DCN 1252

C112

NAVAL AVIATION DEPOT

JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL # 8
CAPACITY

ORIGINAL

1 June 1994

Revised pg

DATA CALL SUPPLEMENT
FOR
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP - DEPOT MAINTENANCE

Table of Contents

Notes 2
Table of Acronyms 4
CAPACITY 5
1. Capacity Utilization 5
2. Plant Replacement Value 11
3. Programmed Workload 12
4. Service Centers of Excellence 14

MEASURES OF MERIT 15
Geographic 15
1. Location 15
2. Environmental Compliance 16
3. Environmental Restrictions 17
4. Other Collocated Activities 18
5. Encroachment 21
Facilities and Equipage 22
6. Unique or Peculiar Facilities 22
7. Buildings and Their Condition 28
8. Unique and/or Peculiar Capabilities and Capacities 30
9. Acreage Available for Building 42
10. Administrative Space 43
11. Industrial Waste 43
Workload and Capabilities 44
12. Core Capabilities (DoD) 44
13. Core Workloads 50
14. Other Workloads (Above Core) 52
15. Unique and/or Peculiar Workloads 66
16. Scope of Work Performed 68
17. Interface with Customers 84
Costs 87
18. Real Property Maintenance (RPM) 87
19. Annual Operating Costs . . . . . A 87
20. Environmental Compliance 88
21. Local Wage Rate 89
22. Programmed Capital Investments 89

DATA CALL SUPPLEMENT
FOR
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP - DEPOT MAINTENANCE

Table of Contents

Notes 2
Table of Acronyms 4
CAPACITY 5
1. Capacity Utilization 5
2. Plant Replacement Value 11
3. Programmed Workload 12
4. Service Centers of Excellence 14

MEASURES OF MERIT 15
Geographic 15
1. Location 15
2. Environmental Compliance 16
3. Environmental Restrictions 17
4. Other Collocated Activities 18
5. Encroachment 21
Facilities and Equipage 22
6. Unique or Peculiar Facilities 22
7. Buildings and Their Condition 28
8. Unique and/or Peculiar Capabilities and Capacities 30
9. Acreage Available for Building 42
10. Administrative Space 43
11. Industrial Waste 43
Workload and Capabilities 44
12. Core Capabilities (DoD) 44
13. Core Workloads 50
14. Other Workloads (Above Core) 52
15. Unique and/or Peculiar Workloads 66
16. Scope of Work Performed 68
17. Interface with Customers 84
Costs 87
18. Real Property Maintenance (RPM) 87
19. Annual Operating Costs 87
20. Environmental Compliance 87
21. Local Wage Rate 89
22. Programmed Capital Investments 89

DATA CALL SUPPLEMENT FOR
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP-DEPOT MAINTENANCE

This supplement is designed to facilitate the cross service analysis required of the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC-95) process. It requests data in a standardized format that will be used by the Joint Cross Service Group-Depot Maintenance (JCSG-DM) to develop closure and realignment alternatives to be given to the Military Departments for their analysis and final recommendations. The JCSG-DM Data Call consists of two sections, one for capacity measurements and a second measuring "measures of merit". This Data Call has been formatted to assist the preparer in providing the required information with the minimum amount of effort. If questions arise, contact your Military Department BRAC-95 office for clarification.

Notes in the context of this data call:

1. Base your responses on workload as programmed for your activity. Unless otherwise specified, use workload mixes as programmed in the FYDP.

2. Direct Labor Hours (DLH) is the common unit of measure unless specifically noted otherwise in the question.

3. Information requested in this supplement may duplicate data requested by BRAC 95 data calls from the individual Military Departments. If this occurs, read both questions carefully to ensure that they are in fact asking for identical information, and if that is the case, transfer information from one data call to the other.

4. These questions should be passed up and down the chain of command without editing or rewriting. This standardized data call is designed to support an auditable process by having each activity (regardless of Military Department assigned) respond to the same question.

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

6. Capacity and utilization index calculations will be performed in accordance with the Defense Depot Maintenance Council approved update to DoD 4151.15H (Depot Maintenance Capacity/Utilization Index Measurement) dated December 5, 1990.

7. All calculations will assume a one shift, 40 hour work week.

8. Workload, capabilities, and capacities will be measured by commodity groups. A detailed breakout of the JCSG-DM commodity groups is contained in the following box. Insert the commodity groups applicable to your depot maintenance activity into the tables whenever a specific break out is requested by the question. Individual Military Departments in their Service specific data calls, may measure data in different commodity groups or categories, but for the Joint Cross Service analysis, these commodity groups must be utilized.

9. Data will be amounts as of the end of the applicable fiscal year.

JOINT CROSS SERVICE - DEPOT MAINTENANCE

Commodity Groups List

1. Aircraft Airframes:
   a. Rotary
   b. VSTOL
   c. Fixed Wing
      (1) Transport / Tanker / Bomber /
      (2) Command and Control
      (3) Light Combat
      (4) Admin / Training
   d. 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)

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

Table of Acronyms

$/DLH	Cost per Direct Labor Hour
$K	Thousands of Dollars
ADMIN	Administrative; administration
AICUZ	Air Installations Compatible Use Zone
AOC$	Annual Operating Cost (dollars)
CCN	Category Code Number
DBOF	Defense Business Operating Fund
DLH	Direct Labor Hour
DoD	Department of Defense
ESQD	Explosive Safety Quantity Distance
FMS	Foreign Military Sales
FY	Fiscal Year
FYDP	Future Year Defense Plan
GTE	Gas Turbine Engines
HERF	Hazardous Electronic Radiation - Fuels
HERO	Hazardous Electronic Radiation - Ordnance
HERP	Hazardous Electronic Radiation - Personnel
JCSG-DM	Joint Cross Service Group - Depot Maintenance
KSF	Thousands of Square Feet
PRV	Plant Replacement Value
R&D	Research and Development
RPM	Real Property Maintenance
SF	Square Feet
WG	Wage Grade

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL SUPPLEMENT
FOR
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP - DEPOT MAINTENANCE

CAPACITY

1. Capacity Utilization

1.1 Calculate the capacity index for the commodity groups applicable to depot maintenance work at your activity. Provide your answers expressed in direct labor hours (DLHs) in Table 1.1.a by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 1.1.a: **Capacity Index** R

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING					
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	314,696	712,426	686,762	702,735	660,918
(4) Admin/Training	87,250	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL) *	900,091	1,018,452	1,093,726	975,618	1,013,574
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	374,576	400,742	374,912	364,043	337,711
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other *	525,515	617,710	718,814	611,575	675,863
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	33,219	61,386	76,246	37,129	53,283
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	(R) 31,346	(R) 37,400	(R) 34,246	21,129	27,283
d. INSTRUMENTS	(R) 21,741	(R) 19,954	(R) 10,399	(R) 9,130	(R) 8,302
e. LANDING GEAR	(R) 37,351	(R) 24,987	(R) 38,951	(R) 44,554	(R) 35,719

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL SUPPLEMENT
FOR
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP - DEPOT MAINTENANCE

CAPACITY

1. Capacity Utilization

1.1 Calculate the capacity index for the commodity groups applicable to depot maintenance work at your activity. Provide your answers expressed in direct labor hours (DLHs) in Table 1.1.a by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 1.1.a: **Capacity Index** R

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING					
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	314,696	712,426	686,762	702,735	660,918
(4) Admin/Training	87,250	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL) *	900,091	1,018,452	1,093,726	975,618	1,013,574
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	374,576	400,742	374,912	364,043	337,711
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other *	525,515	617,710	718,814	611,575	675,863
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	33,219	61,386	76,246	37,129	53,283
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	32,451	42,386	38,901	21,129	27,283
d. INSTRUMENTS	24,548	21,411	12,776	10,276	10,373
e. LANDING GEAR	38,356	27,945	41,872	47,288	38,356

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL SUPPLEMENT
FOR
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP - DEPOT MAINTENANCE

CAPACITY

1. Capacity Utilization

1.1 Calculate the capacity index for the commodity groups applicable to depot maintenance work at your activity. Provide your answers expressed in direct labor hours (DLHs) in Table 1.1.a by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 1.1.a: **Capacity Index** R

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY					
SUB-TOTAL ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL					
SUB-TOTAL VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING					
A-7E	113,888	78,535	16,465	0	0
EA-6B	128,454	164,505	145,912	147,403	113,618
EP-3A	16,519	0	0	12,063	0
EP-3B	0	0	11,304	0	0
EP-3E	0	22,783	11,941	24,126	12,785
EP-3J	0	11,391	0	12,063	0
P-3C (AUSTRALIAN)	0	40,659	42,621	0	0
P-3C	398,262	250,687	254,023	238,921	290,733
RP-3A	0	0	0	12,063	12,823
UP-3A	33,038	11,391	11,941	12,063	0
F-14A	141,988	228,461	222,377	338,454	321,138

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised 5j

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL SUPPLEMENT
FOR
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP - DEPOT MAINTENANCE

CAPACITY

1. Capacity Utilization

1.1 Calculate the capacity index for the commodity groups applicable to depot maintenance work at your activity. Provide your answers expressed in direct labor hours (DLHs) in Table 1.1.a by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 1.1.a: **Capacity Index** **R**

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY					
SUB-TOTAL ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL					
SUB-TOTAL VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING					
A-7E	113,888	78,535	16,465	0	0
EA-6B	128,454	164,505	145,912	147,403	113,618
EP-3A	16,519	0	0	12,063	0
EP-3B	0	0	11,304	0	0
EP-3E	0	22,783	11,941	24,126	12,785
EP-3J	0	11,391	0	12,063	0
P-3C (AUSTRALIAN)	0	40,659	42,621	0	0
P-3C	398,262	250,687	254,023	238,921	290,733
RP-3A	0	0	0	12,063	12,823
UP-3A	33,038	11,391	11,941	12,063	0
F-14A	141,988	228,461	222,377	338,454	321,138

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 25 JUL 1994

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL SUPPLEMENT
FOR
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP - DEPOT MAINTENANCE

CAPACITY

1. Capacity Utilization

1.1 Calculate the capacity index for the commodity groups applicable to depot maintenance work at your activity. Provide your answers expressed in direct labor hours (DLHs) in Table 1.1.a by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 1.1.a: **Capacity Index**

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING	938,961	938,961	938,961	938,961	938,961
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	NOT AVAILABLE				
Command and Control					
Light Combat					
Admin/Training					
OTHER	354,412	354,412	354,412	354,412	354,412
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	81,315	81,315	81,315	81,315	81,315
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	27,617	27,617	27,617	27,617	27,617
INSTRUMENTS	19,945	19,945	19,945	19,945	19,945
LANDING GEAR	16,877	16,877	16,877	16,877	16,877
AVIATION ORDNANCE	21,480	21,480	21,480	21,480	21,480
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	176,439	176,439	176,439	176,439	176,439
APUs	0	0	0	0	0

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F404GE400S	1,226	1,379	4,208	4,642	3,061
J52 O/A	0	865	497	0	0
J52P408	653	1,389	1,595	1,082	910
J52P408A	32,213	18,692	38,848	31,817	43,544
J52P6C	1,627	1,157	1,328	4,518	4,556
J52P8B	10,189	2,049	173	0	0
J52P8B/C	0	9,502	0	0	0
J52P8C	38,044	32,177	28,552	0	0
TF34GE400B	14,738	35,695	29,512	57,963	52,483
COMP J52 F	745	0	0	0	0
BLADES/VANES (TYPE 2)	0	0	0	0	0
SUB-TOTAL ENGINES	150,357	150,357	150,357	150,357	150,357
TOTAL	3,060,831	3,060,831	3,060,831	3,060,831	3,060,831

N.A. - Fixed wing data is not broken into categories shown due to non-availability of information.

Artisans work on multiple TMSs and are not bound to fixed work positions. Commodity groups are only available as fixed wing, R/W and VSTOL.

R

NOTE: Product engineering direct labor workload is not included in capacity index, utilization index, maximum potential capacity, or programmed workload in accordance with Department of Defense guidelines.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	14,867	46,460	31,593	14,415	24,029
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	115,069	113,452	120,971	141,274	105,055
h. APUs	0	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	92,171	98,152	134,158	121,578	136,101
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
a. AIRCRAFT	456,782	490,093	456,122	440,842	428,006
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS					
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	52,614	118,470	(R) 87,218	(R) 92,820	(R) 104,680
14. OTHER	176,246	173,360	246,496	250,111	254,554
15. MANUFACTURING	(R) 519,775	501,677	(R) 529,811	(R) 557,692	(R) 557,692
16. FLEET SUPPORT				(R) 1,648,000	
a. Product Support (Engineering)	(R) 1,210,820	(R)1,380,500	(R)1,494,200	(R)1,~~708,563~~	(R)1,648,000
b. Voyage Repair	(R) 126,683	(R) 134,649	(R) 134,649	(R) 134,649	(R) 134,649
c. Customer Service	7,109	(R) 13,109	(R) 12,441	(R) 12,627	(R) 12,601
d. BRAC Transition	255,671	(R) 136,350	(R) 55,762	0	0
TOTAL	(R) 4,453,501	(R) 5,080,877	(R) 5,243,751	(R) 5,204,303	(R) 5,204,446

*** P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal Other (Sub-Total).**

R, AIR-09B3
18 Oct 94

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 17 OCT 1994

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	14,867	46,460	31,593	14,415	24,029
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	115,069	113,452	120,971	141,274	105,055
h. APUs	0	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	92,171	98,152	134,158	121,578	136,101
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
a. AIRCRAFT	456,782	490,093	456,122	440,842	428,006
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS					
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	52,614	118,470	91,078	94,821	124,680
14. OTHER	176,246	173,360	246,496	250,111	254,554
15. MANUFACTURING	545,774	501,677	531,638	681,454	585,252
16. FLEET SUPPORT					
a. Product Support (Engineering)	1,295,820	1,600,254	1,720,952	1,708,563	1,790,252
b. Voyage Repair	131,742	130,100	154,657	131,742	131,742
c. Customer Service	7,109	14,444	13,985	13,225	13,225
d. BRAC Transition	255,671	142,366	60,966	0	0
TOTAL	4,574,476	5,312,834	5,512,899	5,392,200	5,396,683

*** P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal Other (Sub-Total).**

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F-14B	0	114,230	136,847	53,177	131,505
F-14D	0	16,319	85,530	88,628	56,359
T-2	106,812	0	0	0	0
SUB-TOTAL FIXED WING	938,961	938,961	938,961	938,961	938,961
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	NOT AVAILABLE				
Command and Control					
Light Combat					
Admin/Training					
OTHER	397,371	397,371	397,371	397,371	397,371
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	35,288	35,288	35,288	35,288	35,288
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	27,617	27,617	27,617	27,617	27,617
INSTRUMENTS	19,945	19,945	19,945	19,945	19,945
LANDING GEAR	16,877	16,877	16,877	16,877	16,877
AVIATION ORDNANCE	21,480	21,480	21,480	21,480	21,480
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	176,439	176,439	176,439	176,439	176,439
APUs	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	1,276,496	1,276,496	1,276,496	1,276,496	1,276,496
SUB-TOTAL A/C COMPONENTS	1,574,142	1,574,142	1,574,142	1,574,142	1,574,142
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
F404GE400	24,025	23,102	25,951	30,558	30,257
F404GE400A	2,318	1,946	2,640	1,933	2,085
F404GE400C	14,044	11,008	4,925	3,786	2,435
F404GE400F	5,358	5,646	5,713	6,948	5,025
F404GE400H	2,985	3,877	3,957	4,208	4,264
F404GE400L	2,192	1,873	2,458	2,902	1,737

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F-14B	0	114,230	136,847	53,177	131,505
F-14D	0	16,319	85,530	88,628	56,359
T-2	106,812	0	0	0	0
SUB-TOTAL FIXED WING	938,961	938,961	938,961	938,961	938,961
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	NOT AVAILABLE				
Command and Control					
Light Combat					
Admin/Training					
OTHER	354,412	354,412	354,412	354,412	354,412
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	81,315	81,315	81,315	81,315	81,315
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	27,617	27,617	27,617	27,617	27,617
INSTRUMENTS	19,945	19,945	19,945	19,945	19,945
LANDING GEAR	16,877	16,877	16,877	16,877	16,877
AVIATION ORDNANCE	21,480	21,480	21,480	21,480	21,480
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	176,439	176,439	176,439	176,439	176,439
APUs	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	1,273,428	1,273,428	1,273,428	1,273,428	1,273,428
SUB-TOTAL A/C COMPONENTS	1,617,101	1,617,101	1,617,101	1,617,101	1,617,101
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
F404GE400	24,025	23,102	25,951	30,558	30,257
F404GE400A	2,318	1,946	2,640	1,933	2,085
F404GE400C	14,044	11,008	4,925	3,786	2,435
F404GE400F	5,358	5,646	5,713	6,948	5,025
F404GE400H	2,985	3,877	3,957	4,208	4,264
F404GE400L	2,192	1,873	2,458	2,902	1,737

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 25 JUL 1994

Revised Pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F404GE400S	1,226	1,379	4,208	4,642	3,061
J52 O/A	0	865	497	0	0
J52P408	653	1,389	1,595	1,082	910
J52P408A	32,213	18,692	38,848	31,817	43,544
J52P6C	1,627	1,157	1,328	4,518	4,556
J52P8B	10,189	2,049	173	0	0
J52P8B/C	0	9,502	0	0	0
J52P8C	38,044	32,177	28,552	0	0
TF34GE400B	14,738	35,695	29,512	57,963	52,483
COMP J52 F	745	0	0	0	0
BLADES/VANES (TYPE 2)	0	0	0	0	0
SUB-TOTAL ENGINES	150,357	150,357	150,357	150,357	150,357
TOTAL	3,060,831	3,060,831	3,060,831	3,060,831	3,060,831

N.A. - Fixed wing data is not broken into categories shown due to non-availability of information.

Artisans work on multiple TMSs and are not bound to fixed work positions. Commodity groups are only available as fixed wing, R/W and VSTOL.

R

NOTE: Product engineering direct labor workload is not included in capacity index, utilization index, maximum potential capacity, or programmed workload in accordance with Department of Defense guidelines.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 25 JUL 1994

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
OTHER	1,273,428	1,273,428	1,273,428	1,273,428	1,273,428
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
AIRCRAFT	150,357	150,357	150,357	150,357	150,357
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	3,060,831	3,060,831	3,060,831	3,060,831	3,060,831

N.A. - Fixed wing data is not broken into categories shown due to non-availability of information.

Artisans work on multiple TMSs and are not bound to fixed work positions. Commodity groups are only available as fixed wing, R/W and VSTOL.

NOTE: Product engineering direct labor workload is not included in capacity index, utilization index, maximum potential capacity, or programmed workload in accordance with Department of Defense guidelines.

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

1.2 Calculate the utilization index for the commodity groups applicable to depot maintenance work at your activity. Provide your answers expressed as a percentage (%) in Table 1.2.a by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 1.2.a: **Utilization Index** **R**

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX %				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING					
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	99	100	100	100	100
(4) Admin/Training	100	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL) *	98	99	99	98	98
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	97	99	100	95	99
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other *	99	99	99	99	98
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	80	97	98	98	97
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100	92	88
d. INSTRUMENTS	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100
e. LANDING GEAR	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	89	91	85	82	94
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	97	96	96	97	94
h. APUs	0	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	75	99	95	97	93
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
a. AIRCRAFT	98	98	97	97	97

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Rein

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

1.2 Calculate the utilization index for the commodity groups applicable to depot maintenance work at your activity. Provide your answers expressed as a percentage (%) in Table 1.2.a by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 1.2.a: **Utilization Index** **R**

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX %				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING					
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	99	100	100	100	100
(4) Admin/Training	100	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL) *	98	99	99	98	98
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	97	99	100	95	99
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other *	99	99	99	99	98
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	80	97	98	98	97
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	97	88	88	92	88
d. INSTRUMENTS	89	93	81	89	80
e. LANDING GEAR	98	89	93	94	93
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	89	91	85	82	94
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	97	96	96	97	94
h. APUs	0	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	75	99	95	97	93
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
a. AIRCRAFT	98	98	97	97	97

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

 REV - 7 OCT 1994

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

1.2 Calculate the utilization index for the commodity groups applicable to depot maintenance work at your activity. Provide your answers expressed as a percentage (%) in Table 1.2.a by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 1.2.a: **Utilization Index** **R**

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (%)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING	99	139	145	139	133
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	0	0	0	0	0
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER (SUB-TOTAL) **	81	118	113	111	105
P-3 (All TMS) *	78	122	113	111	105
Emerg. Repair & Mods *					
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	76	169	212	103	147
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	114	135	124	70	87
INSTRUMENTS	109	100	52	46	42
LANDING GEAR	222	148	231	264	212
AVIATION ORDNANCE	62	197	125	55	105
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	98	140	126	141	127
APUs	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	112	104	102	104	102

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

 REV - 15 SEPT 1994

Revised pg

1.2 Calculate the utilization index for the commodity groups applicable to depot maintenance work at your activity. Provide your answers expressed as a percentage (%) in Table 1.2.a by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 1.2.a: **Utilization Index** **R**

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (%)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING	99	139	145	139	133
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	0	0	0	0	0
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	100	118	115	103	119
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	32	59	91	67	64
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	110	136	124	96	87
INSTRUMENTS	109	100	52	46	42
LANDING GEAR	198	186	231	233	210
AVIATION ORDNANCE	96	197	125	108	105
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	96	141	123	121	124
APUs	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	112	104	103	104	102
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
AIRCRAFT	100	114	100	75	88

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 25 JUL 1994

1. Capacity Utilization, continued

1.2 Calculate the utilization index for the commodity groups applicable to depot maintenance work at your activity. Provide your answers expressed as a percentage (%) in Table 1.2.a by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 1.2.a: **Utilization Index**

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (%)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING	99	139	145	139	133
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	0	0	0	0	0
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	100	118	115	103	119
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	32	59	91	67	64
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	110	136	124	96	87
INSTRUMENTS	109	100	52	46	42
LANDING GEAR	198	186	231	233	210
AVIATION ORDNANCE	96	197	125	108	105
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	96	141	123	121	124
APUs	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	112	104	103	104	102
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX %				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS					
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	77	100	(R) 98	(R) 100	(R) 100
14. OTHER	100	100	86	95	94
15. MANUFACTURING	(R) 100	98	(R) 95	(R) 96	(R) 96
16. FLEET SUPPORT					
a. Product Support (Engineering)	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 91
b. Voyage Repair	(R) 97	(R) 91	(R) 91	(R) 91	(R) 91
c. Customer Service	93	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100	(R) 100
d. BRAC Transition	100	(R) 100	(R) 96	0	0
TOTAL	(R) 98	(R) 99	(R) 98	(R) 98	(R) 95

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal Other (Sub-Total).

*** TOTALS WILL NOT EQUAL 100%.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX %				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS					
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	77	100	94	98	84
14. OTHER	100	100	86	95	94
15. MANUFACTURING	95	98	94	79	92
16. FLEET SUPPORT					
a. Product Support (Engineering)	93	86	87	96	84
b. Voyage Repair	93	94	79	93	93
c. Customer Service	93	91	89	95	95
d. BRAC Transition	100	96	88	0	0
TOTAL	95	94	92	94	91

*** P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal Other (Sub-Total).**

***** TOTALS WILL NOT EQUAL 100%.**

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (%)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
AIRCRAFT	100	114	100	75	88
SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
TANK	0	0	0	0	0
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT					
CALIBRATION TYPE I	0	0	0	0	0
TMDE	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0	0	0
*** OVERALL UTILIZATION	103	119	118	113	113

R

* P-3, Emergency Repair & Mods will not equal Other Sub-Total for utilization index because the sub-total also includes other miscellaneous categories.

