHAT IS THE COST TO UPGRADE THE FACILITY TO SUBSTANDARD?
- (5) WHAT OTHER USE COULD BE MADE OF THE FACILITY AND AT WHAT COST?
- (6) CURRENT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND PROGRAMMED FUNDING:
- (7) HAS THIS FACILITY CONDITION RESULTED IN C3 OR C4 DESIGNATION ON YOUR BASEREP?

N/A

**Table 2.2 Main Site Class 2 Space of NAWC AD Indpls (UIC N00163)
Assigned to Tenants**

TENANT		NAVFAC (P-80) Category Code	GF/BA Assigned (KSF)
Name	UIC		
Naval Criminal Investigative Service Resident Agency	42919	610.10	0.1
Personnel Support Activity Detachment	43050	610.10	2.6
Defense Printing Service Detachment Branch Office	43635	229.50	3.2
NAVFAC Contracts Office Northern Div. Contracts Officer	45208	610.10	0.5
Naval Aviation Engineering Service Unit	62849	317.20	0.5
Small Business Administration Region 5		610.10	0.1
Defense Finance Accounting Service (DFAS)	Not Assigned	610.10	2.0
NAWC-AD Human Resources Offices (HRO)	00421	610.10	6.8
NAWC-AD Indpls NAG CSS/Fleet Introduction Team	47796	317.20	0.3
		Total:	16.1

Table 2.3 Class 2 Space Utilized/Leased by NAWC AD Indpls (UIC N00163)

Building type	NAVFAC (P-80) category code	GF/BA (KSF)			
		Adequate	Sub-standard	In-adequate	Total
Operational & Training	100	56.0 ⁽¹⁾			56.0
Maintenance & Production	200	9.4 ⁽²⁾			9.4
Science labs	310	7.0 ⁽³⁾			7.0
Aircraft labs	311				
Missile and Space labs	312				
Ship and Marine labs	313				
Ground Transportation labs	314				
Weapon and Weapon Systems labs	315				
Ammunition, Explosives, and Toxics labs	316				
Electrical Equip. labs	317	21.5 ⁽⁴⁾			21.5
Propulsion labs	318				
Miscellaneous labs	319				
Underwater Equip. labs	320				
Technical Services labs	321				
Supply Facilities	400	42.9 ⁽⁵⁾			42.9
Hospital & other Medical	500				
Administrative Facilities	600				
Housing & Community	700	9.9 ⁽⁶⁾			9.9
Utilities & Grounds	800				
Other					
Totals		146.7*	0	0	146.7*

(1)	<u>Title</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>UIC</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	EMPF	46,000	N/A	No lease, Paid Utilities of \$153,250
	Western Electric	10,042	N/A	\$142,596
(2)	Public Works Warehouse	9,359	N/A	\$75,858; Lease will be terminated in FY-95
(3)	East Trailers(1/2)	7,015	N/A	Combined cost East Trailers \$89,000
(4)	East Trailers(1/2) West Trailer	7,200 14,280	N/A N/A	Combined cost East Trailers \$89,000 \$65,000
(5)	Warehouse at Defense Electronics Supply Center	42,930	D64177	\$22,000
(6)	Apartments	9,900	N/A	\$209,694

* The intent is to terminate all leases by the end of FY 1997. The number of apartments will be adjusted as appropriate.

For your Detachment sites not receiving this Data Call directly:

e. Use Table 2.4 below to indicate the combined total amount of Class 2 space that is occupied by your Detachments for which you are the plant account holder as of 31 March 1994. Attach a list with the titles and UIC's of these Detachments.

f. Use Table 2.5 below to indicate the total amount of your Class 2 space reported in Table 2.4 that is assigned to tenant commands and/or independent activities as of 31 March 1994. Include numbered notes to indicate the Detachment site that hosts the tenant.

g. Use Table 2.6 below to indicate the combined total amount of Class 2 space utilized/leased by your Detachments for which you are not the plant account holder. Provide numbered notes to indicate the quantity of leased space and their associated rental cost.

Table 2.4 Class 2 Assets of NAWC AD Indpls Occupied by Detachments

Building type	NAVFAC (P-80) category code	GF/BA (KSF)			
		Adequate	Sub-standard	In-adequate	Total
Operational & Training	100				
Maintenance & Production	200				
Science labs	310				
Aircraft labs	311				
Missile and Space labs	312				
Ship and Marine labs	313				
Ground Transportation labs	314				
Weapon and Weapon Systems labs	315				
Ammunition, Explosives, and Toxics labs	316				
Electrical Equip. labs	317	0.2 ⁽¹⁾			0.2
Propulsion labs	318				
Miscellaneous labs	319				
Underwater Equip. labs	320				
Technical Services labs	321				
Supply Facilities	400				
Hospital & other Medical	500				
Administrative Facilities	600				
Housing & Community	700				
Utilities & Grounds	800				
Other					
Totals		0.2	0	0	0.2

⁽¹⁾ Naval Advisory Group for Combat Systems Support

UIC 47796

h. In accordance with NAVFACINST 11010.44E, an Inadequate facility cannot be made Adequate for its present use through "economically justifiable means". For all the categories above where Inadequate facilities are identified provide the following information:

Not Applicable

- (1) FACILITY TYPE/CODE:
- (2) WHAT MAKES IT INADEQUATE?
- (3) WHAT USE IS BEING MADE OF THE FACILITY?
- (4) WHAT IS THE COST TO UPGRADE THE FACILITY TO SUBSTANDARD?

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**Page 18 of 33
UIC 00163**

- (5) WHAT OTHER USE COULD BE MADE OF THE FACILITY AND AT WHAT COST?
- (6) CURRENT IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND PROGRAMMED FUNDING:
- (7) HAS THIS FACILITY CONDITION RESULTED IN C3 OR C4 DESIGNATION ON YOUR BASEREP?

Table 2.6 Class 2 Space Utilized/Leased by Detachments of NAWC AD Indpls (UIC N00163)

Building type	NAVFAC (P-80) category code	GF/BA (KSF)			
		Adequate	Sub-standard	In-adequate	Total
Operational & Training	100				
Maintenance & Production	200				
Science labs	310				
Aircraft labs	311				
Missile and Space labs	312				
Ship and Marine labs	313				
Ground Transportation labs	314				
Weapon and Weapon Systems labs	315				
Ammunition, Explosives, and Toxics labs	316				
Electrical Equip. labs	317	1.0 ⁽¹⁾			1.0
Propulsion labs	318				
Miscellaneous labs	319				
Underwater Equip. labs	320				
Technical Services labs	321				
Supply Facilities	400				
Hospital & other Medical	500				
Administrative Facilities	600				
Housing & Community	700				
Utilities & Grounds	800				
Other					
	Totals	1.0			1.0

⁽¹⁾ NAWC AD Indpls. Detachments at Alameda (UIC 48865), Dahlgren (UIC 48576) and Wright Patterson (Station Number 595600). There is no lease or cost associated with this space.

3. Class 2 Space Available for Expansion. An activity's expansion capability is a function of it's ability to reconfigure and/or expand existing facilities to accept new or increased roles. Such a reconfiguration may require rehabilitation or buildout of a space to support the new or expanded role. A space expansion could include converting an underutilized storage space into laboratory spaces, or buildout of a high bay area into a multifloor office/laboratory space. All questions refer to Class 2 property for which you are the plant account holder as of 31 March 1994. Do not report any currently programmed changes or additions previously reported in question #2 above. Expansion opportunities must follow the guidance of NAVFAC P-80 for the appropriate facility category code, as well as applicable fire and safety codes. Personnel loading density should not exceed those specified in the P-80. Space is only available if it is currently unoccupied or the current occupants are officially designated for relocation. Report space as Net Floor Area (NFA) as defined in the P-80. Do not include opportunities that are being reported by your Detachments who received this Data Call directly. Reported expansion opportunities must be able to accommodate the necessary ancillary facilities and equipment, such as adequate parking space, required to support the amount of people projected.

a. What is the maximum quantity of space that could be made available for expansion to accommodate other functions and/or increased efforts? Report in terms of the "Current NFA" as shown in Tables 3.1 & 3.2. 93K SQFT.

Building 1000 has adequate interior height to accommodate construction of mezzanines, which would allow relocation of offices to provide additional ground floor space for labs.

b. How much of the space reported in question 3.a. above is currently available with minimal or no reconfiguration costs? Report in terms of the "Current NFA" as shown in Tables 3.1 & 3.2. 0 SQFT.

c. Use Table 3.1 below to indicate the constrained growth opportunities for accepting expanded or new roles. Constrained growth is defined as growth limited to buildings and structures currently on your Class 2 plant account. Add numbered notes to highlight and explain opportunities that require remediation or waiver of a restriction or encumbrance as part of the expansion. Provide lettered notes to clearly identify each opportunity with the title & UIC of the site it refers to. The "Current NFA (KSF)" column total should match the quantity provided in question #3.a. above. Annotate those opportunities that were used to obtain the answer to question #3.b. above. Report space once, do not use the same space for different expansion opportunities. Include in this table space that will become available once planned downsizing (separate from BRAC realignments) has been completed, provide the estimated completion date of the downsizing effort.

d. Use Table 3.2 below to indicate additional unconstrained growth opportunities for accepting expanded or new roles. Unconstrained growth allows for construction of new facilities on existing buildable Class 1 property. The only constraint being that the land must currently be

on your plant account holdings as of 31 March 1994 and free of existing land use constraints. Limit new buildings to three stories. Add numbered notes to highlight and explain additional opportunities that would require remediation or waiver of a land use constraint as part of the expansion. Provide lettered notes to clearly identify each opportunity with the title & UIC of the site it refers to. Do not include space that has been reported in Table 3.1.

a. Identify in Table 4.1 below the real estate resources which have the potential to facilitate future development, and for which you are the plant account holder as of 31 March 1994, or into which, though a tenant, your activity could reasonably expect to expand. Complete a separate table for each individual site (i.e., main base, outlying airfields, special off-site areas, etc.) and Detachment that did not receive this Data Call directly. The unit of measure is acres. Developed area is defined as land currently with buildings, roads, and utilities where further development is not possible without demolition of existing improvements. Include in "Restricted" acreage that is restricted for future development due to environmental constraints (e.g. wetlands, landfills, archaeological sites), operational restrictions (e.g. ESQD arcs, HERO, HERP, HERF, AICUZ, ranges) or cultural resources restrictions. Identify the reason for the restriction when providing the acreage in the table. Specify any entry in "Other" (e.g. submerged lands).

b. Are there any constraints such as parking, utilities, legal restrictions that limit the potential for using Undeveloped land for expansion?

No.

c. Explain the radio frequency constraints/opportunities within your Class 1 holdings.

Given that Class 1 holdings are located within a major metropolitan area, there are radio frequency constraints.

Table 4.1

**Class 1 Resources of NAWC AD Indpls (UIC: N00163)
Site Location: Indianapolis**

Land Use	Total Acres	Developed Acreage	Available for Development	
			Restricted	Unrestricted
Maintenance				
Operational				
Training				
R & D				
Supply & Storage	8	7		1
Admin				
Housing	8	4		4
Recreational	23	14		9
Navy Forestry Program				
Navy Agricultural Outlease Program				
Hunting/Fishing Programs				
Other *	124	70		54
Total:	163	95		68

*** Land is suitable for maintenance, operational, training, R & D, Supply, Administration, Housing, etc.**

d. Of the total Unrestricted Acres reported above, how much of it has existing roads and/or utilities that could support expansion efforts? 68 Acres. Explain.

Land is surrounded by developed areas and has road access from three sides.

Table 4.1

**Class 1 Resources of NAWC AD Indpls (UIC: N00163)
Site Location: St. Croix**

Land Use	Total Acres	Developed Acreage	Available for Development	
			Restricted	Unrestricted
Maintenance				
Operational				
Training				
R & D				
Supply & Storage				
Admin				
Housing				
Recreational				
Navy Forestry Program				
Navy Agricultural Outlease Program				
Hunting/Fishing Programs				
Other *	22.5 (1)	1		2
Total:	22.5	1		2

* Land is suitable for maintenance, operational, training, R & D, Supply, Administration, Housing, etc.

(1) In process of transferring property to another government agency.

d. Of the total Unrestricted Acres reported above, how much of it has existing roads and/or utilities that could support expansion efforts? 2 Acres. Explain.

There are 3 acres of land that is in the cleared, flat section of the property. All other land is on a very steep hillside that is covered with forest vegetation.

5. Base Infrastructure Capacity. Provide base infrastructure data as of 31 March 1994. Provide numbered notes to explain imminent changes, additions & deletions driven by previous BRAC realignments, MILCON (including BRAC related MILCON) & Special Projects that are currently programmed in the FYDP. Give the project number & title, cost, short description, quantity of additional square footage, award date, estimated/actual construction start date and estimated BOD.

There are no imminent changes, additions or deletions as a result of previous BRAC realignments. MILCONS and special projects currently programmed are summarized below:

Proj No. & Title: P-028, Chemical Processing Building

Cost: \$10.7 M

Desc: Provide state-of-the-art plating and printed wiring board facility that incorporates comprehensive waste stream management. This will meet or exceed current and anticipated local, state and federal environmental regulations.

SF: 46,000

Estimated Start Date: Mar 97

Estimated Comp Date: Dec 99

Estimated BOD: Dec 99

Proj No. & Title: P-035, Air Conditioning Plant Renovation

Cost: \$3.3 M

Desc: Provides upgraded pumping system and improved distribution for main plant condenser water piping system and provides for replacement of several CFC using central station air conditioning systems.

SF: Not Applicable

Estimated Start Date: Mar 97

Estimated Comp Date: Jan 99

Estimated BOD: Not Applicable

Proj No. & Title: P-032, Sprinkler System Building 1000

Cost: \$5.5 M

Desc: Provide sprinklers above and below ceiling level throughout building 1000, to upgrade the facility and meet current National Fire Protection Association Codes.

SF: Not Applicable

Estimated Start Date: Oct 97

Estimated Comp Date: Jun 99

Estimated BOD: Not Applicable

a. Utilize Table 5.1 below to provide information on your activity's base infrastructure capacity and load. Do not report this information if you are a tenant activity.

Table 5.1 Base Infrastructure Capacity & Load

	On Base Capacity	Off base long term contract	Normal Steady State Load	Peak Demand
Electrical Supply (KWH)	500	14,000	7,000	8,400
Natural Gas (CFH)	0	152,000	26,333	35,500
Sewage (GPD)	2,800,000	N/A	176,000	280,000
Potable Water (GPD)	5,400,000	N/A	220,000	350,000
Steam (PSI & lbm/Hr)	48,000	N/A	8,000	22,000
Long Term Parking	2,530	N/A	N/A	N/A
Short Term Parking	103	N/A	N/A	N/A

b. Maintenance, Repair & Equipment Expenditure Data: Use Table 5.2 below to provide data on facilities and equipment expenditures at your activity. Project expenditures to FY 1997. Do not include data on Detachments who have received this Data Call directly. Do not report this information if you are a tenant activity. The following definitions apply:

Maintenance of Real Property (MRP) Dollars: MRP is a budgetary term used to gather the expenses or budget requirements for facility work including recurring maintenance, major repairs & minor construction (non-MILCON) inclusive of all Major Claimant funded Special Projects. It is the amount of funds spent on or budgeted for maintenance and repair of real property assets to maintain the facility in satisfactory operating condition. For purposes of this Data Call MRP includes all M1/R1 and M2/R2 expenditures.

Current Plant Value (CPV) of Class 2 Real Property: The hypothetical dollar amount to replace a Class 2 facility in kind with today's dollars. Example: the cost today to replace a wood frame barracks with a wood frame barracks.

Acquisition Cost of Equipment (ACE): The total cumulative acquisition cost of all "personal property" equipment maintained at your activity which includes the cost of installed equipment directly related to mission execution, such as lab test equipment. Class 2 installed capital equipment that is an integral part of the facility will not be reported as ACE.