R

** Due to the nature of indices, they cannot be summed or averaged but are calculated individually from workload and work positions.

N/A - Fixed wing data is not broken into categories shown due to non-availability of information.

Artisans work on multiple TMSs and are not bound to fixed work positions. Commodity groups are only available as fixed wing, R/W and VSTOL.

*** TOTALS WILL NOT EQUAL 100%.

NOTE: Product engineering direct labor workload is not included in capacity index, utilization index, maximum potential capacity, or programmed workload in accordance with Department of Defense guidelines.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (%)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
*** OVERALL UTILIZATION	103	119	118	114	113

N/A - Fixed wing data is not broken into categories shown due to non-availability of information.

Artisans work on multiple TMSs and are not bound to fixed work positions. Commodity groups are only available as fixed wing, R/W and VSTOL.

***** TOTALS WILL NOT EQUAL 100%.**

R

NOTE: Product engineering direct labor workload is not included in capacity index, utilization index, maximum potential capacity, or programmed workload in accordance with Department of Defense guidelines.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 25 JUL 1994

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (%)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT	100	114	100	75	88
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
*** OVERALL UTILIZATION	103	119	118	114	113

N/A - Fixed wing data is not broken into categories shown due to non-availability of information.

Artisans work on multiple TMSs and are not bound to fixed work positions. Commodity groups are only available as fixed wing, R/W and VSTOL.

***** TOTALS WILL NOT EQUAL 100%.**

NOTE: Product engineering direct labor workload is not included in capacity index, utilization index, maximum potential capacity, or programmed workload in accordance with Department of Defense guidelines.

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total workload remains as assigned; (b) that sufficient production demand is available to justify maximum hiring, with no significant investment in capital equipment; and (c) no major Military Construction additional to that already approved and funded: what is the maximum extent to which operations, by commodity group, could be expanded for depot maintenance work at your activity, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of direct labor hours (DLHs).

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Capacity** **R**

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLMHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING					
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	651,712	1,246,562	1,068,340	1,031,254	986,437
(4) Admin/Training	86,954	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)	1,201,712	1,245,255	1,256,795	1,249,308	1,156,739
(1) P-3 (All TMS)	720,376	772,614	786,227	719,120	654,626
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other	481,336	472,641	470,568	530,188	502,113
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	186,447	186,107	185,977	185,983	185,983
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137
d. INSTRUMENTS	21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302
e. LANDING GEAR	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	82,470	80,216	79,468	79,091	79,091
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	465,938	496,500	506,829	508,626	509,454
h. APUs	0	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Rev 7

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total workload remains as assigned; (b) that sufficient production demand is available to justify maximum hiring, with no significant investment in capital equipment; and (c) no major Military Construction additional to that already approved and funded: what is the maximum extent to which operations, by commodity group, could be expanded for depot maintenance work at your activity, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of direct labor hours (DLHs).

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Capacity** **R**

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLMHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING					
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	651,712	1,246,562	1,068,340	1,031,254	986,437
(4) Admin/Training	86,954	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)	1,201,712	1,245,255	1,256,795	1,249,308	1,156,739
(1) P-3 (All TMS)	720,376	772,614	786,227	719,120	654,626
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other	481,336	472,641	470,568	530,188	502,113
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	321,447	321,107	320,977	320,983	320,983
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	31,346	37,400	34,246	29,137	29,137
d. INSTRUMENTS	21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302
e. LANDING GEAR	37,351	24,987	38,951	44,554	35,719
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	82,470	80,216	79,468	79,091	79,091
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	324,941	467,373	478,363	476,869	476,622
h. APUs	0	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

 REV - 7 OCT 1994

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total workload remains as assigned; (b) that sufficient production demand is available to justify maximum hiring, with no significant investment in capital equipment; and (c) no major Military Construction additional to that already approved and funded: what is the maximum extent to which operations, by commodity group, could be expanded for depot maintenance work at your activity, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of direct labor hours (DLHs).

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Capacity** R

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING	1,459,042	2,019,176	1,854,567	1,750,374	1,641,063
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	0	0	0	0	0
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	481,336	472,641	470,568	530,188	502,113
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	321,447	321,107	320,977	320,983	320,983
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137
INSTRUMENTS	21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302
LANDING GEAR	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232
AVIATION ORDNANCE	82,470	80,216	79,468	79,091	79,091
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	635,141	665,703	676,032	677,829	678,657
APUs	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	1,393,139	1,397,062	1,405,745	1,434,071	1,426,645

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

1. Capacity Utilization, continued

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total workload remains as assigned; (b) that sufficient production demand is available to justify maximum hiring, with no significant investment in capital equipment; and (c) no major Military Construction additional to that already approved and funded: what is the maximum extent to which operations, by commodity group, could be expanded for depot maintenance work at your activity, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of direct labor hours (DLHs).

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Capacity**

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING	1,391,802	2,731,981	2,567,872	2,395,939	2,353,868
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	0	0	0	0	0
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	481,336	472,641	470,568	530,188	502,113
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	186,932	186,592	186,462	186,468	186,468
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137
INSTRUMENTS	19,930	17,143	8,788	6,549	4,691
LANDING GEAR	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232
AVIATION ORDNANCE	82,470	80,216	79,468	79,091	79,091
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	636,952	706,870	715,999	718,766	720,624
APUs	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	1,482,024	1,345,028	1,340,110	1,371,434	1,371,434

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLMHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
i. OTHER **	230,792	214,639	240,216	241,032	239,108
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
a. AIRCRAFT	1,120,959	1,319,034	1,259,911	1,210,675	1,209,076
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS					
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	90,990	112,578	87,218	90,209	92,133
14. OTHER	127,175	168,300	219,568	243,466	243,536
15. MANUFACTURING	509,896	501,930	529,811	557,692	557,692
16. FLEET SUPPORT					
a. Product Support (Engineering)	1,235,300	1,417,200	1,545,000	1,698,800	1,698,800
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	14,583	22,549	22,549	22,549	22,549
d. BRAC Transition	171,269	131,439	55,762	0	0
TOTAL	6,367,007	7,331,332	7,236,912	7,296,884	7,157,969

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 14 OCT 1994

Cert

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLMHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
i. OTHER **	230,792	214,639	240,216	241,032	239,108
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
a. AIRCRAFT	985,756	1,183,831	1,124,708	1,075,472	1,073,873
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS					
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	90,990	118,470	87,218	92,820	104,680
14. OTHER	176,246	205,000	270,368	294,266	294,336
15. MANUFACTURING	519,775	501,930	529,811	557,692	557,692
16. FLEET SUPPORT					
a. Product Support (Engineering)	1,210,820	1,380,500	1,494,200	1,648,000	1,648,000
b. Voyage Repair	126,683	134,649	134,649	134,649	134,649
c. Customer Service	10,600	13,109	12,441	12,627	12,601
d. BRAC Transition	255,671	136,350	55,762	0	0
TOTAL	6,367,007	7,331,332	7,236,912	7,296,884	7,157,969

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 7 OCT 1994

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
AIRCRAFT	715,522	928,604	878,587	800,849	806,746
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
TANK	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	5,156,207	5,950,832	5,742,712	5,648,884	5,509,969

N/A - Fixed wing data is not broken into categories shown due to non-availability of information.

NOTE: Product engineering direct labor workload is not included in capacity index, utilization index, maximum potential capacity, or programmed workload in accordance with Department of Defense guidelines.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
AIRCRAFT	715,522	928,604	878,587	800,849	806,746
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
TANK	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	5,043,337	6,515,444	6,294,223	6,135,653	6,071,404

N/A - Fixed wing data is not broken into categories shown due to non-availability of information.

R

NOTE: Product engineering direct labor workload is not included in capacity index, utilization index, maximum potential capacity, or programmed workload in accordance with Department of Defense guidelines.

REV - 25 JUL 1994

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

COMMODITY GROUP	INDEX (DLHs)				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
AIRCRAFT	715,522	928,604	878,587	800,849	806,746
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
TANK	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	5,043,337	6,515,444	6,294,223	6,135,653	6,071,404

N/A - Fixed wing data is not broken into categories shown due to non-availability of information.

NOTE: Product engineering direct labor workload is not included in capacity index, utilization index, maximum potential capacity, or programmed workload in accordance with Department of Defense guidelines.

CAPACITY

2. Plant Replacement Value

2.1 What is the estimated Plant Replacement Value (PRV) as of the end of each Fiscal Year of your depot maintenance activity expressed in thousands of dollars ($K) as a function of the facilities and equipment? Provide your answer in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: **Expenditures and Equipment Values**

PRV	$ K				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Facilities	316,000	348,200	358,600	369,400	380,500
Equipments	318,975	355,061	365,713	376,684	387,986
TOTAL	634,975	703,261	724,313	746,084	768,486

CAPACITY

3. Programmed Workload

3.1 Given the current configuration and operation of your activity, provide the programmed depot level workload by commodity group in Tables 3.1.a and 3.1.b. Express your answer in both dollars ($K) and direct labor hours (DLH) for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 3.1.a: **Programmed Workload** R

COMMODITY GROUP	$ K				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING					
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	25,478	59,555	59,012	62,203	59,965
(4) Admin/Training	7,081	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)	63,950	74,817	83,582	76,189	80,803
(1) P-3 (All TMS)	29,686	33,327	32,253	30,850	30,463
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Others	34,264	41,490	51,328	45,339	50,339
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	7,119	16,391	21,154	10,585	15,599
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	8,374	10,281	9,697	5,648	7,199
d. INSTRUMENTS	5,808	5,485	2,944	2,663	2,494
e. LANDING GEAR	10,026	6,869	11,029	12,994	10,730
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	3,553	11,616	7,580	3,434	6,775
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	29,872	29,976	32,870	39,902	29,613
h. APUs	0	0	0	0	0

Rev 7

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	$ K				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
i OTHER	11,909	16,489	21,085	18,166	20,314
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
a. AIRCRAFT	139,508	155,601	147,074	141,174	144,611
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS					
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	3,029	9,092	6,781	7,557	8,778
14. OTHER	11,676	11,355	14,678	17,366	17,848
15. MANUFACTURING	48,626	48,819	51,204	55,874	57,525
16. FLEET SUPPORT					
a. Product Support (Engineering)	83,341	97,775	109,003	123,824	115,971
b. Voyage Repair	9,638	9,918	10,215	10,522	10,837
c. Customer Service	518	1,059	1,035	1,081	1,112
d. BRAC Transition	20,083	11,021	4,467	0	0
TOTAL	489,589	576,119	593,410	589,182	590,174

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

~~13R~~ 12a

REV - 7 OCT 1994

Revised pg

CAPACITY

3. Programmed Workload

3.1 Given the current configuration and operation of your activity, provide the programmed depot level workload by commodity group in Tables 3.1.a and 3.1.b. Express your answer in both dollars ($K) and direct labor hours (DLH) for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 3.1.a: **Programmed Workload** R

COMMODITY GROUP	$ K				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING	62,245	92,882	91,266	93,053	90,428
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	0	0	0	0	0
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	42,386	51,340	61,174	53,921	60,601
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	71	23	23
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	7,119	16,391	21,154	10,585	15,599
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	8,374	10,281	9,697	5,648	7,199
INSTRUMENTS	5,808	5,485	2,944	2,663	2,494
LANDING GEAR	10,026	6,869	11,029	12,994	10,730
AVIATION ORDNANCE	3,553	11,616	7,580	3,434	6,775
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	34,439	40,650	41,281	49,138	40,121
APUs	2	21	51	1	1
OTHER	179,819	181,792	184,111	193,296	190,828
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
AIRCRAFT	60,613	70,909	63,977	49,269	59,761
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
TANK	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	414,384	488,236	494,335	474,025	484,560

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

CAPACITY

3. Programmed Workload

3.1 Given the current configuration and operation of your activity, provide the programmed depot level workload by commodity group in Tables 3.1.a and 3.1.b. Express your answer in both dollars ($K) and direct labor hours (DLH) for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 3.1.a: **Programmed Workload**

COMMODITY GROUP	$ K				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING	62,245	92,882	91,266	93,053	90,428
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	0	0	0	0	0
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	42,386	51,340	61,174	55,784	62,520
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	71	23	23
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	7,119	16,391	21,154	10,585	15,599
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	8,374	10,281	9,697	5,648	7,199
INSTRUMENTS	5,808	5,485	2,944	2,663	2,494
LANDING GEAR	10,026	6,869	11,029	12,994	10,730
AVIATION ORDNANCE	3,553	11,616	7,580	3,434	6,775
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	34,439	40,650	41,281	49,138	40,121
APUs	2	21	51	1	1
OTHER	179,819	181,792	184,111	193,296	190,821
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
AIRCRAFT	60,613	70,909	63,977	49,269	59,761
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
TANK	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	414,384	488,236	494,335	475,888	486,472

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 3.1.b: **Programmed Workload** **R**

COMMODITY GROUP	DLMHs				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING					
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	312,878	710,752	683,762	699,735	654,918
(4) Admin/Training	86,954	0	0	0	0
OTHER (SUB-TOTAL) *	885,079	1,010,452	1,082,526	953,618	994,574
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	364,564	397,742	373,712	347,043	332,711
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	520,515	612,710	708,814	606,575	661,863
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	26,648	59,625	74,712	36,296	51,929
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	31,346	37,400	34,246	19,365	23,966
d. INSTRUMENTS	21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302
e. LANDING GEAR	37,531	24,987	38,951	44,554	35,719
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	13,300	42,254	26,771	11,774	22,554
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	111,817	109,043	116,090	136,820	98,583
h. APUs	0	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER **	69,121	97,608	127,353	118,013	126,719
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
a. AIRCRAFT	445,774	479,136	443,312	427,159	414,392
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS					
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

~~14~~ R

REV - 7 OCT 1994

13

Revised pg

Table 3.1.b: **Programmed Workload** R

COMMODITY GROUP	DLMHs				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING	764,396	1,108,494	1,057,474	1,046,778	987,629
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	0	0	0	0	0
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	520,515	612,710	708,814	606,575	661,863
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	250	78	78
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	26,648	59,625	74,712	36,296	51,929
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	31,346	37,400	34,246	19,365	23,966
INSTRUMENTS	21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302
LANDING GEAR	37,531	24,987	38,951	44,554	35,719
AVIATION ORDNANCE	13,300	42,254	26,771	11,774	22,554
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	172,431	247,513	221,871	249,640	223,263
APUs	6	75	181	4	4
OTHER	1,425,418	1,323,234	1,303,398	1,324,115	1,299,406
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
AIRCRAFT	150,453	171,049	149,833	112,025	131,924
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
TANK	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	3,163,785	3,647,295	3,626,900	3,460,334	3,446,637

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R - 27 JUNE 1994

Table 3.1.b: **Programmed Workload**

COMMODITY GROUP	DLMHs				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:					
ROTARY	0	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED WING	764,396	1,108,494	1,057,474	1,046,778	987,629
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	0	0	0	0	0
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	520,515	612,710	708,814	627,533	682,821
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS					
DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	250	78	78
AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	26,648	59,625	74,712	36,296	51,929
HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	31,346	37,400	34,246	19,365	23,966
INSTRUMENTS	21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302
LANDING GEAR	37,531	24,987	38,951	44,554	35,719
AVIATION ORDNANCE	13,300	42,254	26,771	11,774	22,554
AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	172,431	247,513	221,871	249,640	223,263
APUs	6	75	181	4	4
OTHER	1,425,418	1,323,234	1,303,398	1,324,115	1,299,336
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)					
AIRCRAFT	150,453	171,049	149,833	112,025	131,924
BLADES/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0	0
SHIP	0	0	0	0	0
TANK	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	3,163,785	3,647,295	3,626,900	3,481,292	3,467,525

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

COMMODITY GROUP	DLMHs				
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	40,614	118,470	85,781	92,820	104,680
14. OTHER	176,246	173,360	212,560	238,774	238,404
15. MANUFACTURING	519,775	492,096	501,638	536,950	536,595
16. FLEET SUPPORT					
a. Product Support (Engineering)	1,210,820	1,380,493	1,494,191	1,647,926	1,498,453
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	6,590	13,108	12,442	12,626	12,602
d. BRAC Transition	255,671	136,350	53,657	0	0
TOTAL	4,374,605	5,027,788	5,121,091	5,108,260	4,945,090

* P-3, Emergency Repair & Mods equal Other Sub-Total.

**** Components Other includes Support Equipment Non-Avionics Programmed Workload as follows:**

FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
28,571	44,642	66,666	66,666	71,428

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

~~15~~ **R** **REV - 7 OCT 1994**

13a

CAPACITY

4. Service Centers of Excellence

4.1 If your activity has been designated as a Service Center of Excellence for any of the commodity groups, please identify them below.

NADEP Jacksonville has been designated as the Center of Excellence for the following commodity groups. All workload for these commodity groups will be single-sited at NADEP JAX.

Electro-Optics
Electronic Warfare
Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) Avionics
Bomb Racks and Launchers
Aerial Refueling Stores and Drop Tanks

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL SUPPLEMENT
FOR
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP - DEPOT MAINTENANCE

MEASURES OF MERIT

Geographic

1. Location

1.1 Specify any special strategic importance or military value consideration of your activity accruing from its geographical location.

Activity	Location	Description of Strategic Importance/Military Value

The Naval Aviation Depot Jacksonville is located on Naval Air Station Jacksonville next to the St. Johns River just 30 miles from Naval Station Mayport and the Atlantic Ocean. We are only 15 miles from NAS Cecil Field and centrally located between Jacksonville International Airport, Aero Corporation and Grumman St. Augustine. This location has military and strategic importance to any war time scenario. If the need to off-load damaged aircraft from carriers, move large quantities of aviation components via air, sea and land or integrate with aviation industrial facilities to accommodate the large surge capacity beyond what the Navy's Industrial Strategy allows for arises, NADEP Jacksonville is the hub for these types of war time missions.

As the only large industrial complex in the region, NADEP Jacksonville has been selected to lead the Southeast Regional Maintenance Group into the future. We expect that in the near future we will become the "hub" integrating "I" and "D" level maintenance for the entire region, with sailors and civilians working side-by-side.

NADEP Jacksonville has been designated by NAVAIR as the East Coast TACAIR depot. This designation means that NADEP Jacksonville will be the depot repair point for all tactical aircraft for in service repair, crash damage, and modifications.

As the largest industrial employer in Northeast Florida and Southeast Georgia, we are the "Employer of Choice." An example of the one of the many benefits of being located in this area, over 50% of our workforce are veterans, with aviation experience.

Geographic, continued

2. Environmental Compliance

Answers to the following questions need to reflect the particular workloads or processes affected by the environmental restrictions/compliance.

2.1 Is your activity in full compliance with all Federal, state, and local environmental regulations? If not in full compliance, provide a comprehensive list of individual regulations that require actions to be taken. What compliance waivers have been granted? When must the activity come into compliance?

Type	Regulation	Waiver (Date Expires)	Date Must be in Compliance
Underground Storage Tanks	RCRA (40 CFR 280) Alternate Procedures Agreement)	31 Dec. 2000	31 Dec. 2000

2.2 Has any actual or programmed work at this installation been restricted or delayed because of environmental considerations, such as air or water quality? If so, provide the details of the impact of the restrictions or delays.

Programmed Work	Restriction/Delay	Describe Impact

NONE

Geographic, continued

3. Environmental Restrictions

Answers to the following questions need to reflect the particular workloads or processes affected by the environmental restrictions/compliance.

3.1 Are there any special programs relating to environmental or industrial waste considerations for your activity? If so, provide the details.

Special Program	Environmental/Industrial Waste	Describe
NONE		

3.2 Within what provisions must the activity operate with regard to disposal of hazardous wastes and radioactive materials?

Type	Provisions	Describe
Hazwaste	RCRA	Florida Administrative code 17-730 is essentially the same as 40 CFR 260-269 for hazardous waste management.

Revised pg

4. Other Collocated Activities

4.1 Are there any collocated activities that directly benefit or relate to the depot maintenance activity? If yes, list and describe the impact of each. Include benefits derived from being collocated.

Collocated Activity	Benefit/Relationship Describe Impact
Public Works Center	NADEP Contributes: 33.6% of PWC Containerized Waste Revenue 54.5% of PWC Guard Service Revenue 12.9% of PWC Utilities Revenue 15.1% of PWC Base Support Revenue 3.3% of PWC Refuse Revenue 6.6% of PWC Administration Revenue 33.6% of PWC Elevator Maintenance Revenue 33.7% of Water Treatment Revenue 1.9% of Transportation Revenue 100% of Industrial Waste Revenue 53% of Custodial Revenue
Naval Air Station	NADEP Contributes: R 88% of Station Security Revenue 29% of Fuel Farm Revenue 61% of Resource Management Revenue 13% of Air Operations Revenue Aircraft Maintenance/Modification, Logistics and Engineering support for assigned fleet activities.
NPPSO	NADEP Contributes: 30% of Printing Revenue
NCTS	NADEP Contributes: 7.37% of Communications Revenue 55.91% of ADP Support Revenue
FISC	NADEP Contributes: 91% of Packing Revenue
HRO	NADEP Contributes: 45% of Personnel Support Revenue

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

REV - 21 JUL 1994

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

R

DESCRIBE IMPACT: Collocations enables intangible benefits to Fleet activities such as; face-to-face customer service, reduced logistics/repair/response time, use of common equipment/facilities for training/aircraft repairs which eliminates redundant capabilities and financial efficiency from no cost associated with per diem, material transportation where added and Fleet activity are not in the same geographical location.

Geographic, continued

4. Other Collocated Activities

4.1 Are there any collocated activities that directly benefit or relate to the depot maintenance activity? If yes, list and describe the impact of each. Include benefits derived from being collocated.

Collocated Activity	Benefit/Relationship Describe Impact
Public Works Center	NADEP Contributes: 33.6% of PWC Containerized Waste Revenue 54.5% of PWC Guard Service Revenue 12.9% of PWC Utilities Revenue 15.1% of PWC Base Support Revenue 3.3% of PWC Refuse Revenue 6.6% of PWC Administration Revenue 33.6% of PWC Elevator Maintenance Revenue 33.7% of Water Treatment Revenue 1.9% of Transportation Revenue 100% of Industrial Waste Revenue 53% of Custodial Revenue
Naval Air Station	NADEP Contributes: 88% of Station Security Revenue 29% of Fuel Farm Revenue 61% of Resource Management Revenue 13% of Air Operations Revenue
NPPSO	NADEP Contributes: 30% of Printing Revenue
NCTS	NADEP Contributes: 7.37% of Communications Revenue 55.91% of ADP Support Revenue
FISC	NADEP Contributes: 91% of Packing Revenue
HRO	NADEP Contributes: 45% of Personnel Support Revenue

Revised pg

4.2 Do collocated activities support, or are they supported by, the depot maintenance activity?

Collocated Activity

Naval Air Station and assigned Fleet activities **R**
Public Works Center
FISC
Human Relations Office
Navy Publications and Printing Service Office
NCTS

Describe Relationship **R**

The other collocated support activities are supported by each other. They each need the other in order to provide all that is needed for Fleet Readiness so that Fleet/Depot activities can perform primary duties. Rapid response for emergency depot level aircraft maintenance/modification, logistics and engineering support for assigned Fleet activities.

4.2 Do collocated activities support, or are they supported by, the depot maintenance activity?

Collocated Activity

Naval Air Station
Public Works Center
FISC
Human Relations Office
Navy Publications and Printing Service Office
NCTS

Describe Relationship

The collocated activities support and are supported by each other. They each need the other in order to provide all that is needed for Fleet Readiness.