**Table 5.2 Maintenance, Repair & Equipment Expenditure Data
for NAWC AD Indpls (UIC: 00163)**

Fiscal Year	MRP (\$M)	CPV (\$M)	ACE (\$M)
1985	3.3	124.8	65.6
1986	3.1	127.8	84.5
1987	3.1	131.0	98.0
1988	5.1	134.4	111.7
1989	5.8	137.9	135.1
1990	4.1	141.6	151.7
1991	5.2	145.4	164.0
1992	5.6	148.1	169.0
1993	4.9	160.8	186.9
1994	4.9	164.4	192.5
1995	4.9	168.2	198.3
1996	5.1	172.0	204.2
1997	5.2	176.0	210.4

c. Training Facilities:

(1) By facility Category Code Number (CCN), provide the usage requirements for each course of instruction required for all formal schools on your installation. A formal school is a programmed course of instruction for military and/or civilian personnel that has been formally approved by an authorized authority (ie: Service Schools Command, Weapons Training Battalion, Human Resources Office). Do not include requirements for maintaining unit readiness, GMT, sexual harassment, etc. Include all applicable 171-xx, 179-xx CCN's.

Type of Training Facility/CCN	School	Type of Training	FY 1993 Requirements			FY 2001 Requirements		
			A	B	C	A	B	C
171.20	Solder School	Solder Technology	1,099	30	32,970	2,749	30	82,470

A = STUDENTS PER YEAR

B = NUMBER OF HOURS EACH STUDENT SPENDS IN THIS TRAINING FACILITY FOR THE TYPE OF TRAINING RECEIVED

C = A x B

(2) By Category Code Number (CCN), complete the following table for all training facilities aboard the installation. Include all 171-xx and 179-xx CCN's.

For example: in the category 171-10, a type of training facility is academic instruction classroom. If you have 10 classrooms with a capacity of 25 students per room, the design capacity would be 250. If these classrooms are available 8 hours a day for 300 days a year, the capacity in student hours per year would be 600,000.

Type Training Facility/CCN	Total Number	Design Capacity (PN) ¹	Capacity (Student HRS/YR)
171.20 Solder School	7	88	176,000
171.10 Academic Instruction (The Learning Resource Center)	7	133	299,250

(3) Describe how the Student HRS/YR value in the preceding table was derived.

171.20: 88 students x 250 days/year x 8 hours/day = 176,000

**171.10: 133 students x 250 days/year x 9 hours/day = 299,250
(9 hours/day also accounts for evening classes.)**

¹ Design Capacity (PN) is the total number of seats available for students in spaces used for academic instruction; applied instruction; and seats or positions for operational trainer spaces and training facilities other than buildings, i.e., ranges. Design Capacity (PN) must reflect current use of the facilities.

6. Ship Berthing Capacity. If your activity has the capacity to berth ships fill out the data sheets provided at TAB A.

This section not applicable to NAWC AD Indpls

7. Operational Airfield Capacity. If your activity owns and operates an operational airfield fill out the data sheets provided at TAB B.

This section not applicable to NAWC AD Indpls

8. Depot Level Maintenance Capacity. Fill out the data sheets provided at TAB C if you or your subordinate activities perform depot level maintenance on a piece of equipment or system.

Tab C has been completed for NAWC AD Indianapolis. (see attached)

9. Ordnance Storage Capacity. If your activity has the capability to store or maintain weapons and ordnance fill out the data sheets provided at TAB D.

This section not applicable to NAWC AD Indpls

TAB C

DEPOT LEVEL MAINTENANCE CAPACITY

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**TAB C - PART I
Page 1 of 41
UIC: 00163**

Maintenance and Industrial Activities

Activities that actually perform Depot Level Maintenance should complete **PART I** of this TAB. Warfare Center Headquarters (Owners & Operators) whose subordinate activities actually perform Depot Level Maintenance should complete **PART II** of this TAB. Depot and/or industrial workload capacity is to be reported as a function of the following categories for the period requested.

Commodity Groups List

1. Aircraft Airframes:
 - Rotary
 - VSTOL
 - Fixed Wing
 - Transport / Tanker / Bomber /
 - Command and Control
 - Light Combat
 - Admin / Training
 - Other
2. Aircraft Components
 - Dynamic Components
 - Aircraft Structures
 - Hydraulic/Pneumatic
 - Instruments
 - Landing Gear
 - Aviation Ordnance
 - Avionics/Electronics
 - APUs
 - Other
3. Engines (Gas Turbine)
 - Aircraft
 - Ship
 - Tank
 - Blades / Vanes (Type 2)
4. Missiles and Missile Components
 - Strategic
 - Tactical / MLRS
5. Amphibians
 - Vehicles
 - Components (less GTE)

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**TAB C - PART I
Page 2 of 41
UIC: 00163**

6. Ground Combat Vehicles
 - Self-propelled
 - Tanks
 - Towed Combat Vehicles
 - Components (less GTE)
7. Ground and Shipboard Communications and Electronic Equipment
 - Radar
 - Radio Communications
 - Wire Communications
 - Electronic Warfare
 - Navigational Aids
 - Electro-Optics / Night Vision
 - Satellite Control / Space Sensors
8. Automotive / Construction Equipment
9. Tactical Vehicles
 - Tactical Automotive Vehicles
 - Components
10. Ground General Purpose Items
 - Ground Support Equipment (except aircraft)
 - Small Arms / Personal Weapons
 - Munitions / Ordnance
 - Ground Generators
 - Other
11. Sea Systems
 - Ships
 - Weapons Systems
12. Software
 - Tactical Systems
 - Support Equipment
13. Special Interest Items
 - Bearings Refurbishment
 - Calibration (Type I)
 - TMDE
14. Other

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**TAB C - PART I
Page 3 of 41
UIC: 00163**

JCSG-DM: Maintenance and Industrial Activities

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**TAB C - PART I
Page 4 of 41
UIC: 00163**

Refer to the following notes when filling out the tables in this TAB.

Notes:

1. "Production" equates to the number of items processed per Fiscal Year (FY), unless otherwise specified.
2. Base your responses for FY 1994 and previous years on executed workload, and for FY 1995 and subsequent years on workload as programmed. Unless otherwise specified, use workload mixes as programmed. In estimating projected workload capabilities, use the Activity's configuration as of completion of implementation of the BRAC-88/91/93 actions.
3. Use single shift operations (1-8-5) as the basis for your calculations. Report in specified units of throughput and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).
4. If any responses are classified, so annotate the applicable question and include those responses in a separate classified annex.
5. Capacity Index and Utilization Index will be calculated in accordance with the Defense Depot Maintenance Council approved update to Department of Defense Instruction (DoDInst) 4151.15H, "Depot Maintenance Capacity/Utilization Index Measurement."
6. The Major Owner/Operator questions will be answered by the Major Claimant/Systems Commander.
7. Utilize the tables provided to answer each question. Answer the questions for all of the commodity groups that are applicable to your activity. In the Aircraft Airframes and Engines (Gas Turbine) commodity groups break out the information by aircraft type, model, series or by engine type as applicable when filling out the tables.

PART I: MAINTENANCE & INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES

1. Historic and Predicted Workload

1.1 Given the current configuration and operation of your activity, provide the depot/industrial level maintenance by commodity group (from the List above) that was executed in and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in units throughput (Tables 1.1.a and 1.1.b) and in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 1.1.c and 1.1.d). Add additional rows as required to report all commodity types serviced at this activity.

Table 1.1.a: Historic and Predicted Depot/Industrial Workload

Commodity Type	Throughput (Units)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Avionics/Electronics	500	500	500	550	400	825	900	650
Total:	500	500	500	550	400	825	900	650

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**TAB C - PART I
Page 6 of 41
UIC: 00163**

Table 1.1.b: Historic and Predicted Depot/Industrial Workload

Commodity Type	Throughput (Units)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Avionics/Electronics	600	600	525	535	575	515	515	515
Total:	600	600	525	535	575	515	515	515

Table 1.1.c: Historic and Predicted Depot/Industrial Workload

Commodity Type	Throughput (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Avionics/Electronics	60.1K	60.1K	60.1K	65.6K	43.7K	94.0K	107.7K	70.4K
Total:	60.1K	60.1K	60.1K	65.6K	43.7K	94.0K	107.7K	70.4K

Table 1.1.d: Historic and Predicted Depot/Industrial Workload

Commodity Type	Throughput (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Avionics/Electronics	64.9K	65.6K	58.7K	59.2K	62.2K	56.4K	56.4K	56.4K
Total:	64.9K	65.6K	58.7K	59.2K	62.2K	56.4K	56.4K	56.4K

1.2 For each commodity type reported in Tables 1.1.a through 1.1.d, assume (a) the current projected total depot / industrial workload remains as assigned; (b) that sufficient production demand is available to justify maximum hiring, optimum (repeat order manufacturing lead times) procurement, and maximum equipment support; and (c) no major MILCON additional to that already programmed: what is the maximum extent to which depot / industrial maintenance operations could be expanded at this activity, based on the current and future planned workload mixes, for the requested period? Please provide your response in both the absolute maximum number of units and DLMHs that could be processed at this activity by applicable commodity group. Add additional rows as necessary to accommodate all commodity types serviced at this activity.

NAWC Indianapolis depot workload consists of overhaul and repair efforts on NAWC Indianapolis designed or manufactured equipment for which we have been assigned support either as interim or for the life cycle of the equipment. Less than 2% of Indianapolis' workload is depot maintenance. Typically, this effort includes low quantity and/or specialized equipment in which the overhaul and repair function utilizes the same test equipment and technical support as used during system design, development or manufacture. NAWC Indianapolis actively declines depot workload unless no other effective source is available. In response to the maximum potential depot/industrial workload question, we expect future workload will continue to be based on only those equipments designed or manufactured in-house. The maximum projected workload increase is 50% above current workload.

Table 1.2.a: Maximum Potential Depot/Industrial Workload

Commodity Type	Throughput (Units)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Avionics/Electronics	900	787	802	862	772	772	772
Total:	900	787	802	862	772	772	772

Table 1.2.b: Maximum Potential Depot/Industrial Workload

Commodity Type	Throughput (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Avionics/Electronics	97.3K	98.4K	88.0K	88.8K	93.3K	84.6K	84.6K	84.6K
Total:	97.3K	98.4K	88.0K	88.8K	93.3K	84.6K	84.6K	84.6K

1.3 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased workload by commodity group at this activity.

The maximum rate is based on the assumption that we will to be assigned only depot workload associated with in-house designed or manufactured equipments. No additional major equipment is required to sustain the rate of 50% above the current workload. This is considered reasonable because of the relatively small amount of depot workload at NAWC Indianapolis (less than 2% of total NAWC Indpls workload, and less than 1% of the total Navy Aviation Depot workload).

1.4 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your activity's capability to perform workload in each of the applicable commodity groups? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your activity's depot/industrial level maintenance capabilities. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

Based on NAWC Indianapolis depot workload projections, and the current industrial facilities in place, there would be no Industrial Plant Equipment changes, additions, or modifications to meet the maximum potential workload levels.

1.5 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of depot/industrial level workload and this activity (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

Based on the small proportion of depot workload at NAWC Indianapolis, (less than 2% of total NAWC Indianapolis workload) there would be no environmental or legal factors inhibiting further workload.

2. Workload Summary

2.1 Enter the information from the Predicted and Potential Workload sections of the previous question into the table below and calculate the variance between projected and potential workloads. Again, clearly identify each commodity and include all commodities serviced at this activity.

Table 2.1.a: PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1995

<i>FY 1995</i> Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Avionics/Electronics	600	900	50%	65.6K	98.4K	50%
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	65.6K	98.4K	50%

¹ This workload is not duplicative of any previously reported workload. Detail all production categorized as "other".

Table 2.1.b: PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1996

<i>FY 1996</i> Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Avionics/Electronics	525	787	50%	58.7K	88.0K	50%
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	58.7K	88.0K	50%

1 This workload is not duplicative of any previously reported workload. Detail all production categorized as "other".

Table 2.1.c: PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1997

<i>FY 1997</i> Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Avionics/Electronics	535	802	50%	59.2K	88.8K	50%
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	59.2K	88.8K	50%

1 This workload is not duplicative of any previously reported workload. Detail all production categorized as "other".

Table 2.1.d: PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1998

FY 1998 Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Avionics/Electronics	575	802	50%	62.2K	93.3K	50%
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	62.2K	93.3K	50%

1 This workload is not duplicative of any previously reported workload. Detail all production categorized as "other".

Table 2.1.e: PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1999

<i>FY 1999</i> Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Avionics/Electronics	515	772	50%	56.4K	84.6K	50%
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	56.4K	84.6K	50%

¹ This workload is not duplicative of any previously reported workload. Detail all production categorized as "other".

00/00/00 0:00 AM04/27/94 9:02 AMTable 2.1.f: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 2000**

<i>FY 2000</i> Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Avionics/Electronics	515	772	50%	56.4K	84.6K	50%
Total	N/A	N/A	N/A	56.4K	84.6K	50%

1 This workload is not duplicative of any previously reported workload. Detail all production categorized as "other".

Table 2.1.g: PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 2001

<i>FY 2001</i> Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Avionics/Electronics	515	772	50%	56.4K	84.6K	50%
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	56.4K	84.6K	50%

1 This workload is not duplicative of any previously reported workload. Detail all production categorized as "other".

PART II: HEADQUARTERS (MAJOR OWNERS & OPERATORS)

Note: NAWC Indianapolis is providing the information in Part II to assist the major claimant/systems commander in completing this section of the data call.

1. Interservicing Candidates

1.1 Specify all depot and/or industrial workload programs, performed by any of your activities, that are possible candidates for interservicing, *both* in to and out from the activity. Provide detailed supporting data for your recommendations.

NAWC Indianapolis only performs overhead and repair (depot) efforts on a small number of electronic components (approximately 65K DLMHs or 37 workyears). Typically this effort includes low quantity and/or specialized equipment that NAWC Indianapolis originally designed, developed or manufactured. NAWC Indianapolis actively declines depot workload unless no other effective source is available. The overhaul/repair function at NAWC Indianapolis uses the same test equipment and technical support that was developed during the new equipment prototype/manufacture function. If the depot functions are moved to another source, specialized test equipment would have to be duplicated and technical expertise independently developed at the new depot site.

2. Core Requirements

2.1 Given the current programmed configuration and operation for these activities, provide the projected Core Workload, Directed workload, Core "Plus" Workload, and Workload required to be retained to meet the Secretary of the Navy's Title 10 responsibilities. Within each Fiscal Year (FY) requested, provide your response in Units of throughput (where applicable) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) for the categories in the following Tables. Core workload includes all Core work performed for other Military Departments (please specify such work within each commodity category).

Core workload calculations are to be performed in accordance with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics) (OUSD(L)) Memorandum dated 15 November 1993 (subject: "Policy for Maintaining Core Depot Maintenance Capability").

Directed workload includes: Foreign Military Sales (FMS); Low Quantity Non-Core; Low Quantity Above Core; Best Value; Engineering Support; and Last Source of Repair. Directed workload is tabulated in Section 2.2, following.

Core-Plus workload is the sum of Core workload and Directed workload.

Title 10 workload is that portion of Core workload that must be retained within the Department of the Navy in order to meet the Secretary of the Navy's Title 10 responsibilities.