Revised pg

4.3 How would these activities and the depot maintenance activity function if they were not collocated?

Collocated Activity **R**

Naval Air Station and assigned activities
Public Works Center
FISC
Human Relations Office
Navy Publications and Printing Service Office
NCTS

Describe Impact if not Collocated **R**

Collocations: Diminishes depot support response time, additional material/personnel transport costs for field team service, minimizes schedule delays all of which adversely affect mission readiness. The relationship between the collocated activities is mutually beneficial. They each need the other in order to provide all that is needed for Fleet Readiness.

Geographic, continued

4. Other Collocated Activities, continued

4.3 How would these activities and the depot maintenance activity function if they were not collocated?

Collocated Activity	Describe Impact if not Collocated
Naval Air Station	
Public Works Center	
FISC	
Human Relations Office	
Navy Publications and Printing Service Office	
NCTS	

Describe Relationship

The relationship between the collocated activities is mutually beneficial. They each need the other in order to provide all that is needed for Fleet Readiness.

Revised pg

5. Encroachment

5.1 Have operations at this activity been at all constrained to accommodate requests of the local communities?

Type of Encroachment	Operation Impacted	Describe	R

NONE

5.2 Indicate any encroachment constraints on current or future operations that would restrict future expansion.

Type of Encroachment	Constraint on Expansion	Describe	R

NONE

Geographic, continued

5. Encroachment

5.1 Have operations at this activity been at all constrained to accommodate requests of the local communities?

Type of Encroachment	Operation Impacted	Describe

The only encroachment issues that has affected our operation is Noise. This restriction has not constrained our operations because of two specialized facilities. The "Hush House" which allows us to test our fighter aircraft at full military power (after burners). We also have a fully automated engine test facility that allows us to test all type of engines in and projected to be in the Naval aviation inventory at full power while being able to have a normal conversation next to the facility. The only reason that noise has affected our operations that we can not "test at will" we have to schedule.

5.2 Indicate any encroachment constraints on current or future operations that would restrict future expansion.

Type of Encroachment	Constraint on Expansion	Describe

As discussed in 5.1.

Fuel Accessories	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives
Main Fuel Control	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives
Lube and Scavenge Pump	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives
Hush House	Aircraft run-up for noise abatement
Paint Facilities 7 Bays	Paint a/c meets state/local air pollution requirements
Real-Time X-Ray Radiography	Unique among Materials Engineering Facilities in DOD
KRATOS Model	Computer controlled ultra high vacuum
Thermo Jarrell Ash ICAP 61	Simultaneous plasma emission spectrometer
Instron Model 1128 Materials TS	High capacity mechanical testing of material samples and aerospace components.
Wastewater Treatment Plants 1, 2 & 3	Closed loop facilities for aircraft and engine programs.
Electro-Optics	AAS-33/36/37/38 repair largest E-O repair depot in support of the Navy complete with 7 laser-safe rooms, 1 clean room, confidential facility, 25 million dollars of unique equipment to test AAS-33/36/37/38 FLIR. **Applicable Aircraft:** F/A-18, OV-10, P-3, S-3, A-6E **Equipment:** Vacuum Bake T/S (2 ea.) Proof Pressure T/S FLIR Subassembly Alignment & Bond T/S FLIR/Laser Boresight T/S (2 ea.) LRD Transmitter Alignment T/S Scan Mikrror Run-In T/S Laser Purge and Fill T/S

Common Laser Test Con (CLTC)
Optical Test/Eval Station
Cryogenics T/S
Gimbal Components T/S
Afocal/Heat Exchanger T/S
Automatic Video Tracker T/S
AN/AAM-74 Interface T/S
Window Tester
ARU T/S
Nitrogen (TSP) Lead T/S
Cold Trap T/S
Helium Leak T/S
TSP Unit and Subassy T/S
Compressor & Cryo Piston T/S
LRD Boresight & Focus T/S
PFS Alignment T/S
PAS Tester
38 autocollimator
Linear Vibration T/S
Stabilization T/S FAC Receiver Unit T/S
Scanner T/S
Emitter T/S
Camera T/S
Primary Test Console (PTC)
Laser Electronic T/S
Laser T/S
Optics Stabilizer T/S
Electro-Optics T/S (EOTS)
AN/AAM-73 Detector T/S
AN/AAM-75 Laser Boresite Bay

Electronic Warfare Repair

Only EW repair depot in support of the Navy, Secret facility, unique equipment to test ALR-67 and ALQ-126A, ALQ-126B, ALQ-162, ALE-29, ALE-39, ALE-37, ALQ-142, ALQ-76C, ALQ-78, ALH-6, ALQ-100, ALQ-108, ALQ-157, ALQ-167, ALQ-55, ALQ-86C, ALQ-99, ALR-45, ALR-66 countermeasures equipment. Unique equipment is required.

Equipment:

AN/USM-630
Upper Deck P.S. w/fill stand
Lower Deck P.S. w/fill stand

	Power Supply Fill Sta (PFSF) EW Power Supply T/S (EWPS) STE-A UP/DATE RF/ UP/DATE Microwave T/S RF Console ALQ-76 WRA Tester ALQ-76 SRA Tester Processor SRA Tester Processor WRA Tester ALQ-78 WRA Tester ALQ-78 SRA Tester
Flat cable manufacturing	Only depot automated manufacturing system with specifically designed equipment, ventilation, and haz mat containment
APQ-126/158 testing/repair	Only ranges designed for this application
A-7 avionics testing/repair	Unique equipment used to test/repair A-7 avionics **Equipment:** AN/USM-479 (IMU) IBM-6003500 (shop test equip) AN/ASM-403 (ASN-91) AN/AVM-11 (HUD) T/S 3455A (HUD SRA's) AN/AWM-55 (ASCU) AN/ASM-398 (map display)
AntiSubmarine Warfare	Only ASW test/repair depot in support of the FLEET. Systems include ALQ-158, AQA-74A(V), AQH-4, AQH-7, AQS-13, ARR-72, ARR-76, ARR-78, ARS-2, ARS-3, ASA-76, ASQ-10A, ASQ-81, USQ-78, UYS-1, OA-8962/ASH. **Equipment includes:** ARR-76 T/S ARS-2 T/S ARS-4 T/S SMARTS T/S (2 ea.) OQ-112/AQM-18 one bay T/S two bay T/S Power Supply T/S (2 ea.)

F-14 A/B mockup	One of a kind system, includes most F-14 avionics
F-14 D mockup	One of a kind system, includes most F-14 avionics
F-14 Radome Range	Only depot radome range supporting the FLEET
F404 Engine Control Unit	**Equipment:** ECU T/S ECU environ chamber
Flat cable manufacturing	Equipment System: 3 each automated etching machines w/photo table and laminator

Facilities and Equipage, continued

10. Administrative Space

10.1 What amount in square feet of administrative space could be made available to the depot maintenance function?

Current Use	Square Feet	Potential Use (Be Specific)
NONE		

11. Industrial Waste

11.1 Are there any inhibiting factors that would limit future expansion on the base? Provide the details if applicable.

Inhibiting Factor

Naval Aviation Depot Jacksonville (NADEP JAX) is extremely proud that we have postured ourselves to be isolated from future NPDES permit modifications. In order to eliminate industrial hazardous waste (HW) discharges originating in the NADEP JAX complex from the NAS Jacksonville domestic waste water treatment plant and hence to the St. Johns River, Military Construction projects were established for three HW sources to remove and/or recover contaminants at the source and reuse or recycle the recovered resources to the greatest extent possible. When the last of the three projects are completed (scheduled by the end of FY-94) all our discharge from electroplating and metal cleaning waste streams, chemical (wet) paint stripping and metal finishing, and painting waste will be closed-loop. These Treatment Plants will result in a cost avoidance of over $300,000 and the recycling achieved will save over 37 million gallons of fresh water per year.

MEASURES OF MERIT

Workload and Capabilities

Answers to the following questions are to reflect programmed amounts by commodity group, by activity in direct labor hours by Fiscal Year for FY 1996 through FY 1999.

12. Core Capabilities (DoD)

12.1 What is the amount of core capability required to support your own Service? Provide your answers in Table 12.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.1.a: **Service Required Core** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	410,448	395,509	401,461	356,644
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	352,844	487,269	423,731	465,486
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	234,464	368,889	305,351	347,106
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
d. INSTRUMENTS	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
e. LANDING GEAR	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	98,991	92,300	113,030	74,793

MEASURES OF MERIT

Workload and Capabilities

Answers to the following questions are to reflect programmed amounts by commodity group, by activity in direct labor hours by Fiscal Year for FY 1996 through FY 1999.

12. Core Capabilities (DoD)

12.1 What is the amount of core capability required to support your own Service? Provide your answers in Table 12.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.1.a: **Service Required Core** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	410,448	395,509	401,461	356,644
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	352,844	487,269	423,731	465,486
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	234,464	368,889	305,351	347,106
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
d. INSTRUMENTS	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
e. LANDING GEAR	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	98,991	92,300	113,030	74,793

MEASURES OF MERIT

Workload and Capabilities

Answers to the following questions are to reflect programmed amounts by commodity group, by activity in direct labor hours by Fiscal Year for FY 1996 through FY 1999.

12. Core Capabilities (DoD)

12.1 What is the amount of core capability required to support your own Service? Provide your answers in Table 12.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.1.a: **Service Required Core** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	410,448	395,509	401,461	356,644
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	352,844	487,269	423,731	465,486
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	234,464	368,889	305,351	347,106
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
d. INSTRUMENTS	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
e. LANDING GEAR	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	98,991	92,300	113,030	74,793

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

MEASURES OF MERIT

Workload and Capabilities

Answers to the following questions are to reflect programmed amounts by commodity group, by activity in direct labor hours by Fiscal Year for FY 1996 through FY 1999.

12. Core Capabilities (DoD)

12.1 What is the amount of core capability required to support your own Service? Provide your answers in Table 12.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.1.a: **Service Required Core** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512
F-14A	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
EMERG REPAIR	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	236	78	78
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	6	6	4	4
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
Instrument	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
Landing Gear	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
Aviation Ordnance Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronics	98,991	92,300	113,030	74,793
Bearings	0	310	527	454
Other	31,240	34,311	21,168	25,183
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised pg

MEASURES OF MERIT

Workload and Capabilities

Answers to the following questions are to reflect programmed amounts by commodity group, by activity in direct labor hours by Fiscal Year for FY 1996 through FY 1999.

12. Core Capabilities (DoD)

12.1 What is the amount of core capability required to support your own Service? Provide your answers in Table 12.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.1.a: **Service Required Core** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512
F-14A	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
EMERG REPAIR	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	236	78	78
Engine Components	156,895	145,161	166,816	134,150
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	6	6	4	4
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
Instrument	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
Landing Gear	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
Aviation Ordnance Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronics	98,991	92,300	113,030	74,793
Bearings	0	310	527	454
Other	31,240	34,311	21,168	25,183
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				

MEASURES OF MERIT

Workload and Capabilities

Answers to the following questions are to reflect programmed amounts by commodity group, by activity in direct labor hours by Fiscal Year for FY 1996 through FY 1999.

12. Core Capabilities (DoD)

12.1 What is the amount of core capability required to support your own Service? Provide your answers in Table 12.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.1.a: **Service Required Core**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512
F-14A	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
EMERG REPAIR	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	155,271	143,537	165,192	132,526
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	6	6	4	4
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	31,564	29,508	14,627	19,228
Instrument	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
Landing Gear	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
Aviation Ordnance Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronics	92,315	85,315	85,624	106,354
Bearings	0	310	527	454
Other	28,510	30,811	17,668	21,683
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65386
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	R 66,949	R 83,579	79,309	88,038
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	248,420	244,756	244,526	226,260
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
14. OTHER	87,756	111,791	135,696	136,140
15. MANUFACTURING	446,275	459,064	483,605	483,964
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	R 330,303	610,281	673,443	733,359
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	7,743	7,291	7,828	7,855
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	R 2,440,674	2,857,587	2,873,653	2,916,774

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	67,044	83,559	79,309	88,038
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	248,420	244,756	244,526	226,260
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
14. OTHER	87,756	111,791	135,696	136,140
15. MANUFACTURING	446,275	459,064	483,605	483,964
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	7,743	7,291	7,828	7,855
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,440,668	2,857,567	2,873,653	2,916,774

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	66,943	83,559	79,309	88,038
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	248,420	244,756	244,526	226,260
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
14. OTHER	87,756	111,791	135,696	136,140
15. MANUFACTURING	446,275	459,064	483,605	483,964
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	330,303	610,281	673,443	733,359
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	7,743	7,291	7,828	7,855
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,440,668	2,857,567	2,873,653	2,916,774

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F400GE400A	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733
F404GE400C	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024
F400GE400F	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177
F400GE400H	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544
F400GE400L	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444
F400GE400S	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544
J52P408	1,516	0	756	0
J52P408A	20,396	35,920	22,236	35,200
TF34GE400B	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348
Engine Field Mod Teams	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946
Engine Components	156,895	145,161	166,816	134,150
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	30,642	52,666	52,666	57,428
Product Support	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	172,931	209,001	260,953	261,808
MANUFACTURING:	374,005	365,195	371,042	371,042
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	83,711	109,674	85,942	127,697
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,440,674	2,857,587	2,873,653	2,916,774

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised pg

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F400GE	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150
F400GE400A	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733
F404GE400C	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024
F400GE400F	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177
F400GE400H	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544
F400GE400L	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444
F400GE400S	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544
J52P408	1,516	0	756	0
J52P408A	20,396	35,920	22,236	35,200
TF34GE400B	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348
Engine Field Mod Teams	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	30,642	52,666	52,666	57,428
Product Support	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	172,931	209,001	260,953	261,808
MANUFACTURING:	374,005	365,195	371,042	371,042
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	83,711	109,674	85,942	127,697
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,440,674	2,857,587	2,873,653	2,916,774

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F400GE400A	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733
F404GE400C	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024
F400GE400F	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177
F400GE400H	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544
F400GE400L	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444
F400GE400S	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544
J52P408	1,516	0	756	0
J52P408A	20,396	35,920	22,236	35,200
TF34GE400B	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348
Engine Field Mod Teams	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	30,642	52,666	52,666	57,428
Product Support	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	172,931	209,001	260,953	261,808
MANUFACTURING:	374,005	365,195	371,042	371,042
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,344,963	2,734,598	2,754,133	2,814,466

R

12.2 What is the amount of capability retained for the performance of other Services core? Provide your answers in Table 12.2.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.2.a: **Core Capability Retained for Other Services** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	0	0	0	0
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)	0	0	0	0
(1) P-3 (All TMS)	0	0	0	0
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other	0	0	0	0
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	0	0	0	0
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	0	0	0	0
d. INSTRUMENTS	184	984	984	984
e. LANDING GEAR	0	0	0	0
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	0	0	0	0
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	6,384	20,989	20,989	20,989
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	3,230	9,435	9,435	9,435
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				

K

12.2 What is the amount of capability retained for the performance of other Services core? Provide your answers in Table 12.2.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.2.a: **Core Capability Retained for Other Services** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	0	0	0	0
F-14A	0	0	0	0
P-3C	0	0	0	0
EMERG REPAIR	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic / Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	184	984	984	984
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	0	0	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	6,384	20,989	20,989	20,989
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	3,230	9,435	9,435	9,435
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	0	0	0	0
F400GE400A	0	0	0	0
F400GE400C	0	0	0	0
F400GE400F	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised pg

12.2 What is the amount of capability retained for the performance of other Services core? Provide your answers in Table 12.2.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.2.a: **Core Capability Retained for Other Services** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	0	0	0	0
F-14A	0	0	0	0
P-3C	0	0	0	0
EMERG REPAIR	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	135,000	144,368	144,368	144,368
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic / Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	184	984	984	984
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	0	0	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	6,384	20,989	20,989	20,989
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	3,230	9,435	9,435	9,435
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	0	0	0	0
F400GE400A	0	0	0	0
F400GE400C	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Workload and Capabilities, continued

12. Core Capabilities (DoD), continued

12.2 What is the amount of capability retained for the performance of other Services core? Provide your answers in Table 12.2.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.2.a: **Core Capability Retained for Other Services**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	0	0	0	0
F-14A	0	0	0	0
P-3C	0	0	0	0
EMERG REPAIR	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	0	0	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic / Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	0	0	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	0	0	0	0
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	0	0	0	0
F400GE400A	0	0	0	0
F400GE400C	0	0	0	0
F400GE400F	0	0	0	0

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
a. AIRCRAFT	135,000	144,368	144,368	144,368
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	0	0	0	0
14. OTHER	0	0	0	0
15. MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	0	0	0	0
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	0	0	0	0
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	144,798	175,776	175,776	175,776

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

~~50~~ R
47

REV - 17 OCT 1994

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F400GE400H	0	0	0	0
F400GE400L	0	0	0	0
F400GE400S	0	0	0	0
J52P408	0	0	0	0
J52P408A	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	0	0	0
ENGINE FIELD MOD TEAMS	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	135,000	144,368	144,368	144,368
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	144,798	175,776	175,776	175,776

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Rev 1 fg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F400GE400F	0	0	0	0
F400GE400H	0	0	0	0
F400GE400L	0	0	0	0
F400GE400S	0	0	0	0
J52P408	0	0	0	0
J52P408A	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	0	0	0
ENGINE FIELD MOD TEAMS	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	144,798	175,776	175,776	175,776

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R - 27 JUNE 1994

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F400GE400H	0	0	0	0
F400GE400L	0	0	0	0
F400GE400S	0	0	0	0
J52P408	0	0	0	0
J52P408A	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	0	0	0
ENGINE FIELD MOD TEAMS	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	0	0	0	0

R

12.3 What portion of the Service Core capability identified in the 12.1a above is identified as Service-Controlled Core (Title 10 responsibility)? Provide your answer in Table 12.3.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.3.a: Service-Controlled Core (Title 10) R

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	410,448	395,509	401,461	356,644
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	352,844	487,269	423,731	465,486
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	234,464	368,889	305,351	347,106
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	32,534	30,478	15,997	20,198
d. INSTRUMENTS	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
e. LANDING GEAR	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	98,991	92,300	113,030	74,793
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	(R) 66,949	(R) 83,579	79,309	88,038

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Rev

12.3 What portion of the Service Core capability identified in the 12.1a above is identified as Service-Controlled Core (Title 10 responsibility)? Provide your answer in Table 12.3.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.3.a: **Service-Controlled Core (Title 10)** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	410,448	395,509	401,461	356,644
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	352,844	487,269	423,731	465,486
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	234,464	368,889	305,351	347,106
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
d. INSTRUMENTS	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
e. LANDING GEAR	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	98,991	92,300	113,030	74,793
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	66,943	83,559	79,309	88,038

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

12.3 What portion of the Service Core capability identified in the 12.1a above is identified as Service-Controlled Core (Title 10 responsibility)? Provide your answer in Table 12.3.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.3.a: **Service-Controlled Core (Title 10)** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512
F-14A	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
EMERG REPAIR	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	236	78	78
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	6	6	4	4
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
Instrument	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
Landing Gear	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
Aviation Ordnance Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronics	98,991	92,300	113,030	74,793
Bearings	0	310	527	454
Other	31,240	34,311	21,168	25,183
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150
F400GE400A	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733
F404GE400C	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised PG

12.3 What portion of the Service Core capability identified in the 12.1a above is identified as Service-Controlled Core (Title 10 responsibility)? Provide your answer in Table 12.3.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.3.a: **Service-Controlled Core (Title 10)** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512
F-14A	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
EMERG REPAIR	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	236	78	78
Engine Components	156,895	145,161	166,816	134,150
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	6	6	4	4
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
Instrument	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
Landing Gear	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
Aviation Ordnance Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronics	98,991	92,300	113,030	74,793
Bearings	0	310	527	454
Other	31,240	34,311	21,168	25,183
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150
F400GE400A	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Workload and Capabilities, continued

12. Core Capabilities (DoD), continued

12.3 What portion of the Service Core capability identified in the 12.1a above is identified as Service-Controlled Core (Title 10 responsibility)? Provide your answer in Table 12.3.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 12.3.a: **Service-Controlled Core (Title 10)**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512
F-14A	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
EMERG REPAIR	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	155,271	143,537	165,192	132,526
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	6	6	4	4
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	31,564	29,508	14,627	19,228
Instrument	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
Landing Gear	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
Aviation Ordnance Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronics	92,315	85,315	85,624	106,354
Bearings	0	310	527	454
Other	28,510	30,811	17,668	21,683
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150
F400GE400A	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733
F404GE400C	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	248,420	244,756	244,526	226,260
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
14. OTHER	87,756	111,791	135,696	136,140
15. MANUFACTURING	446,275	459,064	483,605	483,964
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	330,303	610,281	673,443	733,359
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	7,743	7,291	7,828	7,855
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	R 2,440,674	2,857,587	2,873,653	2,916,774

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	248,420	244,756	244,526	226,260
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
14. OTHER	87,756	111,791	135,696	136,140
15. MANUFACTURING	446,275	459,064	483,605	483,964
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	330,303	610,281	673,443	733,359
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	7,743	7,291	7,828	7,855
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,440,668	2,857,567	2,873,653	2,916,774

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F400GE400F	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177
F400GE400H	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544
F400GE400L	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444
F400GE400S	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544
J52P408	1,516	0	756	0
J52P408A	20,396	35,920	22,236	35,200
TF34GE400B	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348
Engine Field Mod Teams	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946
Engine Components	156,895	145,161	166,815	134,150
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	30,642	52,666	52,666	57,428
Product Support	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	172,931	209,001	260,953	261,808
MANUFACTURING:	374,005	365,195	371,042	371,042
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	83,711	109,674	85,942	127,697
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,440,674	2,857,587	2,873,652	2,916,774

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F404GE400C	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024
F400GE400F	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177
F400GE400H	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544
F400GE400L	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444
F400GE400S	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544
J52P408	1,516	0	756	0
J52P408A	20,396	35,920	22,236	35,200
TF34GE400B	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348
Engine Field Mod Teams	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	30,642	52,666	52,666	57,428
Product Support	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	172,931	209,001	260,953	261,808
MANUFACTURING:	374,005	365,195	371,042	371,042
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	83,711	109,674	85,942	127,697
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,440,674	2,857,587	2,873,653	2,916,774

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R - 27 JUNE 1994

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F400GE400F	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177
F400GE400H	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544
F400GE400L	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444
F400GE400S	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544
J52P408	1,516	0	756	0
J52P408A	20,396	35,920	22,236	35,200
TF34GE400B	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348
Engine Field Mod Teams	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	30,642	52,666	52,666	57,428
Product Support	390,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	172,931	209,001	260,953	261,808
MANUFACTURING:	374,005	365,195	371,042	371,042
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,344,963	2,734,598	2,754,133	2,814,466

R

13. Core Workloads

13.1 What are your total Core Workloads to be applied against capabilities identified in Tables 12.1a and 12.2a)? Provide your answer (DLH) in Table 13.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Year requested.

Table 13.1a **Total Core Workloads** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	410,448	395,509	401,461	356,644
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	352,844	487,269	423,731	465,486
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	234,464	368,889	305,351	347,106
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
d. INSTRUMENTS	16,744	7,362	6,503	5,675
e. LANDING GEAR	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	105,375	113,289	134,019	95,782
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	(R) 70,179	(R) 93,014	(R) 88,744	(R) 97,473

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	383,420	389,124	388,894	370,628
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
14. OTHER	87,756	111,791	135,696	136,140
15. MANUFACTURING	446,275	459,064	483,605	483,964
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	(R) 330,303	610,281	673,443	733,359
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	7,743	7,291	7,828	7,855
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	(R) 2,585,472	(R) 3,033,363	(R) 3,049,429	(R) 3,092,550

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Rev

13. Core Workloads

13.1 What are your total Core Workloads to be applied against capabilities identified in Tables 12.1a and 12.2a)? Provide your answer (DLH) in Table 13.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Year requested.

Table 13.1a **Total Core Workloads** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	410,448	395,509	401,461	356,644
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	352,844	487,269	423,731	465,486
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	234,464	368,889	305,351	347,106
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
d. INSTRUMENTS	16,744	7,362	6,503	5,675
e. LANDING GEAR	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	105,375	113,289	134,019	95,782
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	70,274	86,789	82,539	91,268

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

13. Core Workloads

13.1 What are your total Core Workloads to be applied against capabilities identified in Tables 12.1a and 12.2a)? Provide your answer (DLH) in Table 13.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Year requested.

Table 13.1a **Total Core Workloads** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512
F-14A	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
EMERG REPAIR	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	236	78	78
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	6	6	4	4
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
Instrument	16,744	7,362	6,503	5,675
Landing Gear	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
Aviation Ordnance Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronics	105,375	113,289	134,019	95,782
Bearings	0	310	527	454
Other	34,470	43,746	30,602	34,618
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150
F400GE400A	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733
F404GE400C	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

13. Core Workloads

13.1 What are your total Core Workloads to be applied against capabilities identified in Tables 12.1a and 12.2a)? Provide your answer (DLH) in Table 13.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Year requested.

Table 13.1a **Total Core Workloads** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	410,448	395,509	401,461	356,644
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	352,844	487,269	423,731	465,486
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	234,464	368,889	305,351	347,106
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
d. INSTRUMENTS	16,744	7,362	6,503	5,675
e. LANDING GEAR	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	105,375	113,289	134,019	95,782
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	70,173	86,789	82,539	91,268

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised pg

13. Core Workloads

13.1 What are your total Core Workloads to be applied against capabilities identified in Tables 12.1a and 12.2a)? Provide your answer (DLH) in Table 13.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Year requested.

Table 13.1a **Total Core Workloads** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512
F-14A	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
EMERG REPAIR	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	236	78	78
Engine Components	291,895	289,529	311,184	278,518
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	6	6	4	4
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198
Instrument	16,744	7,362	6,503	5,675
Landing Gear	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
Aviation Ordnance/Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronics	105,375	113,289	134,019	95,782
Bearings	0	310	527	454
Other	34,470	43,746	30,602	34,618
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150
F400GE400A	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Workload and Capacities, continued

13. Core Workloads

13.1 What are your total Core Workloads to be applied against capabilities identified in Tables 12.1a and 12.2a)? Provide your answer (DLH) in Table 13.1.a by commodity group for the Fiscal Year requested.

Table 13.1a **Total Core Workloads**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EA-6B	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512
F-14A	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
EMERG REPAIR	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	155,271	143,537	165,192	132,526
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	6	6	4	4
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	31,564	29,508	14,627	19,228
Instrument	16,560	6,378	5,519	4,691
Landing Gear	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549
Aviation Ordnance Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronics	92,315	85,315	85,624	106,354
Bearings	0	310	527	454
Other	28,510	30,811	17,668	21,683
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F400GE	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150
F400GE400A	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733
F404GE400C	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	383,420	389,124	388,894	370,628
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
14. OTHER	87,756	111,791	135,696	136,140
15. MANUFACTURING	446,275	459,064	483,605	483,964
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	7,743	7,291	7,828	7,855
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,585,466	3,027,138	3,043,224	3,086,345

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	383,420	389,124	388,894	370,628
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
14. OTHER	87,756	111,791	135,696	136,140
15. MANUFACTURING	446,275	459,064	483,605	483,964
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	330,303	610,281	673,443	733,359
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	7,743	7,291	7,828	7,855
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,585,466	3,027,138	3,043,224	3,086,345

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F400GE400F	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177
F400GE400H	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544
F400GE400L	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444
F400GE400S	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544
J52P408	1,516	0	756	0
J52P408A	20,396	35,920	22,236	35,200
TF34GE400B	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348
Engine Field Mod Teams	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946
Engine Components	291,895	289,529	311,184	278,518
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	30,642	52,666	52,666	57,428
Product Support	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	172,931	209,001	260,953	261,808
MANUFACTURING:	374,005	365,195	371,042	371,042
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	83,711	109,674	85,942	127,697
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,585,472	3,033,363	3,049,428	3,092,550

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F404GE400C	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024
F400GE400F	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177
F400GE400H	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544
F400GE400L	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444
F400GE400S	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544
J52P408	1,516	0	756	0
J52P408A	20,396	35,920	22,236	35,200
TF34GE400B	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348
Engine Field Mod Teams	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	30,642	52,666	52,666	57,428
Product Support	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	172,931	209,001	260,953	261,808
MANUFACTURING:	374,005	365,195	371,042	371,042
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	83,711	109,674	85,942	127,697
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,585,472	3,033,363	3,049,428	3,092,550

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R - 27 JUNE 1994

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F400GE400F	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177
F400GE400H	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544
F400GE400L	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444
F400GE400S	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544
J52P408	1,516	0	756	0
J52P408A	20,396	35,920	22,236	35,200
TF34GE400B	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348
Engine Field Mod Teams	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	30,642	52,666	52,666	57,428
Product Support	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	172,931	209,001	260,953	261,808
MANUFACTURING:	374,005	365,195	371,042	371,042
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,344,963	2,734,598	2,754,133	2,814,466

Rev.

14. Other Workloads (Above Core)

14.1 What above core workloads do you perform by these source categories? Use the most appropriate category, but do not duplicate workload on more than one table. Provide answers in Tables 14.1.a through 14.1.g by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 14.1.a: **FMS Above Core Workload** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	92,715	18,543	0	0
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	48,000	48,000	0	0
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	48,000	48,000	0	0
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	0	0	0	0
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	0	0	0	0
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	3,768	3,768	3,768	3,768
d. INSTRUMENTS	2,627	2,627	2,627	2,627
e. LANDING GEAR	170	170	170	170
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	1,116	1,116	1,116	1,116
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	2,801	2,801	2,801	2,801

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

14. Other Workloads (Above Core)

14.1 What above core workloads do you perform by these source categories? Use the most appropriate category, but do not duplicate workload on more than one table. Provide answers in Tables 14.1.a through 14.1.g by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 14.1.a: **FMS Above Core Workload** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
A-7E	92,715	18,543	0	0
P-3	48,000	48,000	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components				
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	3,768	3,768	3,768	3,768
Instrument	2,627	2,627	2,627	2,627
Landing Gear	170	170	170	170
Aviation Ordnance Equip	1,116	1,116	1,116	1,116
Avionics/Electronics	2,801	2,801	2,801	2,801
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	6,452	8,452	8,452	8,452
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F404GE400	0	0	0	0
F404GE400A	0	0	0	0
F404GE400C	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Workload and Capabilities, continued

14. Other Workloads (Above Core)

14.1 What above core workloads do you perform by these source categories? Use the most appropriate category, but do not duplicate workload on more than one table. Provide answers in Tables 14.1.a through 14.1.g by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 14.1.a: **FMS Above Core Workload**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
A-7E	92,715	18,543	0	0
P-3	48,000	48,000	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components				
Engine Components	3,950	3,950	3,950	3,950
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	3,768	3,768	3,768	3,768
Instrument	2,627	2,627	2,627	2,627
Landing Gear	170	170	170	170
Aviation Ordnance Equip	1,116	1,116	1,116	1,116
Avionics/Electronics	2,801	2,801	2,801	2,801
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	6,452	8,452	8,452	8,452
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F404GE400	0	0	0	0
F404GE400A	0	0	0	0
F404GE400C	0	0	0	0
F404GE400F	0	0	0	0
F404GE400H	0	0	0	0

Ct v

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	6,452	8,452	8,452	8,452
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	3,950	3,950	3,950	3,950
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	0	0	0	0
14. OTHER	2,400	2,300	2,337	2,337
15. MANUFACTURING	9,000	12,000	13,500	13,500
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	0	0	0	0
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	0	0	0	0
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	172,999	103,727	38,721	38,721

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F404GE400F	0	0	0	0
F404GE400H	0	0	0	0
F404GE400L	0	0	0	0
F404GE400S	0	0	0	0
J52P408	0	0	0	0
J52P408A	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	0	0	0
ENGINE FIELD MOD TEAM	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	3,950	3,950	3,950	3,950
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	9,000	12,000	13,500	13,500
MANUFACTURING:	2,400	2,300	2,337	2,337
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	172,999	103,727	38,721	38,721

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
F404GE400L	0	0	0	0
F404GE400S	0	0	0	0
J52P408	0	0	0	0
J52P408A	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	0	0	0
ENGINE FIELD MOD TEAM	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	9,000	12,000	13,500	13,500
MANUFACTURING:	2,400	2,300	2,337	2,337
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	172,999	103,727	38,721	38,721

Workload and Capabilities, continued

14. Other Workloads (Above Core), continued

Table 14.1.b: **Interservice Above Core Workload**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:	NOT APPLICABLE			
Calibration Type I				
Calibration Types II & III				
Support Equip TMDE				
Support Equip Non-Avionics				
Product Support				
Customer Service				
Field Teams				
Voyage Repairs				
Software - Tactical				
Software - Support Equip				
Other				
MANUFACTURING:				
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:				
FLEET TRAINING:				
Total:				

Table 14.1.c: **Other Agency Above Core Workload**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:	NOT APPLICABLE			
Calibration Type I				
Calibration Types II & III				
Support Equip TMDE				
Support Equip Non-Avionics				
Product Support				
Customer Service				
Field Teams				
Voyage Repairs				
Software - Tactical				
Software - Support Equip				
Other				
MANUFACTURING:				
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:				
FLEET TRAINING:				
Total:				

Cen.

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 14.1.d: **Last Source of Repair Workload** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	0	0	0	0
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)	0	0	0	0
(1) P-3 (All TMS)	0	0	0	0
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other	0	0	0	0
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	0	0	0	0
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	0	0	0	0
d. INSTRUMENTS	0	0	0	0
e. LANDING GEAR	0	0	0	0
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	0	0	0	0
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	0	0	0	0
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	0	0	0	0
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Table 14.1.d: **Last Source of Repair Workload** R

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
NONE	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	0	0	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	0	0	0	0
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
Engine Components	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	16,950	16,950	16,950	16,950
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Workload and Capabilities, continued

14. Other Workloads (Above Core), continued

Table 14.1.d: **Last Source of Repair Workload**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
NONE	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	0	0	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	0	0	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	0	0	0	0
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
NONE	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	16,950	16,950	16,950	16,950
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	16,950	16,950	16,950	16,950
14. OTHER	8,000	8,501	9,600	9,600
15. MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	0	0	0	0
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	0	0	0	0
d. BRAC Transition	136,350	53,657	0	0
Total:	161,300	79,108	26,550	26,550

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	144,350	62,158	9,600	9,600
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	161,300	79,108	26,550	26,550

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	144,350	62,158	9,600	9,600
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	161,300	79,108	26,550	26,550

R

Table 14.1.e: **Within Service Above Core Workload** R

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
P-3C	177,570	167,705	147,975	187,435
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	0	0	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	0	0	0	0
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F404GE400	0	0	0	0
F404GE400A	0	0	0	0
F404GE400C	0	0	0	0
F404GE400F	0	0	0	0
F404GE400H	0	0	0	0
F404GE400L	0	0	0	0
F404GE400S	0	0	0	0
J52P408	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Workload and Capabilities, continued

14. Other Workloads (Above Core), continued

Table 14.1.e: **Within Service Above Core Workload**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
P-3C	177,570	167,705	147,975	187,435
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	0	0	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	0	0	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	0	0	0	0
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
F404GE400	0	0	0	0
F404GE400A	0	0	0	0
F404GE400C	0	0	0	0
F404GE400F	0	0	0	0
F404GE400H	0	0	0	0
F404GE400L	0	0	0	0
F404GE400S	0	0	0	0
J52P408	0	0	0	0

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
J52P408A	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	0	0	0
ENGINE FIELD MOD TEAM	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	177,570	167,705	147,975	187,435

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
J52P408A	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	0	0	0
ENGINE FIELD MOD TEAM	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	177,570	167,705	147,975	187,435

R

Table 14.1.f: **Low Quantity Above Core Workload** R

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	207,589	269,710	298,274	298,274
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	97,192	83,027	124,088	70,296
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	53,792	39,627	80,688	26,896
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	43,400	43,400	43,400	43,400
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	3,695	853	0	0
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	1,098	0	0	0
d. INSTRUMENTS	583	410	0	0
e. LANDING GEAR	416	0	0	0
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	3,838	935	0	0
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	867	0	0	0
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	(R) 20,977	(R) 25,887	(R) 20,817	(R) 20,794
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	91,766	50,238	34,315	39,814
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Table 14.1.f: **Low Quantity Above Core Workload** R

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	207,589	269,710	298,274	298,274
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	97,192	83,027	124,088	70,296
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	53,792	39,627	80,688	26,896
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	43,400	43,400	43,400	43,400
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	3,695	853	0	0
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	1,098	0	0	0
d. INSTRUMENTS	583	410	0	0
e. LANDING GEAR	416	0	0	0
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	3,838	935	0	0
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	867	0	0	0
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	20,983	32,112	27,022	26,999
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	91,766	50,238	34,315	39,814
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	0	0	0	0
14. OTHER	(R) 75,203	(R) 89,968	(R) 91,141	(R) 90,327
15. MANUFACTURING	36,821	30,575	39,845	39,131
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	0	0	0	0
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	5,366	5,150	4,798	4,747
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	(R) 545,411	(R) 556,753	(R) 613,278	(R) 563,383

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Table 14.1.f: **Low Quantity Above Core Workload** R

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EP-3E	26,896	13,448	26,896	13,448
F-14A	38,530	19,265	140,186	100,664
F-14B	134,855	154,120	59,283	138,327
F-14D	19,265	96,325	98,805	59,283
EA-6B	14,939	0	0	0
EP-3A	0	0	13,448	0
EP-3B	0	12,731	0	0
EP-3J	13,448	0	13,448	0
RP-3A	0	0	13,448	13,448
UP-3A	13,448	13,448	13,448	0
EMERG REPAIR	43,400	43,400	43,400	43,400
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	14	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	69	175	0	0
Aircraft Structural	3,695	853	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	1,098	0	0	0
Instrument	584	410	0	0
Landing Gear	417	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	3,838	935	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	868	0	0	0
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	3,705	83	0	27
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Workload and Capabilities, continued

14. Other Workloads (Above Core), continued

Table 14.1.f: **Low Quantity Above Core Workload**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
EP-3E	26,896	13,448	26,896	13,448
F-14A	38,530	19,265	140,186	100,664
F-14B	134,855	154,120	59,283	138,327
F-14D	19,265	96,325	98,805	59,283
EA-6B	14,939	0	0	0
EP-3A	0	0	13,448	0
EP-3B	0	12,731	0	0
EP-3J	13,448	0	13,448	0
RP-3A	0	0	13,448	13,448
UP-3A	13,448	13,448	13,448	0
EMERG REPAIR	43,400	43,400	43,400	43,400
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	14	0	0
Engine Components	12,242	0	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	69	175	0	0
Aircraft Structural	3,695	853	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	1,098	0	0	0
Instrument	584	410	0	0
Landing Gear	417	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	3,838	935	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	868	0	0	0
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	3,705	83	0	27

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	0	0	0	0
14. OTHER	0	0	0	0
15. MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	(R) 1,050,190	833,910	974,483	765,094
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	0	0	0	0
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	(R) 1,385,036	1,130,435	1,232,307	1,036,451

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	0	0	0	0
14. OTHER	35,421	31,774	41,408	40,694
15. MANUFACTURING	36,821	30,575	39,845	39,131
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	0	0	0	0
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	5,366	5,150	4,798	4,747
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	505,635	504,784	569,750	519,955

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
J52 O/A	944	472	0	0
J52P6C	1,262	1,262	3,155	3,786
J52P8B	2,236	164	0	0
J52P8B/C	10,368	0	0	0
J52P8C	35,112	27,132	0	0
J52P408	0	1,516	0	756
J52P408A	0	996	0	996
TF34GE400B	29,602	18,696	31,160	34,276
Engine Components	12,242	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	714	943	943	943
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	86,900	100,107	105,400	103,700
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	32,878	36,258	36,258	36,328
Total:	545,313	556,753	613,278	563,382

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
J52 O/A	944	472	0	0
J52P6C	1,262	1,262	3,155	3,786
J52P8B	2,236	164	0	0
J52P8B/C	10,368	0	0	0
J52P8C	35,112	27,132	0	0
J52P408	0	1,516	0	756
J52P408A	0	996	0	996
TF34GE400B	29,602	18,696	31,160	34,276
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	714	943	943	943
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	86,900	100,107	105,400	103,700
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
FLEET TRAINING:	32,878	36,258	36,258	36,328
Total:	545,313	556,753	613,278	563,382

Rev

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 14.1.g: **All Other Workload (Above Core)** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	0	0	0	0
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	334,846	296,525	257,824	271,357
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	0	0	0	0
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	334,846	296,525	257,824	271,357
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	0	0	0	0
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	0	0	0	0
d. INSTRUMENTS	0	0	0	0
e. LANDING GEAR	0	0	0	0
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	0	0	0	0
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	0	0	0	0
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	0	0	0	0
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	0
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 14.1.g: **All Other Workload (Above Core)** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
NONE	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	0	0	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	0	0	0	0
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
Engine Components	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	1,050,291	883,910	974,483	765,094

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Workload and Capabilities, continued

14. All Other Workloads (Above Core), continued

Table 14.1.g: **All Other Workload (Above Core)**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
NONE	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Engine Components	0	0	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	0	0	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	0	0	0	0
Avionics/Electronics	0	0	0	0
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
NONE	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	1,050,291	883,910	974,483	765,094

Rev.

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	0	0	0	0
14. OTHER	0	0	0	0
15. MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	1,050,291	833,910	974,483	765,094
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	0	0	0	0
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	1,385,137	1,130,435	1,232,307	1,036,451

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	334,846	296,525	257,824	271,357
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	1,385,137	1,180,435	1,232,307	1,036,451

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	334,846	296,525	257,824	271,357
FLEET TRAINING:	0	0	0	0
Total:	1,385,137	1,180,435	1,232,307	1,036,451

Table 14.1.h: **Total Above Core Workload** R
(Sum of Tables 14.1.a through 14.1.g)

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	300,304	288,253	298,274	298,274
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	657,608	595,257	529,887	529,088
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	279,362	255,332	228,663	214,331
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	378,246	339,925	301,224	314,757
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	3,695	853	0	0
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	4,866	3,768	3,768	3,768
d. INSTRUMENTS	3,210	3,037	2,627	2,627
e. LANDING GEAR	586	170	170	170
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	4,954	2,051	1,116	1,116
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	3,668	2,801	2,801	2,801
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	27,435	40,564	35,474	35,451
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	95,716	54,188	38,265	43,764
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Table 14.1.h: **Total Above Core Workload** R
(Sum of Tables 14.1.a through 14.1.g)

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
A-7E	92,715	18,543	0	0
P-3	48,000	48,000	0	0
P-3C	177,570	167,705	147,975	187,435
EP-3E	26,896	13,448	26,896	13,448
F-14A	38,530	19,265	140,186	100,664
F-14B	134,855	154,120	59,283	138,327
F-14D	19,265	96,325	98,805	59,283
EA-6B	14,939	0	0	0
EP-3A	0	0	13,448	0
EP-3B	0	12,731	0	0
EP-3J	13,448	0	13,448	0
RP-3A	0	0	13,448	13,448
UP-3A	13,448	13,448	13,448	0
EMERG REPAIR	43,400	43,400	43,400	43,400
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	14	0	0
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	69	175	0	0
Aircraft Structural	3,695	853	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	4,866	3,768	3,768	3,768
Instrument	3,211	3,037	2,627	2,627
Landing Gear	587	170	170	170
Aviation Ordnance Equip	4,954	2,051	1,116	1,116
Avionics/Electronics	3,669	2,801	2,801	2,801
Bearings	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Workloads and Capabilities, continued

14. Other Workloads (Above Core), continued

Table 14.1.h: **Total Above Core Workload**

(Sum of Tables 14.1.a through 14.1.g)

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
A-7E	92,715	18,543	0	0
P-3	48,000	48,000	0	0
P-3C	177,570	167,705	147,975	187,435
EP-3E	26,896	13,448	26,896	13,448
F-14A	38,530	19,265	140,186	100,664
F-14B	134,855	154,120	59,283	138,327
F-14D	19,265	96,325	98,805	59,283
EA-6B	14,939	0	0	0
EP-3A	0	0	13,448	0
EP-3B	0	12,731	0	0
EP-3J	13,448	0	13,448	0
RP-3A	0	0	13,448	13,448
UP-3A	13,448	13,448	13,448	0
EMERG REPAIR	43,400	43,400	43,400	43,400
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
Dynamic Components	0	14	0	0
Engine Components	16,192	3,950	3,950	3,950
Blade/Vane (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
APU/Ground Generators	69	175	0	0
Aircraft Structural	3,695	853	0	0
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	4,866	3,768	3,768	3,768
Instrument	3,211	3,037	2,627	2,627
Landing Gear	587	170	170	170
Aviation Ordnance Equip	4,954	2,051	1,116	1,116

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 14.1.h: **Total Above Core Workload** R
(Sum of Tables 14.1.a through 14.1.g)

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	300,304	288,253	298,274	298,274
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	657,608	595,257	529,887	529,088
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	279,362	255,332	228,663	214,331
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	378,246	339,925	301,224	314,757
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	3,695	853	0	0
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	4,866	3,768	3,768	3,768
d. INSTRUMENTS	3,210	3,037	2,627	2,627
e. LANDING GEAR	586	170	170	170
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	4,954	2,051	1,116	1,116
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	3,668	2,801	2,801	2,801
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	(R) 27,429	(R) 34,339	(R) 29,269	(R) 29,246
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	95,716	54,188	38,265	43,764
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	16,950	16,950	16,950	16,950
14. OTHER	(R) 85,604	(R) 100,769	(R) 103,078	(R) 102,264
15. MANUFACTURING	45,821	42,575	53,345	52,631
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	(R) 1,050,190	883,910	974,483	765,094
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	5,366	5,150	4,798	4,747
d. BRAC Transition	136,350	53,657	0	0
Total:	(R) 2,442,316	(R) 2,087,728	(R) 2,058,831	(R) 1,852,540

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Rev

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	16,950	16,950	16,950	16,950
14. OTHER	45,821	42,575	53,345	52,631
15. MANUFACTURING	45,821	42,575	53,345	52,631
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	1,050,291	883,910	974,483	765,094
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	5,366	5,150	4,798	4,747
d. BRAC Transition	136,350	53,657	0	0
Total:	2,402,641	2,035,759	2,015,303	1,809,112

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Other	10,157	8,535	8,452	8,479
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
J52 O/A	944	472	0	0
J52P6C	1,262	1,262	3,155	3,786
J52P8B	2,236	164	0	0
J52P8B/C	10,368	0	0	0
J52P8C	35,112	27,132	0	0
J52P408	0	1,516	0	756
J52P408A	0	996	0	996
TF34GE400B	29,602	18,696	31,160	34,276
Engine Components	16,192	3,950	3,950	3,950
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	16,950	16,950	16,950	16,950
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
Product Support	1,050,291	883,910	974,483	765,094
Customer Service	714	943	943	943
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	240,250	174,265	128,500	126,800
MANUFACTURING:	2,400	2,300	2,337	2,337
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	334,846	296,525	257,824	271,357
FLEET TRAINING:	32,878	36,258	36,258	36,328
Total:	2,442,319	2,087,728	2,058,831	1,852,539