 **FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**TAB C - PART II
Page 21 of 41
UIC: 00163**

Table 2.1.a: Workload Requirements FY 1993

<i>FY 1993</i> Commodity Type	Core Workload (DLMHs)			
	Core Workload	Directed Workload	Core "Plus" Workload	Title 10 Workload
Avionics/Electronics	0	70.4K	70.4K	0
Total:	0	70.4K	70.4K	0

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**TAB C - PART II
Page 22 of 41
UIC: 00163**

Table 2.1.b: Workload Requirements FY 1994

<i>FY 1994</i>	Core Workload (DLMHs)			
Commodity Type	Core Workload	Directed Workload	Core "Plus" Workload	Title 10 Workload
Avionics/Electronics	0	64.9K	64.9K	0
Total:	0	64.9K	64.9K	0

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**TAB C - PART II
Page 23 of 41
UIC: 00163**

Table 2.1.c: Workload Requirements FY 1995

<i>FY 1995</i>	Core Workload (DLMHs)			
Commodity Type	Core Workload	Directed Workload	Core "Plus" Workload	Title 10 Workload
Avionics/Electronics	0	65.6K	65.6K	0
Total:	0	65.6K	65.6K	0

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
 PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
Page 24 of 41
UIC: 00163

Table 2.1.d: Workload Requirements FY 1996

<i>FY 1996</i>	Core Workload (DLMHs)			
Commodity Type	Core Workload	Directed Workload	Core "Plus" Workload	Title 10 Workload
Avionics/Electronics	0	58.7K	58.7K	0
Total:	0	58.7K	58.7K	0

Table 2.1.e: Workload Requirements FY 1997

<i>FY 1997</i> Commodity Type	Core Workload (DLMHs)			
	Core Workload	Directed Workload	Core "Plus" Workload	Title 10 Workload
Avionics/Electronics	0	59.2K	59.2K	0
Total:	0	59.2K	59.2K	0

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
Page 26 of 41
UIC: 00163

Table 2.1.g: Workload Requirements FY 1999

<i>FY 1999</i>	Core Workload (DLMHs)			
Commodity Type	Core Workload	Directed Workload	Core "Plus" Workload	Title 10 Workload
Avionics/Electronics	0	56.4K	56.4K	0
Total:	0	56.4K	56.4K	0

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
 PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
Page 28 of 41
UIC: 00163

Table 2.1.h: Workload Requirements FY 2000

<i>FY 2000</i>	Core Workload (DLMHs)			
Commodity Type	Core Workload	Directed Workload	Core "Plus" Workload	Title 10 Workload
Avionics/Electronics	0	56.4K	56.4K	0
Total:	0	56.4K	56.4K	0

Table 2.1.i: Workload Requirements FY 2001

<i>FY 2001</i>	Core Workload (DLMHs)			
Commodity Type	Core Workload	Directed Workload	Core "Plus" Workload	Title 10 Workload
Avionics/Electronics	0	56.4K	56.4K	0
Total:	0	56.4K	56.4K	0

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
 PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
Page 30 of 41
UIC: 00163

2.2 Given the current programmed configuration and operation of the NADEPs, provide the projected Directed Workload. Within each Fiscal Year (FY) requested, provide your response in units throughput (where available) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) for the categories requested.

Foreign Military Sales (FMS) include airframe, engine and component maintenance and manufacturing support.

Modifications (Mods) include only those modifications performed concurrently with scheduled depot level work packages constituting Core workload.

Low Quantity Non-Core (LQNC) is that Non-Core workload with insufficient programmed quantity for competition. This category also includes above threshold Core workload for weapons systems which have a total projected workload greater than the computed core quantity (above core workload).

Best Value (BV) includes items that have been offered for maintenance under competitive rules and no offerer has provided a bid that is equal to or better than the value provided by a current organic source.

Engineering Support (Engr) consists of Engineering Support to field, modify, operate, and maintain aviation weapon systems (i.e. RCM analysis, defining maintenance intervals, developing maintenance concepts, modification management, industrial support, investigations, bulletins and flight safety, and environmental issues).

Last Source of Repair (LSOR) comprises Non-Core workload which has been offered for maintenance under competitive rules and no offerer has provided a bid, and for which a workload requirement exists and the organic depot is the only remaining source of repair.

Table 2.2.a: Directed Workloads - FY 1993

FY 1993 Commodity	Units Throughput						Total
	FMS	Mods	LQNC	BV	Engr	LSOR	
Avionics/Electronics			650				650
FY 1993 Total:			650				650

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
 PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
Page 32 of 41
UIC: 00163

Table 2.2.b: Directed Workloads - FY 1994

FY 1994 Commodity	Units Throughput						Total
	FMS	Mods	LQNC	BV	Engr	LSOR	
Avionics/Electronics			600				600
FY 1994 Total:			600				600

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION**

**TAB C - PART II
Page 33 of 41
UIC: 00163**

Table 2.2.c: Directed Workloads - FY 1995

FY 1995 Commodity	Units Throughput						Total
	FMS	Mods	LQNC	BV	Engr	LSOR	
Avionics/Electronics			600				600
FY 1995 Total:			600				600

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
Page 34 of 41
UIC: 00163

Table 2.2.d: Directed Workloads - FY 1996

FY 1996 Commodity	Units Throughput						Total
	FMS	Mods	LQNC	BV	Engr	LSOR	
Avionics/Electronics			525				525
FY 1996 Total:			525				525

Table 2.2.e: Directed Workloads - FY 1997

FY 1997 Commodity	Units Throughput						Total
	FMS	Mods	LQNC	BV	Engr	LSOR	
Avionics/Electronics			535				535
FY 1997 Total:			535				535

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
 PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
 Page 36 of 41
 UIC: 00163

Table 2.2.f. Directed Workloads - FY 1998

FY 1993 Commodity	Units Throughput						Total
	FMS	Mods	LQNC	BV	Engr	LSOR	
Avionics/Electronics			575				575
FY 1998 Total:			575				575

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
 PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
 Page 37 of 41
 UIC: 00163

Table 2.2.g: Directed Workloads - FY 1999

FY 1999 Commodity	Units Throughput						Total
	FMS	Mods	LQNC	BV	Engr	LSOR	
Avionics/Electronics			515				515
FY 1999 Total:			515				515

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
 PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
 Page 38 of 41
 UIC: 00163

Table 2.2.h: Directed Workloads - FY 2000

FY 2000 Commodity	Units Throughput						Total
	FMS	Mods	LQNC	BV	Engr	LSOR	
Avionics/Electronics			515				515
FY 2000 Total:			515				515

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
 PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
 Page 39 of 41
 UIC: 00163

Table 2.2.i: Directed Workloads - FY 2001

FY 2001 Commodity	Units Throughput						Total
	FMS	Mods	LQNC	BV	Engr	LSOR	
Avionics/Electronics			515				515
FY 2001 Total:			515				515

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
PREDECISIONAL INFORMATION

TAB C - PART II
Page 40 of 41
UIC: 00163

3. Organization

3.1 Can the depot/industrial level workload be transferred to other sources such as other Navy activities, interservice to other DoD entities, or outsourced to commercial activities? Identify all applicable considerations to your recommendations.

The depot/industrial level workload at NAWC Indianapolis (approximately 65,000 DLMHs or 37 workyears and less than 2% of total workload) can be transferred to a depot site or another facility that possesses avionics equipment test and repair capabilities. All the Navy NADEP's, as well as interservice depot activities are viable candidates to transfer the depot/industrial level workload. Because both the new production and overhaul/repair functions share the same test equipment and technical support at NAWC Indianapolis, the new depot would have to duplicate both specialized test equipment and technically knowledgeable personnel at the new depot source.

TAB D

THIS SECTION NOT APPLICABLE TO NAWC AD INDIANAPOLIS

DATA CALL #4

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAV NOTE 11000 dtd 8 Dec 93

In accordance with policy set forth by the Secretary of the Navy, personnel of the Department of the Navy, uniformed and civilian, who provide information for use in the BRAC-95 process are required to provide a signed certification that states "I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief."

The signing of this certification constitutes a representation that the certifying official has reviewed the information and either (1) personally vouches for its accuracy and completeness or (2) has possession of, and is relying upon, a certification executed by a competent subordinate.

Each individual in your activity generating information for the BRAC-95 process must certify that information. Enclosure (1) is provided for individual certifications and may be duplicated as necessary. You are directed to maintain those certifications at your activity for audit purposes. For purposes of this certification sheet, the commander of the activity will begin the certification process and each reporting senior in the Chain of Command reviewing the information will also sign this certification sheet. This sheet must remain attached to this package and be forwarded up the Chain of Command. Copies must be retained by each level in the Chain of Command for audit purposes.

I certify the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

Thomas R. Darnell
(Name (Please type or print))


Signature

Commanding Officer
Title

27 April 1994
Date

Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Div. , Indianapolis
Activity

DATA CALL 4
BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (if applicable)

BARTON D. STRONG
NAME (Please type or print)

Barton D. Strong
Signature

COMMANDER
Title

MAY 12 1994
Date

NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER AIRCRAFT DIVISION PATUXENT RIVER, MD
Activity

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (if applicable)

G.H. Strohsahl, RADM, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

G.H. Strohsahl
Signature

Commander
Title

5/13/94
Date

Naval Air Warfare Center
Activity

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

W. C. BOWES, VADM, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

W.C. Bowes
Signature

COMMANDER
Title

15 May 94
Date

NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Activity

I certify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DEPUTY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS (LOGISTICS)
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF (INSTALLATIONS & LOGISTICS)

J.B. Greene, Jr.
NAME (Please type or print)

J.B. Greene Jr.
Signature

Acting
Title

19 MAY 1994
Date

Document Separator

WJ4-

ISSUE RELATING TO CLOSURE OF NAWC INDIANAPOLIS

Issue

Does the Navy/DOD recommendation to relocate software support work for the EP-3/ES-3 aircraft from NAWC Indianapolis to China Lake represent a deviation from the base closure criteria?

Background

As part of its recommendation to close NAWC Indianapolis, the Navy proposes to relocate 220 positions in the software support activities (SSA) for the EP-3/ES-3 to China Lake. Another 145 related positions associated with V-22 software support (60 positions) and NAVAIR Team Leaders (85 positions) would go to Pax.

Discussion

Minutes of the 10 January 1995 meeting of the Navy BSEC reveal how decisions were made regarding the relocation of the EP-3/ES-3 SSAs, V-22 work, and Team Leaders (Tab A). The BSEC decided to recommend that the EP-3/ES-3 SSAs go to China Lake, and that the V-22 work and Team Leaders go to Pax.

The minutes state: "At its 29 December 1994 session, the BSEC expressed concern over the large amount of work and people being moved to NAWC Patuxent River in BRAC-95 over and above that moved there by BRAC-93. Not all of the billets moving to Patuxent River were directed by the BSEC. Consequently, the BSEC directed the BSAT to look at alternative receiving sites." (BSEC minutes of 10 Jan 1995, page 2, para. 5.) (Emphasis added.)

The minutes then explain that the BSEC adopted Alternative 3 as shown in enclosure (4) to the same minutes (see Tab A). This relocates the EP-3/ES-3 SSAs to China Lake at a cost of \$746,000. Under Alternative 1, however, this work could have gone to Pax at an estimated cost of \$537,000, a savings of \$209,000.

Furthermore, internal Navy documentation (Tab B) indicates that Pax is the best alternative for this work. The Navy data shows that Pax can realize total recurring savings of \$111 million in labor costs over China Lake due to economies realized through collocation of the SSAs with EP-3/ES-3 Integrated Program Team (IPT) support work at Pax. Note that this document is dated March 13, 1995 -- two months after the BSEC decision meeting. Therefore, the community believes the data and recommendation it contains never came to the BSEC's attention.

RP-0546-F10
BSAT\ON
10 Jan 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR THE BASE STRUCTURE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Subj: REPORT OF BSEC DELIBERATIONS ON 10 JANUARY 1995

Encl: (1) Briefing Materials for COBRA Analysis (ONR)
(2) Available Space at Washington Navy Yard
(3) Briefing Materials for COBRA Analysis (Indy/Louisville)
→ (4) EP-3/ES-3 and V-22 Alternatives
(5) Briefing Materials for COBRA Analysis (NATSF)
(6) Briefing Materials for COBRA Analysis (NAESU)
(7) Briefing Materials for COBRA Analysis (Lakehurst).
(8) LJCSG Alternative J-25

1. The seventy-seventh deliberative session of the Base Structure Evaluation Committee (BSEC) convened at 1018 on 10 January 1995 in the Base Structure Analysis Team (BSAT) Conference Room at the Center for Naval Analyses. The following members of the BSEC were present: Mr. Charles P. Nemfakos, Vice Chairman; Ms. Genie McBurnett; Vice Admiral Richard Allen, USN; Vice Admiral William A. Earner, Jr., USN; Lieutenant General James A. Brabham, USMC; and Ms. Elsie Munsell. The following members of the BSAT were present: Mr. Richard A. Leach; Mr. David Wennergren; Mr. John Turnquist; Ms. Anne Rathmell Davis; Mr. Gerald Schiefer; Lieutenant Colonel Orval E. Nangle, USMC; Major Walter Cone, USMC; and Lieutenant Christina May, USN.

2. Mr. Nemfakos advised that the budget process was complete, and the ship count contained therein was increased by two FFG-7s over and above what was in the POM. For purposes of the out-years, the final decision on additional FFGs is not reflected, but it appears there is every intent to fund additional FFGs in POM 97. Additional FFGs are reflected in the force structure papers accompanying the budget. The BSEC discussed its decision to leave the piers at Little Creek open (see Reports of Deliberative Session on 13 and 29 December 1994) noting that the budgeted increase in the number of ships was less than expected. The BSEC found the amount of available DoN pier space was so close to the minimum requirement that any change could result in a shortage of space. The decision on the FFGs is a good example of such potential changes.

3. Major Cone and Mr. Wennergren briefed the results of the COBRA analysis for relocating the Office of Naval Research (ONR) to Nebraska Avenue to be collocated with ARO and AFOSR (scenario 072). See enclosure (1). BRAC-93 directed ONR to be relocated to DOD

RP-0546-F10
*** MASTER DOCUMENT ***
DO NOT REMOVE FROM FILESTab A

Community Position

(a) The BSEC's "concern over the large amount of work and people being moved to NAWC Patuxent River in BRAC-95" is not one of the base closure criteria and, therefore, does not constitute proper rationale for selection of a site for the SSA work.

(b) According to the enclosure (4) data, the most cost-effective alternative is to move the SSA work to Pax. Moving it to China Lake will cost \$209,000 more. Also, the Navy internal documentation shows that moving the SSAs to Pax would realize more than \$100 million in labor cost savings over 20 years.

(c) In view of the above, the community believes the Navy's recommendation on the EP-3/ES-3 SSA work deviated substantially from the base closure criteria. Therefore, there are grounds to relocate the SSAs, with their 220 positions, to Pax.

Southern Maryland Navy Alliance
Points of Contact

J. Frank Raley, President	301-863-6625
Jack Lynch, BRAC Subcommittee	301-862-2200
Steve Karalekas/Jim Noone Washington Representatives	202-466-7330

Subj: REPORT OF BSEC DELIBERATIONS ON 10 JANUARY 1995

owned space (the Washington Navy Yard was subsequently selected). Anita Jones, Director of Defense Research & Engineering, asked the Military Departments to consider collocating their research offices. DoN developed a scenario to collocate the three offices at Nebraska Avenue. The Army and Air Force have not expressed interest in collocating.

a. ONR-1 is the COBRA analysis for relocating ONR to Nebraska Avenue. New construction would be required at a cost of \$26.9M. Movement of ONR to the Navy Yard would require rehabilitation of existing facilities at a cost of \$7.1M, a cost avoided by going to Nebraska Avenue. No billets are eliminated by relocating.

b. ONR-2 is the COBRA analysis for leaving ONR at its present location at Ballston, an alternative receiving site suggested by ONR. The analysis has up-front savings because the rehabilitation costs at the Navy Yard and the costs of moving to the Navy Yard would be avoided; however, there are recurring lease costs of \$1.4M. Consequently, this analysis would produce a net savings for the first ten years. Looking at the analysis the other way, movement of the ONR to the Navy Yard would have up-front costs of \$9.4M, recurring savings of \$1.4M, and a return on investment in 10 years.

Since the BSEC has recommended closing White Oak and moving NAVSEA to the Navy Yard, there is no longer adequate space at the Navy Yard for ONR. See enclosure (2). Moreover, leaving ONR in its present location will be the most cost effective solution over the next 10 years. The BSEC accepted the analyses as presented and decided to recommend to the Secretary of the Navy that ONR be located at Ballston.