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Avionics/Electronics	3,669	2,801	2,801	2,801
Bearings	0	0	0	0
Other	10,157	8,535	8,452	8,479
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
J52 O/A	944	472	0	0
J52P6C	1,262	1,262	3,155	3,786
J52P8B	2,236	164	0	0
J52P8B/C	10,368	0	0	0
J52P8C	35,112	27,132	0	0
J52P408	0	1,516	0	756
J52P408A	0	996	0	996
TF34GE400B	29,602	18,696	31,160	34,276
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III	16,950	16,950	16,950	16,950
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0
Support Equip Non-Avionics	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
Product Support	1,050,291	883,910	974,483	765,094
Customer Service	714	943	943	943
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Other	240,250	174,265	128,500	126,800
MANUFACTURING:	2,400	2,300	2,337	2,337
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	334,846	296,525	257,824	271,357
FLEET TRAINING:	32,878	36,258	36,258	36,328
Total:	2,442,319	2,087,728	2,058,831	1,852,539

Rev

15. Unique and/or Peculiar Workloads (Refer to Question 8.1)

15.1 What amount of the workload reported in question 8.1 is Core? Provide your answer in Table 15.1 by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 15.1: **Unique and/or Peculiar Total Core Workload** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	410,448	395,509	401,461	356,644
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	269,133	377,595	337,789	337,789
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	0	0	0	0
d. INSTRUMENTS	0	0	0	0
e. LANDING GEAR	0	0	0	0
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	104,183	103,265	101,162	95,782
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	6	6	4	4
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	91,525	99,595	77,710	92,110

15. Unique and/or Peculiar Workloads (Refer to Question 8.1)

15.1 What amount of the workload reported in question 8.1 is Core? Provide your answer in Table 15.1 by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 15.1: **Unique and/or Peculiar Total Core Workload** R

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
Rotary	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0
Fixed Wing				
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	410,448	395,509	401,461	356,644
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
Other (Sub-Total)	269,133	377,595	337,789	337,789
P-3 (All TMS) *	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
Emerg Repair & Mods *	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronic	104,183	103,265	101,162	95,782
APUs	6	6	4	4
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINE (GAS TURBINE)				
Aircraft	91,525	99,595	77,710	92,110

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised fg

15. Unique and/or Peculiar Workloads (Refer to Question 8.1)

15.1 What amount of the workload reported in question 8.1 is Core? Provide your answer in Table 15.1 by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 15.1: **Unique and/or Peculiar Total Core Workload** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
Rotary	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0
Fixed Wing	679,581	773,104	739,250	694,433
Other	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instrument	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance Equip	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438
Avionics/Electronic	104,183	103,265	101,162	95,782
APUs	6	6	4	4
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINE (GAS TURBINE)				
Aircraft	91,525	99,595	77,710	92,110
Blades/Vanes (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
Ship	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Type II & III	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	0	0	0	0
14. OTHER	(R) 172,931	(R) 209,001	(R) 260,953	(R) 261,808
15. MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	0	0	0	0
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	0	0	0	0
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	(R) 1,264,156	(R) 1,406,250	(R)1,348,733	(R) 1,340,204

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	0	0	0	0
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	0	0	0	0
14. OTHER	34,470	43,746	30,602	95,782
15. MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	0	0	0	0
b. Voyage Repair	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
c. Customer Service	0	0	0	0
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	1,125,695	1,240,995	1,118,382	1,174,178

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

Recording

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	0	0	0	0
Bearings (Other Funded)	0	0	0	0
Bearings Reg	0	310	527	454
Other	34,470	43,746	30,602	95,782
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
Total:	1,125,695	1,241,305	1,118,909	1,174,632

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 28 JUL 1994

R

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Ship	0	0	0	0
Tank	0	0	0	0
Blades/Vanes (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
TMDE	0	0	0	0
OTHER	157,170	166,756	153,829	218,936
Total:	1,125,695	1,241,305	1,118,909	1,174,632

* P-3, Emergency Repair & Mods equal Other Sub-Total. R

Workload and Capabilities, continued

15. Unique and/or Peculiar Workloads (Refer to Question 8.1)

15.1 What amount of the workload reported in question 8.1 is Core? Provide your answer in Table 15.1 by commodity groups for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 15.1: **Unique and/or Peculiar Total Core Workload**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:	NOT AVAILABLE			
Calibration Type I				
Calibration Types II & III				
Support Equip TMDE				
Support Equip Non-Avionics				
Product Support				
Customer Service				
Field Teams				
Voyage Repairs				
Software - Tactical				
Software - Support Equip				
Other				
MANUFACTURING:				
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:				
FLEET TRAINING:				
Total:				

Rev

15. Unique and/or Peculiar Workloads (Refer to Question 8.1), continued

15.2 What amount of the workload reported in question 8.1 is non-Core? Provide your answer in table 15.2 by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 15.2: **Non-Core Unique and/or Peculiar Workload** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
1. AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
a. ROTARY	0	0	0	0
b. VSTOL	0	0	0	0
c. FIXED WING				
(1) Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
(2) Command and Control	0	0	0	0
(3) Light Combat	455,236	437,365	441,696	486,670
(4) Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
d. OTHER (SUB-TOTAL)*	489,280	453,265	402,881	398,577
(1) P-3 (All TMS) *	423,489	387,414	338,613	327,765
(2) Aircraft/Airframe Other*	65,791	65,851	64,268	70,812
2. AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
a. DYNAMIC COMPONENTS	0	0	0	0
b. AIRCRAFT STRUCTURES	130,142	108,123	145,955	130,501
c. HYDRAULIC/PNEUMATIC	0	0	0	0
d. INSTRUMENTS	0	0	0	0
e. LANDING GEAR	0	0	0	0
f. AVIATION ORDNANCE	50,434	63,014	77,076	66,296
g. AVIONICS/ELECTRONICS	0	0	0	5,380
h. APUs	0	0	0	0
i. OTHER	1,098	1,098	1,100	1,100
3. ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
a. AIRCRAFT	559,153	528,510	495,556	461,056

15. Unique and/or Peculiar Workloads (Refer to Question 8.1), continued

15.2 What amount of the workload reported in question 8.1 is non-Core? Provide your answer in table 15.2 by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 15.2: **Non-Core Unique and/or Peculiar Workload** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
Rotary	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0
Fixed Wing				
Transport/Tanker/Bomber	0	0	0	0
Command and Control	0	0	0	0
Light Combat	455,236	437,365	441,696	486,670
Admin/Training	0	0	0	0
Other (Sub-Total)	489,280	453,265	402,881	398,577
P-3 (All TMS) *	423,489	387,414	338,613	327,765
Emerg Repair & Mods *	65,791	65,851	64,268	70,812
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	130,142	108,123	145,955	130,501
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instruments	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance	50,434	63,014	77,076	66,296
Aviation/Electronics	0	0	0	5,380
APUs	1,098	1,098	1,100	1,100
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
Aircraft	559,153	528,510	495,556	461,056

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Revised 19

15. Unique and/or Peculiar Workloads (Refer to Question 8.1), continued

15.2 What amount of the workload reported in question 8.1 is non-Core? Provide your answer in table 15.2 by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 15.2: **Non-Core Unique and/or Peculiar Workload** **R**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
Rotary	0	0	0	0
VSTOL	0	0	0	0
Fixed Wing	944,516	890,630	844,577	885,247
Other	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS				
Dynamic Components	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural	130,142	108,123	145,955	130,501
Hydraulic/Pneumatic	0	0	0	0
Instruments	0	0	0	0
Landing Gear	0	0	0	0
Aviation Ordnance	50,434	63,014	77,076	66,296
Aviation/Electronics	0	0	0	5,380
APUs	1,098	1,098	1,100	1,100
Other	0	0	0	0
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
Aircraft	559,153	528,510	495,556	461,056
Blades/Vanes (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
Ship	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
Calibration Type I & II	0	0	0	0
Support Equip TMDE	0	0	0	0

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 28 JUL 1994

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	19,972	19,972	19,445	19,518
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	0	0	0	0
14. OTHER	(R) 177,771	(R) 157,331	(R) 105,379	(R) 104,524
15. MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	0	0	0	0
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	0	0	0	0
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	(R) 1,883,086	(R) 1,768,678	(R) 1,689,088	(R) 1,673,622

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

74 67A R

REV - 17 OCT 1994

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
b. SHIP	0	0	0	0
c. TANK	0	0	0	0
d. BLADE/VANES (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
13. SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS				
a. Bearings & Refurbishment	19,972	19,972	19,445	19,518
b. Calibration (Type I)	0	0	0	0
c. TMDE	0	0	0	0
14. OTHER	396,732	403,086	416,230	351,050
15. MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0
16. FLEET SUPPORT				
a. Product Support (Engineering)	0	0	0	0
b. Voyage Repair	0	0	0	0
c. Customer Service	0	0	0	0
d. BRAC Transition	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,102,047	2,014,433	1,999,939	1,920,148

* P-3, Aircraft/Airframe Other equal OTHER (SUB-TOTAL).

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Ship	0	0	0	0
Tank	0	0	0	0
Blades/Vanes (Type 2)	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT				
Calibration Type I	0	0	0	0
TMDE	0	0	0	0
Other	416,704	423,058	435,675	370,568
Total:	2,102,047	2,014,433	1,999,939	1,920,148

* P-3, Emergency Repair & Mods equal Other Sub-Total.

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
Support Equip Non-Avionics	0	0	0	0
Product Support	0	0	0	0
Customer Service	0	0	0	0
Field Teams	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs	0	0	0	0
Software - Tactical	0	0	0	0
Software - Support Equip	80,500	80,500	80,500	80,500
Bearings (Other Funded)	0	0	0	0
Bearings Reg.	19,972	19,972	19,445	19,518
Other	316,232	322,586	335,730	270,550
MANUFACTURING:	0	0	0	0
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:	0	0	0	0
Total:	2,102,047	2,014,433	1,999,939	1,920,148

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

REV - 28 JUL 1994

Workload and Capabilities, continued

15. Unique and/or Peculiar Workloads (Refer to Question 8.1), continued

15.2 What amount of the workload reported in question 8.1 is non-Core? Provide your answer in table 15.2 by commodity group for the Fiscal Years requested.

Table 15.2: **Non-Core Unique and/or Peculiar Workload**

Service Type	Capability (DLHs)			
	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
AIRCRAFT AIRFRAMES:				
AIRCRAFT COMPONENTS:				
ENGINES (GAS TURBINE)				
AIRCRAFT SERVICE SUPPORT:	NOT AVAILABLE			
Calibration Type I				
Calibration Types II & III				
Support Equip TMDE				
Support Equip Non-Avionics				
Product Support				
Customer Service				
Field Teams				
Voyage Repairs				
Software - Tactical				
Software - Support Equip				
Other				
MANUFACTURING:				
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS:				
FLEET TRAINING:				
Total:				

Workload and Capabilities, continued

16. Scope of Work Performed

16.1 Indicate the services/functions performed at this activity that are associated with depot maintenance, but not generally classified or considered as integral to the depot maintenance functions.

Service/Function	Description
Cognizant Field Activity	Provides in-service engineering services consisting of basic design, maintenance engineering, and/or logistics management.
	Provides engineering requirements, specifications, technical directives, technical data, and other technical services.
	Develops engineering design data for redesign, reconfiguration, and modification of power plants, components, aircraft and equipment.
	Coordinates design engineering efforts and maintenance engineering efforts of power plants, components, aircraft and equipment.
	Furnished consultant engineering services, as required. Provides acquisition support services to NAVAIR. Provides support to ensure transition of programs through each life cycle phase and to ensure that programs are supportable in the field.
	Conducts continuing engineering analysis to establish/update inspection intervals and time between overhauls. Determines specific problem areas and implements solutions.
	Monitors the logistics posture for the assigned systems, and takes necessary action to correct problems and/or deficiencies.
	Prepares and maintains Maintenance Requirement Cards (MRC'S) Prepares bulletins and changes for Navy-wide compliance.
	Performs engineering investigations (EI's) on failed components, and/or provides technical assistance to the Naval Safety Center (NAVSAFCEN) during mishap investigations.
	Identifies logistics support hardware and software required to accomplish maintenance plans, and ensures delivery of these items in accordance with site activation schedules.

Generates and maintains MIR data on all assigned repairable items such that accurate visibility of interchangeability, modification, evolution, and actual experience comparison is readily available.

Research technical manuals for accuracy and adequacy and make appropriate recommendations to NAVAIR.

Respond to technical questions from operating and maintenance personnel, and develop solutions to operating and maintenance problems.

Engineering Support

Principal point of contact for the Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR) Product Support Management Office (AIR-41P).

Plans and promotes product support technology development, centers of excellence development, and post transition workload support. Incorporates these elements into the product support capability plan.

Progressively develops and performs basic design in-service engineering functions on designated service equipment assigned by higher command.

Performs engineering and logistics support tasks for out-of-production weapon systems and equipment.

Establishes and develops local engineering and logistics support capability for the assigned weapon systems and components to provide cohesive support to the Fleet.

Advises NAVAIR in connection with engineering specifications.

Accomplishes turn key aircraft design modifications from initial customer contact through design concept to completion of project.

Program Manager Air

Responsible to the Commander, Naval Air Systems Command (via the Assistant Commander for Fleet Support and Field Activity Management (AIR-04)) for the overall program (engineering, logistics, financial, configuration, readiness, acquisition, systems safety, and Foreign Military Sales (FMS)), management of the assigned aircraft weapon systems and Electronic Warfare (TACAIR) systems and components.

Formulates and executes transition plans for the transition of weapon systems, components, subsystems, and common equipment from NAVAIR.

Logistics Management

Develops or directs the development of an effective logistics support program for assigned aviation EO, EW, and common avionics systems, and associated support equipment relative to the ten elements of logistics for all three levels of maintenance. Reviews the status of the Integrated Logistics Support (ILS) Program to identify and correct deficiencies in the established logistics support program. Recommends changes to the basic logistics management policies and procedures, and initiates action to effectively incorporate approved changes into the existing logistics support programs.

Executes, develops, or directs the development of system supporting data, logistics planning information, logistics plans, support recommendations, maintenance support system alternatives, impact statements, Integrated Logistics Support Detailed Specifications (ILSDS's) statements of work, and requests for proposals. Provides system supporting data to activity staff, program managers, weapons systems managers, program and workload planners, and headquarters and field Assistant Program Managers Logistics (APML's).

Organizes and coordinates the efforts of Integrated Logistics Support Management Teams (ILSMT's). Chairs ILSMT meetings, Logistics Element Manager (LEM) reviews, and other logistics meetings, reviews, and audits.

Reviews technical engineering recommendations and decisions pertaining to reliability, maintainability, supportability, producibility, and quality for effect on mission accomplishment and operational availability.

Reviews Engineering Change Proposals (ECP's), assesses the impact of the changes, prepares ECP cost and funding sheets, prepares ECP milestone charts, and recommends alternative solutions, approval, or disapproval based on analysis of performance, reliability, supportability, or economic improvement.

Tracks all ECP's of assigned systems from conception through approval date to final installation of the change. Coordinates staffing of proposed ECP's prior to board approval. Presents ECP's to the NAVAIR Modification Management Configuration Control Board for consideration.

Prepares ECP long range implementation plans for approved changes. Manages configuration status accounting programs. Evaluates support problems of assigned and comparable systems. Determines causes of problems, and either develops solutions or

provides directions to resolve logistics support deficiencies. Influence design changes to improve reliability, maintainability, or supportability.

Originates, provides input to, and/or reviews planning documents, such as technical data plans, operational requirements, acquisition plans, configuration management plans, Operational Safety and Improvement Program (OSIP) plans, logistics support analysis plans, logistics requirements, and funding plans, etc.

Develops and approves logistics support plans. Modifies, expands, and updates support plans to reflect significant program events or changes.

Provides logistics and maintenance guidance to fleet and other field personnel for cognizant systems. Studies failure data and support problems to determine maintenance drivers. Develops and initiates corrective actions, or recommends design changes to resolve ILS deficiencies.

Logistics Support Analysis

Conducts continuing engineering maintenance analysis to determine engine/accessory/component, reliability and maintainability. Determines specific problem areas and implements solutions.

Executes life cycle logistics process system tasks. Obtains the engineering criteria and technical justification, and publishes the maintenance plan/logistics support analysis for all three levels of maintenance. This includes the formulation of logistic considerations for scheduled and unscheduled maintenance, one-time inspections, and special repair maintenance requirements.

Identifies logistics support hardware and software required to accomplish maintenance plans, and ensures delivery of these items in accordance with site activation schedules.

Coordinates and develops the logistic inputs to ECP's, manages the development and implementation of logistics support program on approved ECP's, and ensures compliance with the change incorporation schedule and status.

Foreign Military Sales

Directs and coordinates the planning and execution of all Foreign Military Sales (FMS) cases within the Depot.

Provides Depot liaison for higher commands and customer representatives on all matters pertaining to FMS depot support services.

Reviews and monitors the progress and status of all FMS cases in the Depot.

Develops information to provide price quotes for FMS rework requirements.

Coordinates customer configuration requirements for foreign military aircraft, components, and engines.

Depot Maint Mgmt Logistics

Responsible for the development and maintenance of a strategy to validly assess NADEP Jacksonville's resources and achieve a professional competitive posture.

For all programs, integrates workload planning, develops activity master workload plan, and provides customer workload requirement coordination.

Administers the long-range planning effort which establishes goals and determines measures necessary for the effective accomplishment of future Depot advancement.

Administers the strategic planning efforts and provides progressive advice and workload alternatives to the Commanding Officer for utilization and future commitment of this command's resource capability potential.

Provides Depot maintenance and logistics services for new depot capability development programs. Investigates feasibility and capability for potential rework programs.

Explores potential plant capability for future rework programs and technical requirements.

Coordinates the allocation of production workload, and correlates workload with production capacity.

Conducts analysis for future workloads to provide management information for the decision making process.

Monitors the workload data of other Department of Defense (DOD) depots to keep abreast of new developments, workload, and associated technologies in order to project potential local workload or technology advancements.

Monitors DOD and Navy long-range projections, research, and development events/trends, and their associated maintenance technologies.

Investigates and recommends potential (long-range) workloads.

Procurement

Oversight for all material requisitioning/handling actions for all NADEP Jacksonville shops.

Establishes communication links with type commanders, NAVAIR, and Naval and Marine Corps aviation fleet operating activities served by this Depot. Establishes and maintains a method of fleet weapon system depot material readiness response that encompasses NADEP Jacksonville product assignments.

Material policy advisor and establishes local material policy directives; identifies and acts to influence NAVAIR and other agencies/activities which are responsible for enacting policies/procedures which could impact upon the material posture of this Depot.

Reviews all major procurement requests for parts/service.

Responsible for forecasting material requirements at the Aviation Supply Office (ASO) and Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) level, and determining the depth and range of material to be stocked in local Navy Industrial Fund (NIF) stores.

Provides central material management which encompasses requisition processing for standard and non-standard items, maintenance of existing on-line automated Naval Industrial Material Management System (NIMMS), analysis of material usage and trends, and receipt/storage and issuance of material.

Publications

Prepares technical manuals, changes, and/or revisions resulting from the effects of technical directives and from engineering monitoring of quality deficiency reports (QDR's), technical publications deficiency reports (TPDR's), material deficiency reports (MDR's), messages, and correspondence which affect in-production and out-of-production weapons/equipment manuals for which this command is designated cognizant field activity (CFA).

Determines manual change/revision schedules and priorities. Develops manual change/revision funding requirements, and coordinates funding approvals with Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR) and Naval Aviation Technical Services Facility (NATSF).

Develops and/or reviews and evaluates statement of work (SOW) for manual change/revision contracted to prime weapon systems contractors and/or regional documentation contractors.

Pre-negotiates and/or negotiates contractor's manual change /revision proposals and cost estimates, approves SOW, manages and monitors contractor's manual change/revision efforts.

Performs technical writing and editing in support of change/revision to manuals updated by the command. Coordinates required illustrating, art work, printing, and distribution. Performs validation/verification in accordance with NAVAIR guidelines.

Performs data management functions associated with the acquisition of technical data, development of the master sets of technical manuals to include all appropriate changes including local engineering specifications (LES's), local interim manual change releases (MCR's), user position data applicable to individual components, troubleshooting assistance on data problems, and the development of modern data storage and retrieval systems.

Manages a technical publications library control system at the command user level.

Provides a positive source of up-to-date aeronautical technical publications from the Naval Air Technical Services Facility (NATSF) via the Automated Distribution Requirement Listing (ADRL).

Specification Development

Provides engineering specifications, technical data, and materials engineering services in the fields of metallurgy chemistry, preservation, polymeric materials, and packaging procedures to support rework of aircraft and missile weapon systems assigned.

Conducts surveys and makes assessments of aircraft maintenance-related materials and process technologies. Advises the command of current technological requirements and of alternative viable courses of action needed for application of technology that is required to accomplish command workload assignments. Provides technical and scientific advice to the command in the areas of materials engineering and materials engineering-related processing and production applications. Promotes optimum application of aircraft maintenance technology for support of command objectives.

Maintains in-house data bases and establishes electronic gateways for accessing government and commercial data bases that contain materials engineering and industrial processing information that is pertinent to aircraft maintenance technology, aircraft refurbishment/restoration, non destructive and destructive

inspection and testing, structural damage tolerance assessments, and service life expectancy.

Develops requirements for contractor support.

Develops production process specifications and provides metallurgical directions to shops for heat treatment, thermal spray coatings, welding, brazing, soldering, machining, grinding, shot peening, metal forming, nondestructive inspection/evaluation, and other similar metallurgical-related processes.

Specifies nondestructive inspection/evaluation techniques, and develops required procedures for inspection/evaluation of cognizant aircraft systems and subsystems for local and fleet-wide application. Provides the Nondestructive Inspection/Testing (NDI/T) Program management for the command.

Provides physical and chemical property data on metallic materials to aircraft and power plant engineering.

Issues local engineering specifications on cognizant systems

Provides technical support to NAVAIR to effect materials and process changes relative to hazardous material minimization

Provides technical support to new weapon system acquisition Hazardous Material Minimization (HAZMIN) in environmental logistics.

Develops production process and engineering specifications in the nonmetallic materials area. Provides materials engineering directions to production shops.

Furnishes technical design information concerning packing equipment/parts for shipment to NAS JAX Supply Department.

Issues engineering instructions and maintains a technology data base on processing of aircraft bearings and assemblies containing bearings.

Laboratory Services

Performs failure analysis of bearing components.

Performs physical destructive testing on materials and aircraft components.

Performs failure analysis on failed metallic parts from aircraft, engines accessories, structures, and ground support equipment.

Performs metallurgical tests on aspects of shop processes and problems.

Determines metallic material identification, acceptability of substitutions, and conformity to specifications.

Develops new chemical processes and provides materials engineering support for the evaluation of new materials and processes.

Provides consultation and analytical services to the NADEP, NAS JAX, and other DOD facilities in the area of environmental engineering and hazardous material problems. Chemicals and materials used are continually reviewed with respect to their environmental effects, with new substitute chemicals/materials being surveyed as less hazardous or less polluting alternates. The analyses determine conformance of the materials of chemicals to specifications, identification of unknowns related to material failure, accident investigations, and problem areas. Analyses also support evaluations of new or existing materials and/or processes.

Performs NAVAIR-assigned maintenance materials engineering support duties, chemical analysis methods, environmental chemistry, hazardous materials control, printed circuit boards, chemical treatment of material surfaces, and other areas of technology.

Performs failure analysis on nonmetallic parts from aerospace systems and ground support equipment.

Provides physical and chemical property data on nonmetallic materials.

Performs physical destructive testing for evaluation of paint system, seals, adhesives, composites, and other nonmetallic materials.