4. The Honorable Robert B. Pirie, Jr., Chairman, arrived at 1040.

5. At its 29 December 1994 session, the BSEC expressed concern over the large amount of work and people being moved to NAWC Patuxent River in BRAC-95 over and above that moved there by BRAC-93. Not all of the billets moving to Patuxent River were directed by the BSEC. Consequently, the BSEC directed the BSAT to look at alternative receiving sites. Mr. Schiefer briefed the BSEC on three activities that could be moved elsewhere.

a. NAWC Indianapolis billets. Enclosure (3) is a portion of the results of COBRA analyses for the combined scenario which removes ship/sea systems work from NSWC Louisville to NSY Norfolk and closes both NAWC Indianapolis and NSWC Louisville as approved by the BSEC on 22 and 29 December 1994. This analysis addresses only the Indianapolis portion of the combined scenario. The Louisville portion remains as previously briefed. Line 1 (ALT2AB) is the analysis as last approved by the BSEC. Line 2 is the

Subj: REPORT OF BSEC DELIBERATIONS ON 10 JANUARY 1995

analysis should the BSEC send EP-3/ES-3 and V-22 work from NAWC Indianapolis to China Lake vice Patuxent River. This analysis also reflects NAVAIR's advice that 39 additional billets would be needed at China Lake to perform V-22 work. Line 3 is the BSAT's analysis for sending that EP-3/ES-3 and V-22 work from NAWC Indianapolis to China Lake and also eliminating the additional 39 V-22 billets. Both alternatives were dependent on NAESU and NATSF not locating at Patuxent River.

The BSEC reviewed enclosure (4) and decided to send EP-3/ES-3 work to China Lake and to send V-22 and Team Leaders to Patuxent River, an alternative not contained in enclosure (3). See paragraph 3 of enclosure (4). This allows consolidation of software support and retains previously identified synergistic savings (39 billets) by locating the V-22 work at Patuxent River. The BSEC decided to recommend this scenario to the Secretary of the Navy.

b. NATSF. Enclosure (5) is the results of COBRA analyses for closing NATSF Philadelphia and consolidating at SPCC Mechanicsburg (scenario 031). Line 1 is the current analysis for scenario 031. Line 2 is the analysis for closing NATSF and consolidating at NADEP North Island.

Much of the work done by NATSF in preparing Naval aviation technical manuals and directives is performed in conjunction with the NADEPs. Consolidation at NADEP North Island results in billet eliminations and consumes excess capacity at the NADEP. The BSEC recognized that its decision not to close ASO Philadelphia meant that NATSF could stay in place, but that would not produce steady-state savings or eliminate excess. The BSEC approved the analysis on line 2 and decided to recommend that scenario to the Secretary of the Navy.

c. NAESU. Enclosure (6) is the results of COBRA analyses for relocating NAESU Philadelphia (scenario 033). Line 1 is the current analysis for scenario 033. Line 2 would consolidate the NAESU at NADEP North Island with rehabilitation of spaces computed at both 75% and 40%. Line 3 would consolidate the NAESU at NADEP North Island without any rehabilitation of spaces.

NAESU provides technical representatives to Aviation activities. Locating at NADEP North Island permits consolidation that eliminates command structure and consumes excess capacity at the NADEP. Moving activities from ASO Philadelphia also potentially reduces the costs to DLA to move its printing services to the ASO compound. Given the greater steady-state savings and 20-year net present value, the BSEC approved the analysis on line 2 (rehabilitating spaces at NADEP North Island at the 40% rate). The BSEC will recommend that scenario to the Secretary of the Navy.

Subj: REPORT OF BSEC DELIBERATIONS ON 10 JANUARY 1995

6. Mr. Trick reported to the BSEC on his attempt to achieve further personnel eliminations from the "Lakehurst 12" COBRA analysis approved by the BSEC on 28 and 29 December 1994 (a modified version of scenario 123). See enclosure (7). In the analysis the BSAT eliminated 14 additional billets. These are financial support personnel. The BSEC found the number of financial support personnel moving to be disproportionately large for the assets managed and recognized that all of NAVAIR's financial management resources would be available at the receiving site. To the extent that additional financial support is needed, billets could be taken from other areas. The BSEC expects further synergistic reductions from collocation but could not identify them specifically. NAVAIR will not certify the data with the additional 14 billets eliminated. Consequently, the BSEC approved the Lakehurst 13 analysis which modifies the previous analysis by eliminating 14 additional billets. The BSEC will include that scenario in its final recommendations to the Secretary of the Navy.

7. Mr. Trick updated the BSEC on the request from the Air Force's request for data to move its C4I Fixed Ground functions from Hanscomb AFB to NCCOSC San Diego. On 28 December 1994 the BSEC directed the BSAT to hold the response until clarification is obtained as to why 50 people need 29,550 square feet of space. The Air Force has subsequently changed its request to 194 personnel and 39,000 square feet of space. This is still 10,000 square feet more than DoN would estimate for that number of personnel. Many of these personnel are presently off-site personnel. The BSAT is in the process of determining why 39,000 square feet of space is needed and why off-site personnel are moving on-site. See enclosure (8).

8. Mr. Trick reported on two Laboratory JCSG alternatives that were not fully addressed during previous analyses: (1) transfer engineering development life cycle phase of satellite common support function from Naval Research Lab (NRL), Washington, and NCCOSC RDT&E Division, San Diego, to Space & Missile Systems Center (SMC), Los Angeles AFB and (2) transfer of energetics-explosive functions from NSWC Indian Head to Picatinny Arsenal. For satellite functions, the BSAT proposed a text response which explains the radically different nature of NRL and NCCOSC functions (in-house rapid infusion of Laboratory technology into operational satellites and satellite communications) and SMC functions (acquisition, program management, and contracting) makes the alternative infeasible. The BSEC rejected the proposed response and directed that a COBRA scenario development data call be released to analyze the JCSG scenario for consolidating satellite functions. The JCSG alternative regarding energetics actually suggested consolidation at China Lake and Picatinny. The BSEC felt it had considered this alternative when it considered moving energetics to China Lake as part of the larger scenario to close

Subj: REPORT OF BSEC DELIBERATIONS ON 10 JANUARY 1995

Indian Head, but to be responsive to the JCSG, the BSEC directed that a COBRA scenario development data call be released to analyze sending energetics-explosive functions from Indian Head to Picatinny Arsenal.

9. The deliberative session adjourned at 1140.



ORVAL E. NANGLE
LTCOL, USMC
Recording Secretary

10 January 95

ALTERNATIVES FOR MOVEMENT OF
EP-3/ES-3, V-22, AND TEAM LEADERS FROM INDIANAPOLIS

ALTERNATIVE	PEOPLE	SPACE SQ. FT.	MILCON \$ (M)
1. Move all to Pax			
EP-3/ES-3	220	41,214	0.950 ⁵³⁷
V-22	60	11,560	0.207 ²⁰⁷
Team Leaders	85	12,750	0.147
TOTAL (see note (1))	365	65,524	0.744
2. Move all to China Lake			
EP-3/ES-3	220	41,214	0.746
V-22	075	13,810	0.215
Team Leaders	109	16,350	0.220
TOTAL (see note (2))	404	71,374	1.181
3. Move EP-3/ES-3 to China Lake; move V-22 and Team Leaders to Pax			
Patuxent River	146	24,310	0.207
China Lake	220	41,214	0.746
TOTAL (see note (3))	365	65,524	0.953

NOTES:

- (1) This alternative has been significantly modified based upon the assumption that NAESU/NATSF functions do not relocate to Patuxent River, which then frees space at St. Inigoes for rehab for admin/office space, V-22 support lab, and two EP-3/ES-3 SCIFs. Additional parking space not required.
- (2) Includes rehab of existing admin/office space, V-22 support lab, and two SCIFs. Additional parking space not required.
- (3) Assumes rehab of existing space at St. Inigoes for admin/office space and V-22 support lab.

SUMMARY:

Alternative 1 permits a reduction of 39 persons from the original Indianapolis/Crane scenario because of the synergy of operation at Patuxent River. (This equates to a recurring annual savings of approximately \$5M). This alternative now benefits significantly from the availability of space at St. Inigoes.

Alternative 2 utilizes existing space at China Lake but loses synergy savings of 39 persons.

Alternative 3 retains the synergistic savings in personnel (since the synergism is attributed primarily to the V-22 and team leader functions rather than the EP-3/ES-3 SSAs), utilizes available space at China Lake, and benefits from the rehab of space at St. Inigoes for the V-22/Team Leaders assuming that NAESU/NATSF functions do not relocate to Patuxent River.

Encl (4)

Subject: NAWCAD-I CLOSURE IMPACT ON PMA290 PROGRAM SUPPORT

Background: BRAC 95 initiatives currently include closure of NAWC AD Indianapolis. An alternative being considered is relocation of EP-3/ES-3 program support to China Lake, and relocation of other PMA290 program support to Crane. NAWCAD-I provides essential systems engineering support for EP-3, ES-3, P-3 AIP, F-3 Special Projects, and P-3 Counter-Drug Upgrade aircraft programs. NAWC AD-I is also the Software Support Activity (SSA) and the lead field activity for mission avionics for EP-3/ES-3 aircraft. A Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) is required.

Discussion: The impact of the closure depends on the selection of the relocation site. The impact of relocating EP-3/ES-3 support from NAWCAD-I is summarized below relative to the following factors: percentage of people willing to relocate, PCS costs, training costs for new hires to replace personnel not relocating, MILCON, and labor costs on a 20-year life cycle basis. These relocation impacts are summarized below:

	PAX RIVER	CHINA LAKE	CRANE
% Personnel Willing to Move	53%	23%	87%
PCS Costs	\$4M	\$3M	\$6M
New Hire Training	\$5M	\$9M	\$2M
SCIF MILCON	\$6.5M	\$8M	\$6.5M
20 Year Labor Costs	\$429M	\$540M	\$499M

In addition to the adverse economic impact, extensive loss of experienced personnel and an attendant gap of 1-3 years for recruitment and training are issues dependent on site relocation. Relocation to Patuxent River is the most economical alternative with expected labor cost savings through manpower efficiencies accruing from extensive collocation of PMA290 program support. Relocation to Patuxent River will capitalize on the synergism derived from collocation with the P-3/ES-3 SSA and other EP-3/ES-3/P-3/ES-3 IPT support at the facility. Engineering and logistic support personnel for the P-3 and ES-3 airframes are at Patuxent River. Testing for the next generation Joint Airborne SIGINT Architecture (JASA) is also planned for NAWC AD Patuxent River.

Recommendation: Provided for information only.

Evaluation of Alternatives

Nine sites were considered for relocation. The sites were compared against the following criteria listed in priority order:

- Cost (Includes construction, PCS, Training and 20 year labor costs)
- Space
- Percentage of personnel willing to relocate to site
- P-3/S-3 software or airframe experience
- Test Facilities (EW)
- Airfield

Space and percentage of team willing to relocate were used as go/no go criteria. Jacksonville was the only site eliminated based on lack of physical space. A minimum of 85% of team had to be willing to move to the site to qualify. Past experience with moving the EP SSA from Dahlgren to Indianapolis had 80% of the personnel relocating. Less than 85% of personnel were willing to move to North Island, Point Mugu, China Lake, San Antonio and Warner-Robins.

PCS costs were based on a family of four with a three bedroom house. Data was provide by the NAWC ADI disbursing office.

All except three sites would require a SCIF to be constructed. China Lake, Wright-Patterson, and Greenville, TX all have SCIFs that would accommodate the ITF or could be easily renovated.

Cost of training new hires was based on lessons learned from move of SSA to Indy from Dahlgren. During this move, 50% of SSA personnel relocated to Indy and overlapped with the new SSA personnel for 18 months. Cost for moving 50% of the personnel and salaries was \$10.9 million. This figure was then pro-rated for the number of personnel willing to relocate.

Manpower efficiencies or costs were based on number of personnel that would be saved or added. Maximum savings or costs were limited to 10%. Pax Filter offers the most savings because of the potential to eliminate redundancy in overhead functions of P-3/S-3 and EP-3/ES-3 SSAs. A 10% manpower cost was included at non NAVAIR facilities. This cost is associated with program management and support personnel that would be required to execute functions that would be available at other NAVAIR IPT sites.

Greenville, TX would result in a completely different concept of support for the EP-3 and ES-3. It would involve contracting out the support and would most likely result in including the EP-3 in with the Big Safari program used for support of the RC-135 aircraft. Wright-Patterson will most likely be the site of the Smart Joint Program Office which will impact the future sensor improvements of the EP/ES aircraft.

Tab A

CAPT L. D. Newsome
PMA290
604-2600 ext7001
9 Jan 95

Subject: Impact of Relocating NAWC AD-1 EP-3 and ES-3 Support

Background: As part of the BRAC 95 initiatives, relocation of the NAWC AD Indianapolis support for EP-3 and ES-3 aircraft programs has been assessed. NAWC AD Indianapolis is the Software Support Activity (SSA) and the cognizant field activity for mission avionics for these aircraft. A Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) is required.

Discussion: The following alternative sites were assessed for relocation: Patuxent River, MD; Jacksonville, FL; North Island CA; Point Mugu, CA; China Lake CA; Warner-Robins AFB, GA; Greenville, TX; Wright-Patterson AFB, OH; and Kelly AFB, TX. Factors considered in selecting these alternative sites included: NAVAIR test facilities with Integrated Program Team (IPT) personnel currently supporting the EP-3 and ES-3, Navy cognizant field activities for EP-3, ES-3, P-3, and S-3 airframes, facilities supporting Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office/Joint/RC-135 programs, and facilities with electronic warfare expertise.

The following factors were assessed relative to the impact of relocating the EP-3 and ES-3 engineering support from Indianapolis: real estate availability including existence of a suitable SCIF, MILCON requirements, percentage of people willing to relocate from Indianapolis, training costs for new hires to replace personnel not relocating, PCS costs, and labor costs on a 20-year life cycle basis. These factors are quantified at Tab A.

In addition to the adverse economic impact, extensive loss of experienced personnel and an attendant gap of 1-3 years for recruitment and training render impractical the relocation to North Island, Point Mugu, China Lake, Warner-Robins AFB, and Kelly AFB.

An assessment of the factors at Tab A indicates that if relocation is mandated, Patuxent River is the most economical alternative that would also capitalize on the synergism derived from other IPT support at this facility.

PMA290 point of contact is Steve Meak, PMA290E, 604-2600 x7042.

Recommendation: If relocation is required, Patuxent River would be the preferred alternative location.

Tab A: Comparison of alternative sites (2 pp)

Site	AFLD	F-35-3 Exp	Test Facilities	Real Estate	% moving	FCB Costs	New Hire Training	DOF Mileon (20 yrs)	Labor costs	Manpower Estimates	Total
Indy	No	No	No	NA	NA	NA	\$0	NA	\$468		\$468
pat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	42%	\$9	\$8	8.8	\$468	(\$48)	\$420
Jax	Yes	Yes	No	Tight	26%	\$2	\$7	8.5	\$463	(\$8)	\$455
North Island	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	18%	\$2	\$9	8.5	\$427	(\$8)	\$435
PT Mugu	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8%	\$1	\$10	8.5	\$668	(\$28)	\$640
China Lake	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	8%	\$1	\$10	0.75	\$668	(\$28)	\$640
weather station	Yes	No	No	Yes	27%	\$2	\$8	8.8	\$488	\$40	\$528
Greenville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	NA	\$11	0	\$531	\$0	\$542
Wright Pat	Yes	No	No	Yes	82%	\$3	\$2	0	\$488	\$40	\$548
San Antonio	Yes	No	No	Yes	18%	\$1	\$9	8.5	\$488	\$40	\$558

\$ in Millions

Fy 86 Labor rates (minus DBOF Recoupment)

Manpower Estimates

F-35-3 Aircraft Exp - 2% Savings (North Island, Jax, Greenville)

F-35-3 BSA/Support Experience - 10% Savings (Pat River) - 3% Savings (Greenville)

NON Navy Site - 10% Increase Manpower

Test Experience - 8% Savings (Pat River, China Lake, Greenville, PT Mugu)

Max savings/foot 10%

Greenville support contracted out

Tab A

1