Source Selection

Provide expertise and knowledge required to select sources of future procurement of aircraft, engines and components.

16.2 Describe how these services/functions are related to accomplishment of the depot maintenance mission, and the benefits of these relationships.

Service/Function	Description
Cognizant Field Activity	Provides in-service engineering services consisting of basic design, maintenance engineering, and/or logistics management. When these functions are directly provided to the artisan time and cost are saved. Develops engineering design data for redesign, reconfiguration, and modification of power plants, components, aircraft and equipment. Not only can this data be used for redesign but for improvement of all levels of maintenance. Furnished consultant engineering services, as required. Provides acquisition support services to NAVAIR. Provides support to ensure transition of programs through each life cycle phase and to ensure that programs are supportable in the field. Ensures that maintenance is a major consideration during the procurement process. Conducts continuing engineering analysis to establish/update inspection intervals and time between overhauls. Determines specific problem areas and implements solutions. Minimizes unneeded work being done and increases readiness. Prepares and maintains Maintenance Requirement Cards (MRC'S) Respond to technical questions from operating and maintenance personnel, and develop solutions to operating and maintenance problems. This is the major reason why it imperative that the engineers are collocated with the maintenance facility (DEPOT).
Engineering Support	Plans and promotes product support technology development, centers of excellence development, and post transition workload support. Incorporates these elements into the product support capability plan. "Center of Excellence" are effective because of the engineering and artisan relationship created by collocation. Establishes and develops local engineering and logistics support capability for the assigned weapon systems and components to provide cohesive support to the Fleet. Local Engineering Specifications and Temporary Engineering Instructions are able to be generated because of the close proximity of engineers and artisans.

Accomplishes turn key aircraft design modifications from initial customer contact through design concept to completion of project. These functions can only be done at the manufacturing and installation site. Usually done concurrently.

Logistics Management

Reviews technical engineering recommendations and decisions pertaining to reliability, maintainability, supportability, producibility, and quality for effect on mission accomplishment and operational availability. Merges logistics support in with maintenance requirements.

Reviews Engineering Change Proposals (ECP's), assesses the impact of the changes, prepares ECP cost and funding sheets, prepares ECP milestone charts, and recommends alternative solutions, approval, or disapproval based on analysis of performance, reliability, supportability, or economic improvement. Ensure that the logistics elements that pertain to maintenance are linked to the artisan's requirements.

Prepares ECP long range implementation plans for approved changes. Manages configuration status accounting programs. Evaluates support problems of assigned and comparable systems. Determines causes of problems, and either develops solutions or provides directions to resolve logistics support deficiencies. Influence design changes to improve reliability, maintainability, or supportability. Direct communications with the artisans identifies issues that will have a major impact on maintenance.

Provides logistics and maintenance guidance to fleet and other field personnel for cognizant systems. Studies failure data and support problems to determine maintenance drivers. Develops and initiates corrective actions, or recommends design changes to resolve ILS deficiencies.

Logistics Support Analysis

Conducts continuing engineering maintenance analysis to determine engine/accessory/component, reliability and maintainability. Determines specific problem areas and Executes life cycle logistics process system tasks. Obtains the engineering criteria and technical justification, and publishes the maintenance plan/logistics support analysis for all three levels of maintenance. This includes the formulation of logistic considerations for scheduled and unscheduled maintenance, one-time inspections, and special repair maintenance requirements. Collocation of these functions are essential, the artisans inputs and the logistics managers understanding of the actual maintenance functions save maintenance dollars and critical resources.

Foreign Military Sales	Reviews and monitors the progress and status of all FMS cases in the Depot. Develops information to provide price quotes for FMS rework requirements. Coordinates customer configuration requirements for foreign military aircraft, components, and engines. All the above function can only be done on-site and must be collocated.
Depot Maint Mgmt Logistics	Responsible for the development and maintenance of a strategy to validly assess NADEP Jacksonville's resources and achieve a professional competitive posture. For all programs, integrates workload planning, develops activity master workload plan, and provides customer workload requirement coordination. Administers the long-range planning effort which establishes goals and determines measures necessary for the effective accomplishment of future Depot advancement. Administers the strategic planning efforts and provides progressive advice and workload alternatives to the Commanding Officer for utilization and future commitment of this command's resource capability potential. Provides Depot maintenance and logistics services for new depot capability development programs. Investigates feasibility and capability for potential rework programs. Explores potential plant capability for future rework programs and technical requirements. Coordinates the allocation of production workload, and correlates workload with production capacity. Investigates and recommends potential (long-range) workloads.
Procurement	Oversight for all material requisitioning/handling actions for all NADEP Jacksonville shops. Establishes communication links with type commanders, NAVAIR, and Naval and Marine Corps aviation fleet operating activities served by this Depot. Establishes and maintains a method of fleet weapon system depot material readiness response that encompasses NADEP Jacksonville product assignments.

Material policy advisor and establishes local material policy directives; identifies and acts to influence NAVAIR and other agencies/activities which are responsible for enacting policies/procedures which could impact upon the material posture of this Depot.

Reviews all major procurement requests for parts/service.

Responsible for forecasting material requirements at the Aviation Supply Office (ASO) and Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) level, and determining the depth and range of material to be stocked in local Navy Industrial Fund (NIF) stores.

Provides central material management which encompasses requisition processing for standard and non-standard items, maintenance of existing on-line automated Naval Industrial Material Management System (NIMMS), analysis of material usage and trends, and receipt/storage and issuance of material.

Publications

Prepares technical manuals, changes, and/or revisions resulting from the effects of technical directives and from engineering monitoring of quality deficiency reports (QDR's), technical publications deficiency reports (TPDR's), material deficiency reports (MDR's), messages, and correspondence which affect in-production and out-of-production weapons/equipment manuals for which this command is designated cognizant field activity (CFA).

Pre-negotiates and/or negotiates contractor's manual change /revision proposals and cost estimates, approves SOW, manages and monitors contractor's manual change/revision efforts.

Performs technical writing and editing in support of change/revision to manuals updated by the command. Coordinates required illustrating, art work, printing, and distribution. Performs validation/verification in accordance with NAVAIR guidelines.

Performs data management functions associated with the acquisition of technical data, development of the master sets of technical manuals to include all appropriate changes including local engineering specifications (LES's), local interim manual change releases (MCR's), user position data applicable to individual components, troubleshooting assistance on data problems, and the development of modern data storage and retrieval systems.

Manages a technical publications library control system at the command user level.

Provides a positive source of up-to date aeronautical technical publications from the Naval Air Technical Services Facility (NATSF) via the Automated Distribution Requirement Listing (ADRL) to the Depot.

Specification Development

Provides engineering specifications, technical data, and materials engineering services in the fields of metallurgy chemistry, preservation, polymeric materials, and packaging procedures to support rework of aircraft and missile weapon systems assigned to the Depot.

Conducts surveys and makes assessments of aircraft maintenance-related materials and process technologies. Advises the command of current technological requirements and of alternative viable courses of action needed for application of technology that is required to accomplish command workload assignments. Provides technical and scientific advice to the command in the areas of materials engineering and materials engineering-related processing and production applications. Promotes optimum application of aircraft maintenance technology for support of command objectives.

Maintains in-house data bases and establishes electronic gateways for accessing government and commercial data bases that contain materials engineering and industrial processing information that is pertinent to aircraft maintenance technology, aircraft refurbishment/restoration, non destructive and destructive inspection and testing, structural damage tolerance assessments, and service life expectancy.

Develops requirements for contractor support.

Develops production process specifications and provides metallurgical directions to shops for heat treatment, thermal spray coatings, welding, brazing, soldering, machining, grinding, shot peening, metal forming, nondestructive inspection/evaluation, and other similar metallurgical-related processes.

Specifies nondestructive inspection/evaluation techniques, and develops required procedures for inspection/evaluation of cognizant aircraft systems and subsystems for local and fleet-wide application. Provides the Nondestructive Inspection/Testing (NDI/T) Program management for the command.

Provides physical and chemical property data on metallic materials to aircraft and power plant engineering.

Issues local engineering specifications on cognizant systems

Provides technical support to NAVAIR to effect materials and process changes relative to hazardous material minimization

Provides technical support to new weapon system acquisition Hazardous Material Minimization (HAZMIN) in environmental logistics.

Develops production process and engineering specifications in the nonmetallic materials area. Provides materials engineering directions to production shops.

Furnishes technical design information concerning packing equipment/parts for shipment to NAS JAX Supply Department.

Issues engineering instructions and maintains a technology data base on processing of aircraft bearings and assemblies containing bearings.

Laboratory Services

Performs failure analysis of bearing components.

Performs physical destructive testing on materials and aircraft components.

Performs failure analysis on failed metallic parts from aircraft, engines accessories, structures, and ground support equipment.

Performs metallurgical tests on aspects of shop processes and problems.

Determines metallic material identification, acceptability of substitutions, and conformity to specifications.

Develops new chemical processes and provides materials engineering support for the evaluation of new materials and processes.

Provides consultation and analytical services to the NADEP, NAS JAX, and other DOD facilities in the area of environmental engineering and hazardous material problems. Chemicals and materials used are continually reviewed with respect to their environmental effects, with new substitute chemicals/materials being surveyed as less hazardous or less polluting alternates. The analyses determine conformance of the materials of chemicals to specifications, identification of unknowns related to material

failure, accident investigations, and problem areas. Analyses also support evaluations of new or existing materials and/or processes.

Performs failure analysis on nonmetallic parts from aerospace systems and ground support equipment.

Provides physical and chemical property data on nonmetallic materials.

Performs physical destructive testing for evaluation of paint system, seals, adhesives, composites, and other nonmetallic materials.

Workload and Capabilities, continued

17. Interface with Customers

17.1 Indicate any special functions that the depot maintenance function performs that require close interface with customers, such as on-site workloads (e.g. technical assistance, crash/battle damage repairs, modification/upgrade installations).

Service/Function	Describe Required Interface/Relationship/Benefit
ASPAs	Site visit to squadron by aircraft P&E and E&E personnel to perform aircraft material condition inspection to extend period end date for SDLM induction as required. Beneficial to squadron in that they are allowed to maintain custody of aircraft which are in good condition.
PACE Inspections	Site visit to squadron by aircraft P&E and E&E personnel to evaluate aircraft material condition to extend period end date for MCAPP induction as required. Beneficial to squadron in that they are allowed to maintain custody of aircraft which are in good condition.
Technical Assistance	Fleet operators require comprehensive and timely technical interface to achieve operational readiness, to ensure safety is not jeopardized, and to maintain their systems economically. Assistance is provided by maintenance troubleshooting, technical data clarification, resolution of emerging technical/product problems, engineering investigations (on-site as required), determination of high usage materials, development of work-arounds for material unavailability, warranty administration, and material expediting.
Support of Drive-In Modifications (DIM) at Fleet locations.	Close interface with shop personnel is required to resolve difficulties with MOD incorporation and other damage discovered and/or self induced during the process. Timely resolution of problems allow aircraft schedules to be made.
Support of aircraft in-Service Repairs and on-site engineering and planning assistance for crash damage aircraft.	Close interface with field team personnel, Engineers and Planners/ Estimators is required to accomplish depot level repairs in the field. Timely repair of aircraft damage which exceeds capabilities of fleet (O/I) personnel is made possible without sending the aircraft to the depot.
Mishap Investigations	The Accident Boards and Navy Safety Center rely heavily upon engineering investigations to determine causal factors in the mishaps and to develop corrective actions to prevent future mishaps. Engineers from the depot are available 24 hours a day to respond to requests for assistance

to be dispatched to mishap sites throughout the world. Initial on-site investigations are typically followed up by extensive disassembly, inspections, metallurgical testing, measurements at the depot.

Technical Data

Provides the Fleet operators and maintainers with proper technical instructions and information by preparing, validating, and publishing technical manuals, by prototyping and validating new technical directives, by issuing bulletins and interim rapid action changes.

Communication

The Fleet personnel are kept aware of emerging problems and solutions, hardware changes, capability improvements, and program activity through reciprocal on-site visits, conferences, maintenance plan reviews, integrated logistics management support team meetings, vendor symposiums, maintenance engineering logistics reviews, component improvement program, workshops, systems safety working groups and industry/government technical data exchanges.

Modification and upgrades

Interface responsibility involves tailoring each work specification and Statements of Work (SOW) to the customer requirement. Certain design changes are required to allow system interface. Design review meetings are held with the customer to ensure the design meets the intent of the SOW. Program Management reviews ensure that the projects are meeting cost and schedule requirements. Technical data, engineering support, kit manufacture, and logistics elements are provided to properly field the modified hardware. The benefit of doing the work at the depot is that most of the source data and experience from previous and current CFA assignments are retained.

Hardware Development Maintenance Procedures

The interaction between the depot, Fleet customers, contractors, and other activities provide the hands on experience to develop, procure, and introduce to the Fleet the hardware and procedures to enhance their mission performance. Interface includes mockup hardware fit demonstrations, maintainability demonstrations/ assessments, logistics support analysis reviews, first article inspections, analytical condition inspections and site surveys.

Support Operational Readiness

Readiness degraders are identified by review of operational data and through interface with Fleet and manufacturing personnel. Root causes are determined and corrective actions developed. Failure trend analysis is used to identify potential problem areas. Contractor produced failure mode data and proposed maintenance actions are evaluated to develop appropriate maintenance actions. Preventive maintenance requirements are developed and validated.

Foreign Military Sales

Interfacing with FMS customers concerning aircraft modification and work to be performed is a critical necessity. Liaison officers are always on site during SDLMS-MODS. Technical assistance is provided by numerous divisions and branches of the NADEP. Cognizant Field Activity (CFA) functions are provided to A-7 and T-2 aircraft as well as J-52 and F404 engine customers. Liaison meetings with F-18 Repair of Repairables (ROR) customers are frequently held. Calibration items are frequently sent to FMS customers to provide assistance and training in the maintenance of their calibration problems. Occasional training is provided in-country in a formalized manner to a group of foreign students, however, most training is in-house and consists of on-the-job-training.

Interservice Program

Interfacing with Interservice customers concerning repairs performed on their assets require face-to-face meetings with program managers, production managers, item managers, financial personnel, engineers, and logistics personnel to establish a contractual agreement between the customer and repair facility. These meetings at the beginning of a repair program are necessary to agree on workload quantities, repair procedures, reporting procedures, funding requirements and procedures, warehousing and shipping of customer assets, engineering requirements and configuration management. During the repair program, frequent contact is necessary to change workload quantities, shipping information for high priority requisitions, etc.

Revised page

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

MEASURES OF MERIT

Costs [1]

18. Real Property Maintenance (RPM)

18.1 What is your activity's backlog of real property maintenance for facilities performing depot maintenance as of 30 September 1993 (express in $K)?

$11,877

18.2 What were your activity's annual RPM expenses (in $K) for Fiscal Years 1990-1993? Provide your answers in Table 18.2.

Table 18.2: **Real Property Maintenance Expenses**

	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
RPM Expenses ($K)	3,822	2,757	3,378	3,947

19. Annual Operating Costs (Excludes Materials used in Depot Maintenance Workloads)

19.1 What were the total depot maintenance actual annual operating costs for your activity (AOC/$K), excluding materials, used in depot maintenance workloads for Fiscal Years 1990-1993? What was the cost per direct labor hour ($DLH) for actual executed hours reported in the DBOF? Provide your answers in Table 19.1.a.

Table 19.1: **Annual Operating Costs** **R**

EXPENSE	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
AOC ($ K)	156,946	153,030	156,188	164,470
$ / DLH	46.89	49.90	49.75	54.10

Costs, continued

20. Environmental Compliance

[1]There are inherent differences in organizational structure and accounting systems across the Services. Consequently, cost accumulations vary considerably. This severely limits the comparability of the cost per direct labor hour ($/DLH) rates across Service lines.

Revised pg

19. Annual Operating Costs (Excludes Materials used in Depot Maintenance Workloads)

19.1 What were the total depot maintenance actual annual operating costs for your activity (AOC/$K), excluding materials, used in depot maintenance workloads for Fiscal Years 1990-1993? What was the cost per direct labor hour ($DLH) for actual executed hours reported in the DBOF? Provide your answers in Table 19.1.a.

Table 19.1: **Annual Operating Costs** **R**

EXPENSE	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
AOC ($ K)	156,946	153,030	156,188	164,470
$ / DLH	46.89	49.90	49.75	54.10

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

MEASURES OF MERIT

Costs [1]

18. Real Property Maintenance (RPM)

18.1 What is your activity's backlog of real property maintenance for facilities performing depot maintenance as of 30 September 1993 (express in $K)?

$11,877

18.2 What were your activity's annual RPM expenses (in $K) for Fiscal Years 1990-1993? Provide your answers in Table 18.2.

Table 18.2: **Real Property Maintenance Expenses**

	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
RPM Expenses ($K)	3,822	2,757	3,378	3,947

19. Annual Operating Costs (Excludes Materials used in Depot Maintenance Workloads)

19.1 What were the total depot maintenance actual annual operating costs for your activity (AOC/$K), excluding materials, used in depot maintenance workloads for Fiscal Years 1990-1993? What was the cost per direct labor hour ($DLH) for actual executed hours reported in the DBOF? Provide your answers in Table 19.1.a.

Table 19.1: **Annual Operating Costs**

EXPENSE	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
AOC ($ K)	169,455	167,860	167,586	174,223
$ / DLH	50.63	54.74	53.38	57.31

Costs, continued

20. Environmental Compliance

[1]There are inherent differences in organizational structure and accounting systems across the Services. Consequently, cost accumulations vary considerably. This severely limits the comparability of the cost per direct labor hour ($/DLH) rates across Service lines.

20. Environmental Compliance

20.1 What were your total depot maintenance actual and programmed environmental compliance costs (expressed in $K) for Fiscal Years 1990-1997? Provide your answers in Table 20.1.

The following figures are NADEP Jacksonville's environmental operational costs. There have only been two projects that have been required to get in compliance, 1993 tank certification and 1993 tank 103-1 closure. Together the cost was $14,500 total. This figure is included in the operational figure provided below. The figures for FY-90-92 do not include maintenance or pollution prevention projects as that information was not tracked until 1993.

Table 20.1: **Environmental Compliance Costs** **R**

COST($K)	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997
Actual	3,295	3,117	2,338	2,738	0	0	0	0
Programmed	0	0	0	0	11,022	12,745	8,254	7,177

20.2 If spending is accomplished as programmed above, what will be the remaining costs (backlog at the end of Fiscal Year 1997 expressed in $K) to bring existing facilities/equipment into environmental compliance?

None, this facility has no outstanding compliance deficiencies.

20.1 What were your total depot maintenance actual and programmed environmental compliance costs (expressed in $K) for Fiscal Years 1990-1997? Provide your answers in Table 20.1.

The following figures are NADEP Jacksonville's environmental operational costs. There have only been two projects that have been required to get in compliance, 1993 tank certification and 1993 tank 103-1 closure. Together the cost was $14,500 total. This figure is included in the operational figure provided below. The figures for FY-90-92 do not include maintenance or pollution prevention projects as that information was not tracked until 1993.

Table 20.1: **Environmental Compliance Costs**

COST($K)	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997
Actual	1,527	2,536	2,103	6,965	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Programmed	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	11,022	12,745	8,254	7,177

N/A - NOT APPLICABLE
N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE

20.2 If spending is accomplished as programmed above, what will be the remaining costs (backlog at the end of Fiscal Year 1997 expressed in $K) to bring existing facilities/equipment into environmental compliance?

None, this facility has no outstanding compliance deficiencies.

21. Local Wage Rate

21.1 What were your Department of Labor local wage rates for a WG-11, step 3 for Fiscal Years 1991 through 1994?

Table 21.1: **Wage Rate**

Wage Rate	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994
WG-11 / Step3	14.19	14.72	15.26	15.49

22. Programmed Capital Investments

22.1 How much is programmed for new mission equipment for Fiscal Years 1996 through 1999? Provide your answer (in $K) in Table 22.1.

22.2 How much is programmed for replacement equipment for Fiscal Years 1996 through 1999? Provide your answer (in $K) in Table 22.1.

Table 22.1: **Programmed Capital Investments** **R**

TYPE	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
NEW MISSION ($K)	2,520	3,332	4,844	4,960
REPLACEMENT ($K)	4,570	50	2,830	2,915

FY-98 and FY-99 Projection based on FY-94-97 average plus 3% inflation.

21. Local Wage Rate

21.1 What were your Department of Labor local wage rates for a WG-11, step 3 for Fiscal Years 1991 through 1994?

Table 21.1: **Wage Rate**

Wage Rate	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994
WG-11 / Step3	14.19	14.72	15.26	15.49

22. Programmed Capital Investments

22.1 How much is programmed for new mission equipment for Fiscal Years 1996 through 1999? Provide your answer (in $K) in Table 22.1.

22.2 How much is programmed for replacement equipment for Fiscal Years 1996 through 1999? Provide your answer (in $K) in Table 22.1.

Table 22.1: **Programmed Capital Investments**

TYPE	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999
NEW MISSION ($K)	2,520	3,332	5,510	5,750
REPLACEMENT ($K)	4,570	50	2,830	2,915

FY-98 and FY-99 Projection based on FY-94-97 average plus 3% inflation.

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAVNOTE 11000 of 08 December 1993

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

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

CAPT A. W. ROSSITER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Commanding Officer
Title

21 July 1994
Date

Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Data Call # 8

ertify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and lief.

KEN L. MYERS
NAME (Please type or print)

K L Myers
Signature

Director
Title

14 July 1994
Date

Depot Corporate Planning Directorate
Division

Naval Aviation Depot Operations Center
Activity

ORIGINAL CERTIFICATION IN THE
OWNER OPERATOR SECTION

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Data Call # 8

ertify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and ef.

Susan B Dean
NAME (Please type or print)

Susan B Dean
Signature

Supv Fin Analyst
Title

7-15-94
Date

Budget + Execution
Division

Depot Operations Directorate

NADOC
Activity

ORIGINAL CERTIFICATION IN THE
OWNER OPERATOR SECTION

Document Separator

R

THE FOLLOWING PAGES CONTAIN EITHER AMENDMENTS OR ARE ADDITIONAL PAGES TO BE INSERTED

DATA CALL # 8 - NADEP JACKSONVILLE

7 OCTOBER 1994

JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP PORTION OF DATA CALL					
5	6	7	8	9	10
12	13	14	15	47	48
51	52	53	54		

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP PORTION - JACKSONVILLE
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT TEN

tify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and f.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT W. SMITH, RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Robert W. Smith
Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR AVIATION
INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITIES
Title

7 OCT 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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Date

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)

Signature

COMMANDER, NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title

7 Oct 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)

NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Title

10/7/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP PORTION - JACKSONVILLE
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT TEN

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

10/7/94
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

Document Separator

R

THE FOLLOWING PAGES CONTAIN EITHER AMENDMENTS OR ARE ADDITIONAL PAGES TO BE INSERTED

DATA CALL # 8 - NADEP JACKSONVILLE

11 OCTOBER 1994

JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP PORTION OF DATA CALL					
47	48	53	54	55	56
61	62	65	66	67	68
69	71	72	73	74	

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP PORTION - JACKSONVILLE
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT TEN - PART TWO

'ertify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and ıief.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT W. SMITH, RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Robert W. Smith
Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR AVIATION INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITIES
Title

11 OCT 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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ıle

Date

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)

Signature

COMMANDER, NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title

11 OCT 94
Date D.H.C

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.
ıAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ACTING
Title

11 OCT 1994
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP PORTION - JACKSONVILLE
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT TEN - PART TWO

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F. C. Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

10/11/94
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

Document Separator

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT THREE

113

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT W.SMITH, RADM(S) USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Robert W. Smith
Signature

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR AVIATION DEPOTS
Title

15 Sep 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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

WILLIAM J. TINSTON, JR. RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR LOGISTICS AND FLEET SUPPORT
Title

16 Sept 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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

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

Signature

COMMANDER, NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title

19 Sept 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)

Signature

Title

9/29/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT THREE

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

9/8/94
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAVNOTE 11000 of 08 December 1993

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

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

CAPT A. W. ROSSITER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Commanding Officer
Title

31 August 1994
Date

Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT FOUR

112

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT W. SMITH, RADM(S), USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Robert W. Smith
Signature

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR AVIATION DEPOTS
Title

15 Sep 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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

WILLIAM J. TINSTON, JR. RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR LOGISTICS AND FLEET SUPPORT
Title

16 Sept 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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

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

Signature

COMMANDER, NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title

19 Sept 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)

Signature

Title

9/29/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT FOUR

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

9/7/94
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT SIX

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

R.W. Smith RADM(S), USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Robert W. Smith
Signature

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR AVIATION DEPOTS
Title

20 Sep 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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

BRUCE L. HAWK, CAPT USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR LOGISTICS AND FLEET SUPPORT (ACTING)
Title

9/20/94
Date

AL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
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)

Signature

COMMANDER, NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title

20 Sep 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)

Signature

Title

9/29/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT SIX

R. W. WIMMER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ACTING SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

9/20/94
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT ELEVEN

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT W. SMITH, RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR AVIATION INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITIES
Title

13 OCT 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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Title

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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

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

Signature

COMMANDER
Title

18 OCT 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)

Signature

Title

10/19/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT ELEVEN

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

10/13/94
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAVNOTE 11000 of 08 December 1993

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

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

CAPT A. W. ROSSITER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

COMMANDING OFFICER
Title

7 Oct '97
Date

NAVAL AVIATION DEPOT, JAX
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
NADEP Jacksonville
Data Call # 8, AMENDMENT # 12

rtify that the information contained herein is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and .ef.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

GEORGE R. BOTT IV
NAME (Please type or print)

GR Bott IV
Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR
AVIATION INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITIES (ACTING)
Title

19 OCT 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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

e

Date

Activity

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

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

DONALD V. BOECKER, RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Donald V. Boecker
Signature

COMMANDER (ACTING)
Title

19 Oct 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 AND LOGISTICS)

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

W Earner
Signature

Title

10/19/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
NADEP Jacksonville
Data Call # 8
AMENDMENT # 12

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

Signature

10/17/94
Date

CAPACITY ANALYSIS: DATA CALL WORK SHEET FOR NAVAL AVIATION DEPOTS

Questions for the Activities

NAVAL AVIATION DEPOT
JACKSONVILLE

ORIGINAL

1 JUNE 1994

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Data Call for Capacity Analysis
Naval Aviation Depots

Questions for Activities

Table of Contents

Table of Acronyms 2

Mission Area 3
1. Airframes 3
2. Air Launched Missiles 16
3. Components 21
4. Engines 33
5. Aircraft Service Support 45
6. Manufacturing 56
7. Modifications 63
8. Training 71
9. Workload Summary 80

Features and Capabilities 94
10 Facility Measures 94
11. Manpower Factors 99
12. Space for Industrial Support 100
13. Facility Limitations 103
14. Regional Maintenance Concept 104

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

1 June 1994

CAPACITY ANALYSIS: DATA CALL WORK SHEET FOR NAVAL AVIATION DEPOTS

Questions for the Activities

Category	**Industrial Activities**
Type	**Naval Aviation Depots (NADEPs)**
Claimant	**COMNAVAIRSYSCOM**

Notes:

In the context of this Data Call:

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 NADEP 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 thousands of Direct Labor Man Hours (K DLMHs).

4. Core workloads are to be calculated 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"). Core workload includes all Core work performed for other Military Departments.

If any responses are classified, so annotate the applicable question and include those responses in a separate classified annex.

This document has been prepared in WordPerfect 5.1/5.2.

Note: The Box below breaks out Defense Department Depot Maintenance and Industrial activities by Commodity Groups for further assessment. The highlighted items have been incorporated into this Data Call. If your activity performs work in any other area, please include such workload and so annotate your Data Call response.

JCSG-DM: Maintenance and Industrial Activities

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)

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**

Data Call for Capacity Analyses
Naval Aviation Depots

Primary UIC: N65886, Naval Aviation Depot Jacksonville
(Use this number as Activity Identification at top of every page)

Mission Area

1. Airframes

1.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the airframe production by Type/Model/Series 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).

Table 1.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Airframe Workload**

Type/Model/ Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
A-7E	115	39	44	27	4	0	12	24
ASPA-E/R	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-7L	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
EMER REPR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3A	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3J	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F/A-18	0	0	1	21	26	27	19	0
NA-7E	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3A	1	2	5	4	1	0	0	0
P-3B	4	16	10	6	3	11	2	4
P-3C	16	19	15	12	14	22	28	36
RP-3A	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1

Type/Model/ Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
RP-3D	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
T-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2C	0	0	8	32	20	33	3	0
TA-7C	2	2	2	4	2	0	0	0
TP-3A	8	1	0	0	1	1	0	2
UP-3A	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
VP-3A	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
WP-3D	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Total:	150	82	88	110	74	99	65	67

1. Airframes, continued

Table 1.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Airframe Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	5	5	5	1	0	0	0	0
ASPA-E/R	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	0	7	13	11	11	8	10	9
EA-7L	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EMER REPR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3A	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	0	2	1	2	1	3	2
EP-3J	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
F-14A	1	6	14	13	19	17	14	12
F-14B	0	0	7	8	3	7	4	5
F-14D	0	0	1	5	5	3	4	8
F/A-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NA-7E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
P-3A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3C	41	29	30	29	27	31	30	29
RP-3A	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
RP-3D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TA-7C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Type/ Model/ Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
TP-3A	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0
VP-3A	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WP-3D	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	57	64	75	71	71	68	66	66

1. Airframes, continued

Table 1.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Airframe Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
A-7E	442,235	258,895	313,283	182,496	31,956	0	174,000	360,000
ASPA-E/R	0	0	0	11,363	0	0	0	14,117
EA-6B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-7L	0	0	0	0	7,345	0	0	0
EMER REPR	155,554	97,670	94,510	138,969	216,626	185,140	131,591	128,430
EP-3A	0	0	0	14,521	0	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	13,571	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3J	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F/A-18	0	0	4,313	72,450	102,848	108,125	119,247	0
NA-7E	0	6,100	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3A	11,602	19,914	49,740	44,506	18,000	0	0	0
P-3B	37,912	155,504	98,490	59,094	37,946	135,798	28,024	55,448
P-3C	148,328	171,912	144,825	115,860	161,503	246,806	344,868	417,994
RP-3A	0	0	0	14,521	0	22,502	0	13,384
RP-3D	0	0	0	12,908	0	21,838	0	0
T-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2C	0	0	72,885	288,000	226,000	372,900	33,924	0
TA-7C	5,930	9,664	13,208	26,416	14,777	0	0	0

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
TP-3A	79,656	10,097	12,412	0	11,251	11,251	2,500	26,768
UP-3A	27,041	11,602	12,412	12,247	0	24,288	13,093	0
VP-3A	25,878	12,391	10,984	0	0	0	0	0
WP-3D	0	0	0	0	25,660	0	0	0
Total:	934,136	753,749	840,633	993,351	853,912	1,128,648	847,247	1,016,141

Table 1.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Airframe Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	75,000	92,715	92,715	18,543	0	0	0	0
ASPA-E/R	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	0	104,573	194,207	164,329	164,329	119,512	149,390	134,451
EA-7L	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EMER REPR	138,009	165,398	194,153	302,615	262,809	262,809	262,809	262,809
EP-3A	22,635	13,448	0	0	13,448	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	0	12,731	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	0	26,896	13,448	26,896	13,448	40,344	26,896
EP-3J	0	0	13,448	0	13,448	0	0	0
F-14A	19,878	115,590	269,710	250,445	377,318	337,796	280,372	240,850
F-14B	0	0	134,855	154,120	59,283	138,327	79,044	98,805
F-14D	0	0	19,265	96,325	98,805	59,283	79,044	158,088
F/A-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NA-7E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3	0	0	48,000	48,000	0	0	0	0
P-3A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3C	480,399	324,220	295,950	286,085	266,355	305,815	295,950	286,085
RP-3A	12,381	0	0	0	13,448	13,448	13,448	13,448
RP-3D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2	13,140	86,954	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TA-7C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TP-3A	37,143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	0	26,896	13,448	13,448	13,448	0	0	0
VP-3A	12,381	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WP-3D	12,381	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	823,347	929,794	1,302,647	1,360,089	1,309,587	1,250,438	1,200,401	1,221,432

1. Airframes, continued

1.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion of the airframe production by Type/Model/Series that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in units throughput and in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 1.2.a: **Core Airframe Workload**

Type/Model/ Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
EA-6B	7	12	11	11	8	10	9
F-14A	6	12	12	12	12	12	12
P-3C	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Total:	25	36	35	35	32	34	33

Table 1.2.b: **Core Airframe Workload**

Type/Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
EA-6B	104,573	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512	149,390	134,451
EMER REPR	139,437	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409	219,409	219,409
F-14A	115,590	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132	237,132	240,850
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
Total:	477,980	679,581	773,104	739,250	694,433	724,311	713,090

Revised pg 112

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 airframe operations could be expanded at this NADEP, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of airframes and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by type/model/series.

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload** **R**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	10	10	2	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	8	13	11	11	8	10	9
EP-3A	6	0	0	6	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	6	6	6	6	6	6
EP-3J	0	3	0	6	0	0	0
F-14A	18	28	24	30	29	28	24
F-14B	0	14	14	8	11	8	7
F-14D	0	3	7	7	5	9	14
P-3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
P-3C	50	46	41	32	50	50	50
RP-3A	0	0	0	6	6	6	6
T-2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	6	4	6	6	0	0	0
* Total:	112	130	120	118	115	117	116

* NOTE: The maximum potential airframe workload data above does not include the impact of an additional 77,000 - 114,000 sq. ft. of existing high bay aircraft assembly spaces that could be made available to NADEP JAX as additional workload materializes. This is an addition to the minimum of 80,000 sq. ft. promised to NADEP JAX by NAS JAX after completion of Hangar MILCON.

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Occupation	Number of Civilian Employees	Percent of Civilian Employees
2k. Health Diagnosing Practitioners (Doctors)		
2l. Health Assessment & Treating(Nurses, Therapists, Pharmacists, Nutritionists, etc.)		
2m. Communications	8	.27
2n. Visual Arts	8	.27
Sub-Total 2a. through 2n.:	479	16.20
3. Technicians and Related Support		
3a. Health Technologists and Technicians	8	.27
3b. Other Technologists	98	3.31
Sub-Total 3a. and 3b.:	106	3.58
4. Administrative Support & Clerical	144	4.87
5. Services		
5a. Protective Services (includes guards, fire fighters, police)		
5b. Food Preparation & Service		
5c. Dental/Medical Assistants/Aides		
5d. Personal Service & Building & Grounds Services (includes janitorial, grounds maintenance, child care workers)		
Sub-Total 5a. through 5d.	0	
6. Agricultural, Forestry & Fishing	0	
7. Mechanics, Installers and Repairers	1,142	38.62
8. Construction Trades	503	17.01

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

Revised pg

Table 1.3.b: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload** R

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	185,430	185,430	37,086	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	119,512	194,207	164,329	164,329	119,512	149,390	134,451
EP-3A	80,688	0	0	80,688	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	76,386	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688
EP-3J	0	40,344	0	80,688	0	0	0
F-14A	346,770	539,420	462,360	577,950	558,685	539,420	462,360
F-14B	0	269,710	269,710	154,120	211,915	154,120	134,855
F-14D	0	57,795	134,855	134,855	96,325	173,385	269,710
P-3	0	144,000	144,000	0	0	0	0
P-3C	559,000	453,790	404,465	315,680	493,250	493,250	493,250
RP-3A	0	0	0	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688
T-2	86,954	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	80,688	53,792	80,688	80,688	0	0	0
Total:	1,459,042	2,019,176	1,854,567	1,750,374	1,641,063	1,670,941	1,656,002

Table 1.3.b: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	185,430	185,430	37,086	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	119,512	194,207	164,329	164,329	119,512	149,390	134,451
EP-3A	13,448	0	0	13,448	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	76,386	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688
EP-3J	0	40,344	0	80,688	0	0	0
F-14A	346,770	539,420	462,360	577,950	558,685	539,420	462,360
F-14B	0	269,710	269,710	154,120	211,915	154,120	134,855
F-14D	0	57,795	134,855	134,855	96,325	173,385	269,710
P-3	0	144,000	144,000	0	0	0	0
P-3C	559,000	453,790	404,465	315,680	493,250	493,250	493,250
RP-3A	0	0	0	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688
T-2	86,954	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	80,688	53,792	80,688	80,688	0	0	0
Total:	1,391,802	2,019,176	1,854,567	1,683,134	1,641,063	1,670,941	1,656,002

Airframe, continued

1.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased airframe workload at this NADEP.

A. General

1. The assembly process (rework/repair/parts processing/reassembly) in the high bay hangars is the constraining process to maximum throughput.

2. Dwell Time in the hangar is divided by the maximum number of hangar spots via the given aircraft mix. That number is then divided into the Fiscal year workdays (246-FY94) to get maximum capacity throughput.

3. Workload mix with numbers of airframes by T/M/S along with funded manhours was provided by NAVAIR -04D.

B. P-3 Aircraft

1. The number of workstations vary between 10-11 for FY95-01 when determining maximum potential for this aircraft with the given aircraft mix.

2. 39 day assembly dwell time was used for all calculations.

3. Only the P-3 SDLM process was used for calculations. No phased Depot Maintenance (PDM) was calculated. If a PDM process was used, the TAT would be decreased with a resulting increase in capacity.

C. T-2 Aircraft

1. Two T-2 workstations were determined to be the maximum potential with the given aircraft mix.

2. 35 day assembly dwell time was used for all calculations.

3. No additional equipment is required for this aircraft rate.

D. A-7 Aircraft

1. Six workstations were determined to be the maximum potential for this aircraft with the aircraft mix.

2. 146 day assembly dwell time was used for all calculations.

E. F-14 Aircraft

1. Assume F-14 aircraft to be transitioned based on input from NADOC dated 5/9/94.

2. Assume 190 day hangar dwell time per aircraft.

3. Maximum of 14 hangar workstations allocated for FY95 and 35 workstations in subsequent years thru FY01.

4. Additional workstations for FY96 thru FY01 to be gained thru use of NAS hangar space.

F. EA-6B Aircraft

1. Assume EA-6B aircraft to be transitioned based on input from NADOC dtd. 5/9/94.

2. Assume 210 day hangar dwell time per aircraft.

3. Number of workstations vary between 7 and 11 for FY95 thru FY01 based on aircraft mix provided by NADOC.

1.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform airframe workload? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase airframe capabilities? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capabilities. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

1. <u>INDUSTRIAL PLANT EQUIPMENT CHANGES:</u>

A. Additional workstands, dollies and ground support equipment for the assembly and disassembly operations would be required.

B. Repair the hangar 101 deck substructure to increase weight bearing capacity and allow heavier aircraft in affected areas.

C. Construct new hangar (approx. 100,000 sq. ft.)

2. QUANTITATIVE CHANGES TO DEPOT CAPABILITIES:

A. The hangar deck substructure repairs would increase P-3 capacity by 21 per year and the F-14 capacity by 8 per year.

B. Additional hangar would increase F-14/EA-6 capacity by 40 per year.

3. OTHER INVESTMENTS:

A. Hangar substructure repair would be $700K.

B. A new hangar is estimated to cost $10M.

4. RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI) AND PAYBACK PERIOD:

Our calculations require information not available regarding workload being processed through hypothetical facility expansion projects. This would be a net present value analysis that considers productivity improvements, process flow changes, economics of scale and current value of money assumptions. The calculation of ROI and payback period must be done within the context of the entire NADEP financial position (Product and G&A expense) and is subject to specific realignment scenarios.

1.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of airframe workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

A. Maximum potential capacity numbers shown in this data call fall within the environmental restriction limits at this NADEP.

B. Wastewater treatment facilities currently on line further reduce our non-domestic industrial wastewater discharge.

Mission Area

2. Air Launched Missiles

2.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Missile/Guidance System production that was executed and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both Systems Worked (Tables 2.1.a and 2.1.b) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 2.1.c and 2.1.d).

Table 2.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Systems Worked (Units) Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
	NOT APPLICABLE *							
Total:								

* NADEP Jacksonville has no applicable responses involving missile workload.

Table 2.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Air Launched Missiles Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Systems Worked (Units) Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE							
Total:								

2. Air Launched Missiles, continued

Table 2.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
	NOT APPLICABLE							
Total:								

Table 2.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE							
Total:								

2. Air Launched Missiles, continued

2.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion of the Missile/Guidance System production that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both Systems Worked and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 2.2.a: **Core Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Systems Worked (Units) Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:							

Table 2.2.b: **Core Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:							

2. Air Launched Missiles, continued

2.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 this NADEP could expand Missile/Guidance System operations based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of systems worked and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by missile / guidance system.

Table 2.3.a: **Maximum Potential Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Systems Worked (Units) Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:							

Table 2.3.b: **Maximum Potential Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:							

2. Air Launched Missiles, continued

2.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased air launched missile workload at this NADEP.

NOT APPLICABLE

2.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform air launched missile workload? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase missile workload? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capabilities. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

NOT APPLICABLE

2.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of missile workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

NOT APPLICABLE

Mission Area

3. Components

3.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the component production, by component type, that was executed in and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both components worked (Tables 3.1.a and 3.1.b) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 3.1.c and 3.1.d).

Table 3.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		8,442	7,569	8,668	8,337	9,726	11,028	11,660	11,435
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	4	0	0	0	0	2	1
Aircraft Structural		1,842	1,728	1,663	1,026	1,152	1,039	638	458
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,941	2,382	2,312	1,828	1,810	1,873	2,059	2,417
Instruments		7,244	5,608	5,557	4,114	4,648	4,751	3,096	2,106
Landing Gear		1,926	1,345	2,053	1,501	1,290	967	553	668
Aviation Ordnance Equip		1,704	1,885	1,858	2,205	2,895	2,225	3,181	2,097
Avionics / Electronics		14,849	11,812	9,791	10,134	8,555	7,206	5,696	4,959
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		4,347	3,885	4,024	3,335	3,447	3,696	3,084	2,260
Total:		43,295	36,218	35,926	32,480	33,523	32,785	29,969	26,401

NOTE: OTHER FUNDED - "Data not available to Commodity Detail" at NADOC. R

Mission Area

3. Components

3.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the component production, by component type, that was executed in and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both components worked (Tables 3.1.a and 3.1.b) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 3.1.c and 3.1.d).

Table 3.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		8,442	7,569	8,668	8,337	9,726	11,028	11,660	11,435
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	4	0	0	0	0	2	1
Aircraft Structural		1,842	1,728	1,663	1,026	1,152	1,039	638	458
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,941	2,382	2,312	1,828	1,810	1,873	2,059	2,417
Instruments		7,244	5,608	5,557	4,114	4,648	4,751	3,096	2,106
Landing Gear		1,926	1,345	2,053	1,501	1,290	967	553	668
Aviation Ordnance Equip		1,704	1,885	1,858	2,205	2,895	2,225	3,181	2,097
Avionics / Electronics		14,849	11,812	9,791	10,134	8,555	7,206	5,696	4,959
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		4,347	3,885	4,024	3,335	3,447	3,696	3,084	2,260
Total:		43,295	36,218	35,926	32,480	33,523	32,785	29,969	26,401

Table 3.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput							
		FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	33	1	1	0	0
Engine Components		11,765	11,237	12,176	11,877	11,864	10,842	10,317	10,317
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	1	9	6	1	1	1	1
Aircraft Structural		741	490	1,175	1,445	547	890	694	711
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,071	2,432	2,938	2,615	1,465	1,831	1,640	1,628
Instruments		2,379	1,925	1,837	1,137	984	890	838	837
Landing Gear		1,568	715	977	989	622	629	556	568
Aviation Ordnance Equip		1,102	885	2,205	1,820	1,160	1,574	965	974
Avionics / Electronics		5,612	4,867	4,515	3,772	3,648	3,401	3,115	3,112
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	54	94	81	75	71
Other		2,286	3,055	3,454	3,906	2,714	2,865	2,673	2,662
Total:		27,524	25,607	29,286	27,654	23,100	23,005	20,874	20,881

NOTE: OTHER FUNDED - "Data not available to Commodity Detail" at NADOC. R

3. Components, continued

Table 3.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput							
		FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	33	1	1	0	0
Engine Components		11,765	11,237	12,176	11,877	11,864	10,842	10,317	10,317
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	1	9	6	1	1	1	1
Aircraft Structural		741	490	1,175	1,445	547	890	694	711
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,071	2,432	2,938	2,615	1,465	1,831	1,640	1,628
Instruments		2,379	1,925	1,837	1,137	984	890	838	837
Landing Gear		1,568	715	977	989	622	629	556	568
Aviation Ordnance Equip		1,102	885	2,205	1,820	1,160	1,574	965	974
Avionics / Electronics		5,612	4,867	4,515	3,772	3,648	3,401	3,115	3,112
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	54	94	81	75	71
Other		2,286	3,055	3,454	3,906	2,714	2,865	2,673	2,662
	Total:	27,524	25,607	29,286	27,654	23,100	23,005	20,874	20,881

Table 3.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		225,745	211,349	253,034	240,794	235,913	263,011	306,431	302,602
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	35	0	0	0	0	13	6
Aircraft Structural		71,293	78,833	74,764	42,844	36,942	35,644	25,827	19,436
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		29,466	22,790	21,561	18,772	16,878	21,291	23,836	29,558
Instruments		84,608	61,585	64,131	50,737	51,749	43,456	25,597	24,500
Landing Gear		43,393	29,560	58,874	43,295	36,577	27,751	22,036	31,548
Aviation Ordnance Eqmt		51,125	38,448	38,051	37,699	52,435	45,847	61,311	35,956
Avionics / Electronics		149,107	132,938	121,598	136,593	132,356	126,462	129,383	140,188
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		41,709	33,014	39,104	34,418	33,503	39,767	39,391	29,087
	Total:	696,446	608,552	671,117	605,152	596,353	603,229	633,825	612,881

NOTE: OTHER FUNDED - "Data not available to Commodity Detail" at NADOC. R

3. Components, continued

Table 3.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		225,745	211,349	253,034	240,794	235,913	263,011	306,431	302,602
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	35	0	0	0	0	13	6
Aircraft Structural		71,293	78,833	74,764	42,844	36,942	35,644	25,827	19,436
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		29,466	22,790	21,561	18,772	16,878	21,291	23,836	29,558
Instruments		84,608	61,585	64,131	50,737	51,749	43,456	25,597	24,500
Landing Gear		43,393	29,560	58,874	43,295	36,577	27,751	22,036	31,548
Aviation Ordnance Eqmt		51,125	38,448	38,051	37,699	52,435	45,847	61,311	35,956
Avionics / Electronics		149,107	132,938	121,598	136,593	132,356	126,462	129,383	140,188
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		41,709	33,014	39,104	34,418	33,503	39,767	39,391	29,087
	Total:	696,446	608,552	671,117	605,152	596,353	603,229	633,825	612,881

3. Components, continued

Table 3.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)							
		FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	250	78	78	0	0
Engine Components		344,442	295,321	308,087	293,479	315,134	282,468	271,655	271,819
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	6	75	181	4	4	4	4
Aircraft Structural		41,205	26,648	59,625	74,712	36,296	51,929	40,011	41,584
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		26,534	31,346	37,400	34,246	19,365	23,966	21,728	21,551
Instruments		24,257	21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302	7,864	7,833
Landing Gear		42,639	37,531	24,987	38,951	44,554	35,719	31,330	35,228
Aviation Ordnance Equip		14,913	13,300	42,254	26,771	11,774	22,554	10,078	10,242
Avionics / Electronics		173,377	111,817	109,043	116,090	136,820	98,583	100,754	98,644
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O / NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	310	527	454	418	399
Other		35,510	34,598	44,627	52,281	39,054	43,097	40,093	39,825
	Total:	702,877	572,308	646,052	647,670	612,736	567,154	523,935	527,129

3. Components, continued

3.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion of component production, by component type, that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both components worked and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 3.2.a: **Core Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	32	1	1	0	0
Engine Components		10,756	11,680	11,740	11,729	10,707	10,182	10,182
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Aircraft Structural		488	1,067	1,418	547	890	694	711
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,101	2,547	2,318	1,168	1,534	1,343	1,331
Instruments		1,545	1,460	811	726	632	580	579
Landing Gear		709	923	983	616	623	550	562
Aviation Ordnance Equip		800	1,970	1,694	1,078	1,492	883	892
Avionics / Electronics		4,748	4,356	3,681	3,557	3,310	3,024	3,021
Ground & ShipboardComm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	54	94	81	75	71
Other		2,577	2,741	3,299	2,118	2,267	2,075	2,064
	Total:	23,725	26,745	26,031	21,635	21,538	19,407	19,414

3. Components, continued

Table 3.2.b: **Core Component Workload**

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	236	78	78	0	0
Engine Components		280,103	291,895	289,529	311,184	278,518	267,705	267,869
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		6	6	6	4	4	4	4
Aircraft Structural		26,586	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929	40,011	41,584
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		27,238	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198	17,960	17,783
Instruments		18,525	16,744	7,362	6,503	5,675	5,237	5,206
Landing Gear		37,361	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549	31,160	35,058
Aviation Ordnance Equip		12,143	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438	8,962	9,126
Avionics / Electronics		108,526	105,375	113,289	134,019	95,782	97,953	95,843
Ground & ShipboardComm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	310	527	454	418	399
Other		28,216	34,470	43,746	30,602	34,618	31,614	31,346
	Total:	538,704	598,655	622,316	589,852	544,243	501,024	504,218

Revised pg

3.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 this NADEP could expand component operations based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of components and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by component type.

Table 3.3.a: **Maximum Potential Component Workload** **R**

Component Type		Units Throughput						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		15,417	15,432	15,438	15,408	15,416	15,411	15,411
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural		5,910	6,323	6,208	4,838	5,501	5,567	5,488
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,261	2,289	2,225	2,204	2,226	2,199	2,201
Instruments		1,925	1,837	1,137	984	890	838	837
Landing Gear		328	674	438	241	303	306	278
Aviation Ordnance Equip		5,488	4,186	5,403	7,792	5,519	7,573	7,521
Avionics / Electronics		20,899	21,146	17,076	13,940	18,066	16,203	16,535
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		1,871	1,871	1,871	1,916	1,916	1,927	1,911
Other		13,427	11,881	11,486	10,671	10,208	10,237	10,264
	Total:	67,526	65,639	61,282	57,994	60,045	60,261	60,446

3. Components, continued

3.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 this NADEP could expand component operations based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of components and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by component type.

Table 3.3.a: **Maximum Potential Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		15,366	15,503	15,513	15,475	15,466	15,529	15,463
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural		3,855	3,659	3,606	3,196	3,195	3,240	3,219
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,312	1,746	2,214	2,189	2,209	2,173	2,201
Instruments		1,649	1,561	783	634	538	484	483
Landing Gear		465	548	437	308	304	326	308
Aviation Ordnance Equip		6,047	4,139	5,344	5,985	5,476	5,432	5,451
Avionics / Electronics		21,881	23,404	17,655	19,780	20,149	20,608	19,977
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		1,894	1,894	1,808	1,914	1,918	1,928	1,911
Other		13,464	12,183	11,246	8,753	8,840	9,849	9,418
	Total:	66,933	64,637	58,606	58,234	58,095	59,569	58,431

Table 3.3.b: **Maximum Potential Component Workload** R

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		405,437	390,430	381,324	409,826	402,330	405,328	406,827
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural		186,447	186,107	185,977	185,983	185,983	185,983	185,983
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137
Instruments		21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302	7,864	7,833
Landing Gear		17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232
Aviation Ordnance Equip		82,470	80,216	79,468	79,091	79,091	79,091	79,091
Avionics / Electronics		465,938	496,500	506,829	508,626	509,454	508,892	509,923
Ground & ShipboardComm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740
Other		152,059	153,511	153,728	153,552	153,552	153,552	153,552
	Total:	1,371,201	1,383,827	1,374,834	1,403,317	1,395,821	1,397,819	1,400,318

Revised pg

Table 3.3.b: Maximum Potential Component Workload R

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		405,437	390,430	381,324	409,826	402,330	405,328	406,827
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural		321,447	321,107	320,977	320,983	320,983	320,983	320,983
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137
Instruments		21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302	7,864	7,833
Landing Gear		17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232
Aviation Ordnance Equip		82,470	80,216	79,468	79,091	79,091	79,091	79,091
Avionics / Electronics		480,141	510,703	521,032	522,829	523,657	524,095	524,126
Ground & ShipboardComm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740
Other		152,059	153,511	153,728	153,552	153,552	153,552	153,552
	Total:	1,520,404	1,533,030	1,524,037	1,552,520	1,545,024	1,548,022	1,549,521

3. Components, continued

Table 3.3.b: **Maximum Potential Component Workload**

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		507,396	351,470	328,855	360,355	360,355	358,856	361,854
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural		186,932	186,592	186,462	186,468	186,468	186,468	186,468
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137
Instruments		19,930	17,143	8,788	6,549	4,691	4,253	4,222
Landing Gear		17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232
Aviation Ordnance Equip		82,470	80,216	79,468	79,091	79,091	79,091	79,091
Avionics / Electronics		481,952	551,870	560,999	563,766	565,624	566,602	566,093
Ground & ShipboardComm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740
Other		139,785	141,237	141,454	141,278	141,278	141,278	141,278
Total:		1,475,574	1,385,637	1,363,135	1,394,616	1,394,616	1,393,657	1,396,115

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

1 June 1994

CAPACITY ANALYSIS: DATA CALL WORK SHEET FOR NAVAL AVIATION DEPOTS

Questions for the Activities

Category	**Industrial Activities**
Type	**Naval Aviation Depots (NADEPs)**
Claimant	**COMNAVAIRSYSCOM**

Notes:

In the context of this Data Call:

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 NADEP 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 thousands of Direct Labor Man Hours (K DLMHs).

4. Core workloads are to be calculated 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"). Core workload includes all Core work performed for other Military Departments.

If any responses are classified, so annotate the applicable question and include those responses in a separate classified annex.

This document has been prepared in WordPerfect 5.1/5.2.

Note: The Box below breaks out Defense Department Depot Maintenance and Industrial activities by Commodity Groups for further assessment. The highlighted items have been incorporated into this Data Call. If your activity performs work in any other area, please include such workload and so annotate your Data Call response.

JCSG-DM: Maintenance and Industrial Activities

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)

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**

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Data Call for Capacity Analysis
Naval Aviation Depots

Questions for Activities

Table of Contents

Table of Acronyms 2

Mission Area 3
1. Airframes 3
2. Air Launched Missiles 16
3. Components 21
4. Engines 33
5. Aircraft Service Support 45
6. Manufacturing 56
7. Modifications 63
8. Training 71
9. Workload Summary 80

Features and Capabilities 94
10 Facility Measures 94
11. Manpower Factors 99
12. Space for Industrial Support 100
13. Facility Limitations 103
14. Regional Maintenance Concept 104

Table of Acronyms

ADMIN	Administration; administrative
AICUZ	Air Installations Compatible Use Zone
APU	Auxiliary Power Unit
CCN	Category Code Number
COMM	Communications
COMNAVAIRSYSCOM	Commander Naval Air Systems Command
DLMH	Direct Labor Man Hour
DoD	Department of Defense
DON	Department of the Navy
ELEC	Electrical, electric
E-O/NV	Electro-Optics / Night Vision
ESQD	Explosive Safety Quantity Distance
EW	Electronic Warfare
FY	Fiscal Year
HERF	Hazardous Electronic Radiation - Fuel
HERO	Hazardous Electronic Radiation - Ordnance
HERP	Hazardous Electronic Radiation - Personnel
IPE	Industrial Plant Equipment
K	Thousands
MCAS	Marine Corps Air Station
N / A	Not applicable
NADEP	Naval Aviation Depot
NAS	Naval Air Station
NAVAID	Navigational Aids
POM	Program Objective Memorandum
RCM	Reliability Centered Maintenance
SC/SS	Satellite Control / Space Sensors
SF	Square Feet
T / M / S	Type / Model / Series
UIC	Unit Identification Code

Data Call for Capacity Analyses
Naval Aviation Depots

Primary UIC: N65886, Naval Aviation Depot Jacksonville
(Use this number as Activity Identification at top of every page)

Mission Area

1. Airframes

1.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the airframe production by Type/Model/Series 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).

Table 1.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Airframe Workload**

Type/Model/ Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
A-7E	115	39	44	27	4	0	12	24
ASPA-E/R	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-7L	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
EMER REPR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3A	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3J	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F/A-18	0	0	1	21	26	27	19	0
NA-7E	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3A	1	2	5	4	1	0	0	0
P-3B	4	16	10	6	3	11	2	4
P-3C	16	19	15	12	14	22	28	36
RP-3A	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1

1. Airframes, continued

Table 1.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Airframe Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	5	5	5	1	0	0	0	0
ASPA-E/R	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	0	7	13	11	11	8	10	9
EA-7L	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EMER REPR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3A	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	0	2	1	2	1	3	2
EP-3J	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
F-14A	1	6	14	13	19	17	14	12
F-14B	0	0	7	8	3	7	4	5
F-14D	0	0	1	5	5	3	4	8
F/A-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NA-7E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
P-3A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3C	41	29	30	29	27	31	30	29
RP-3A	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
RP-3D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TA-7C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Type/ Model/ Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
TP-3A	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0
VP-3A	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WP-3D	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	57	64	75	71	71	68	66	66

1. Airframes, continued

Table 1.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Airframe Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
A-7E	442,235	258,895	313,283	182,496	31,956	0	174,000	360,000
ASPA-E/R	0	0	0	11,363	0	0	0	14,117
EA-6B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-7L	0	0	0	0	7,345	0	0	0
EMER REPR	155,554	97,670	94,510	138,969	216,626	185,140	131,591	128,430
EP-3A	0	0	0	14,521	0	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	13,571	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EP-3J	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F-14D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F/A-18	0	0	4,313	72,450	102,848	108,125	119,247	0
NA-7E	0	6,100	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3A	11,602	19,914	49,740	44,506	18,000	0	0	0
P-3B	37,912	155,504	98,490	59,094	37,946	135,798	28,024	55,448
P-3C	148,328	171,912	144,825	115,860	161,503	246,806	344,868	417,994
RP-3A	0	0	0	14,521	0	22,502	0	13,384
RP-3D	0	0	0	12,908	0	21,838	0	0
T-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2C	0	0	72,885	288,000	226,000	372,900	33,924	0
TA-7C	5,930	9,664	13,208	26,416	14,777	0	0	0

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
TP-3A	79,656	10,097	12,412	0	11,251	11,251	2,500	26,768
UP-3A	27,041	11,602	12,412	12,247	0	24,288	13,093	0
VP-3A	25,878	12,391	10,984	0	0	0	0	0
WP-3D	0	0	0	0	25,660	0	0	0
Total:	934,136	753,749	840,633	993,351	853,912	1,128,648	847,247	1,016,141

Table 1.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Airframe Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	75,000	92,715	92,715	18,543	0	0	0	0
ASPA-E/R	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	0	104,573	194,207	164,329	164,329	119,512	149,390	134,451
EA-7L	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EMER REPR	138,009	165,398	194,153	302,615	262,809	262,809	262,809	262,809
EP-3A	22,635	13,448	0	0	13,448	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	0	12,731	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	0	26,896	13,448	26,896	13,448	40,344	26,896
EP-3J	0	0	13,448	0	13,448	0	0	0
F-14A	19,878	115,590	269,710	250,445	377,318	337,796	280,372	240,850
F-14B	0	0	134,855	154,120	59,283	138,327	79,044	98,805
F-14D	0	0	19,265	96,325	98,805	59,283	79,044	158,088
F/A-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NA-7E	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3	0	0	48,000	48,000	0	0	0	0
P-3A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P-3C	480,399	324,220	295,950	286,085	266,355	305,815	295,950	286,085
RP-3A	12,381	0	0	0	13,448	13,448	13,448	13,448
RP-3D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2	13,140	86,954	0	0	0	0	0	0
T-2C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TA-7C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TP-3A	37,143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	0	26,896	13,448	13,448	13,448	0	0	0
VP-3A	12,381	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WP-3D	12,381	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	823,347	929,794	1,302,647	1,360,089	1,309,587	1,250,438	1,200,401	1,221,432

1. Airframes, continued

1.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion of the airframe production by Type/Model/Series that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in units throughput and in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 1.2.a: **Core Airframe Workload**

Type/Model/ Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
EA-6B	7	12	11	11	8	10	9
F-14A	6	12	12	12	12	12	12
P-3C	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Total:	25	36	35	35	32	34	33

Table 1.2.b: **Core Airframe Workload**

Type/Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
EA-6B	104,573	179,268	164,329	164,329	119,512	149,390	134,451
EMER REPR	139,437	150,753	259,215	219,409	219,409	219,409	219,409
F-14A	115,590	231,180	231,180	237,132	237,132	237,132	240,850
P-3C	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380	118,380
Total:	477,980	679,581	773,104	739,250	694,433	724,311	713,090

Revised pg 112

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 airframe operations could be expanded at this NADEP, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of airframes and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by type/model/series.

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload** **R**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	10	10	2	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	8	13	11	11	8	10	9
EP-3A	6	0	0	6	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	6	6	6	6	6	6
EP-3J	0	3	0	6	0	0	0
F-14A	18	28	24	30	29	28	24
F-14B	0	14	14	8	11	8	7
F-14D	0	3	7	7	5	9	14
P-3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
P-3C	50	46	41	32	50	50	50
RP-3A	0	0	0	6	6	6	6
T-2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	6	4	6	6	0	0	0
* Total:	112	130	120	118	115	117	116

* NOTE: The maximum potential airframe workload data above does not include the impact of an additional 77,000 - 114,000 sq. ft. of existing high bay aircraft assembly spaces that could be made available to NADEP JAX as additional workload materializes. This is an addition to the minimum of 80,000 sq. ft. promised to NADEP JAX by NAS JAX after completion of Hangar MILCON.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

1. Airframes, continued

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 airframe operations could be expanded at this NADEP, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of airframes and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by type/model/series.

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	10	10	2	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	8	13	11	11	8	13	12
EP-3A	6	0	0	6	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	6	6	6	6	6	6
EP-3J	0	3	0	6	0	0	0
F-14A	18	28	24	30	29	28	24
F-14B	0	14	14	8	11	8	7
F-14D	0	3	7	7	5	9	14
P-3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
P-3C	50	46	41	32	50	50	50
RP-3A	0	0	0	6	6	6	6
T-2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	6	4	6	6	0	0	0
*** Total:**	112	130	120	118	115	120	119

*** NOTE: The maximum potential airframe workload data above does not include the impact of an additional 77,000 - 114,000 sq. ft. of existing high bay aircraft assembly spaces that could be made available to NADEP JAX as additional workload materializes. This is an addition to the minimum of 80,000 sq. ft. promised to NADEP JAX by NAS JAX after completion of Hangar MILCON.**

Revised pg

Table 1.3.b: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload** R

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	185,430	185,430	37,086	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	119,512	194,207	164,329	164,329	119,512	149,390	134,451
EP-3A	80,688	0	0	80,688	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	76,386	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688
EP-3J	0	40,344	0	80,688	0	0	0
F-14A	346,770	539,420	462,360	577,950	558,685	539,420	462,360
F-14B	0	269,710	269,710	154,120	211,915	154,120	134,855
F-14D	0	57,795	134,855	134,855	96,325	173,385	269,710
P-3	0	144,000	144,000	0	0	0	0
P-3C	559,000	453,790	404,465	315,680	493,250	493,250	493,250
RP-3A	0	0	0	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688
T-2	86,954	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	80,688	53,792	80,688	80,688	0	0	0
Total:	1,459,042	2,019,176	1,854,567	1,750,374	1,641,063	1,670,941	1,656,002

Table 1.3.b: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	185,430	185,430	37,086	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	119,512	194,207	164,329	164,329	119,512	149,390	134,451
EP-3A	13,448	0	0	13,448	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	76,386	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688
EP-3J	0	40,344	0	80,688	0	0	0
F-14A	346,770	539,420	462,360	577,950	558,685	539,420	462,360
F-14B	0	269,710	269,710	154,120	211,915	154,120	134,855
F-14D	0	57,795	134,855	134,855	96,325	173,385	269,710
P-3	0	144,000	144,000	0	0	0	0
P-3C	559,000	453,790	404,465	315,680	493,250	493,250	493,250
RP-3A	0	0	0	80,688	80,688	80,688	80,688
T-2	86,954	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	80,688	53,792	80,688	80,688	0	0	0
Total:	1,391,802	2,019,176	1,854,567	1,683,134	1,641,063	1,670,941	1,656,002

Airframe, continued

1.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased airframe workload at this NADEP.

A. General

1. The assembly process (rework/repair/parts processing/reassembly) in the high bay hangars is the constraining process to maximum throughput.

2. Dwell Time in the hangar is divided by the maximum number of hangar spots via the given aircraft mix. That number is then divided into the Fiscal year workdays (246-FY94) to get maximum capacity throughput.

3. Workload mix with numbers of airframes by T/M/S along with funded manhours was provided by NAVAIR -04D.

B. P-3 Aircraft

1. The number of workstations vary between 10-11 for FY95-01 when determining maximum potential for this aircraft with the given aircraft mix.

2. 39 day assembly dwell time was used for all calculations.

3. Only the P-3 SDLM process was used for calculations. No phased Depot Maintenance (PDM) was calculated. If a PDM process was used, the TAT would be decreased with a resulting increase in capacity.

C. T-2 Aircraft

1. Two T-2 workstations were determined to be the maximum potential with the given aircraft mix.

2. 35 day assembly dwell time was used for all calculations.

3. No additional equipment is required for this aircraft rate.

D. A-7 Aircraft

1. Six workstations were determined to be the maximum potential for this aircraft with the aircraft mix.

2. 146 day assembly dwell time was used for all calculations.

E. F-14 Aircraft

1. Assume F-14 aircraft to be transitioned based on input from NADOC dated 5/9/94.

2. Assume 190 day hangar dwell time per aircraft.

3. Maximum of 14 hangar workstations allocated for FY95 and 35 workstations in subsequent years thru FY01.

4. Additional workstations for FY96 thru FY01 to be gained thru use of NAS hangar space.

F. EA-6B Aircraft

1. Assume EA-6B aircraft to be transitioned based on input from NADOC dtd. 5/9/94.

2. Assume 210 day hangar dwell time per aircraft.

3. Number of workstations vary between 7 and 11 for FY95 thru FY01 based on aircraft mix provided by NADOC.

1.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform airframe workload? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase airframe capabilities? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capabilities. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

1. <u>INDUSTRIAL PLANT EQUIPMENT CHANGES:</u>

A. Additional workstands, dollies and ground support equipment for the assembly and disassembly operations would be required.

B. Repair the hangar 101 deck substructure to increase weight bearing capacity and allow heavier aircraft in affected areas.

C. Construct new hangar (approx. 100,000 sq. ft.)

2. QUANTITATIVE CHANGES TO DEPOT CAPABILITIES:

A. The hangar deck substructure repairs would increase P-3 capacity by 21 per year and the F-14 capacity by 8 per year.

B. Additional hangar would increase F-14/EA-6 capacity by 40 per year.

3. OTHER INVESTMENTS:

A. Hangar substructure repair would be $700K.

B. A new hangar is estimated to cost $10M.

4. RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI) AND PAYBACK PERIOD:

Our calculations require information not available regarding workload being processed through hypothetical facility expansion projects. This would be a net present value analysis that considers productivity improvements, process flow changes, economics of scale and current value of money assumptions. The calculation of ROI and payback period must be done within the context of the entire NADEP financial position (Product and G&A expense) and is subject to specific realignment scenarios.

1.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of airframe workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

A. Maximum potential capacity numbers shown in this data call fall within the environmental restriction limits at this NADEP.

B. Wastewater treatment facilities currently on line further reduce our non-domestic industrial wastewater discharge.

Mission Area

2. Air Launched Missiles

2.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Missile/Guidance System production that was executed and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both Systems Worked (Tables 2.1.a and 2.1.b) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 2.1.c and 2.1.d).

Table 2.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Systems Worked (Units) Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
	NOT APPLICABLE *							
Total:								

* NADEP Jacksonville has no applicable responses involving missile workload.

Table 2.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Air Launched Missiles Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Systems Worked (Units) Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE							
Total:								

2. Air Launched Missiles, continued

Table 2.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
	NOT APPLICABLE							
Total:								

Table 2.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE							
Total:								

2. Air Launched Missiles, continued

2.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion of the Missile/Guidance System production that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both Systems Worked and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 2.2.a: **Core Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Systems Worked (Units) Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:							

Table 2.2.b: **Core Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:							

2. Air Launched Missiles, continued

2.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 this NADEP could expand Missile/Guidance System operations based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of systems worked and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by missile / guidance system.

Table 2.3.a: **Maximum Potential Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Systems Worked (Units) Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:							

Table 2.3.b: **Maximum Potential Air Launched Missile Workload**

Missile/ Guidance System	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:							

2. Air Launched Missiles, continued

2.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased air launched missile workload at this NADEP.

NOT APPLICABLE

2.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform air launched missile workload? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase missile workload? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capabilities. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

NOT APPLICABLE

2.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of missile workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

NOT APPLICABLE

Mission Area

3. Components

3.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the component production, by component type, that was executed in and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both components worked (Tables 3.1.a and 3.1.b) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 3.1.c and 3.1.d).

Table 3.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		8,442	7,569	8,668	8,337	9,726	11,028	11,660	11,435
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	4	0	0	0	0	2	1
Aircraft Structural		1,842	1,728	1,663	1,026	1,152	1,039	638	458
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,941	2,382	2,312	1,828	1,810	1,873	2,059	2,417
Instruments		7,244	5,608	5,557	4,114	4,648	4,751	3,096	2,106
Landing Gear		1,926	1,345	2,053	1,501	1,290	967	553	668
Aviation Ordnance Equip		1,704	1,885	1,858	2,205	2,895	2,225	3,181	2,097
Avionics / Electronics		14,849	11,812	9,791	10,134	8,555	7,206	5,696	4,959
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		4,347	3,885	4,024	3,335	3,447	3,696	3,084	2,260
	Total:	43,295	36,218	35,926	32,480	33,523	32,785	29,969	26,401

NOTE: OTHER FUNDED - "Data not available to Commodity Detail" at NADOC. R

Mission Area

3. Components

3.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the component production, by component type, that was executed in and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both components worked (Tables 3.1.a and 3.1.b) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 3.1.c and 3.1.d).

Table 3.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		8,442	7,569	8,668	8,337	9,726	11,028	11,660	11,435
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	4	0	0	0	0	2	1
Aircraft Structural		1,842	1,728	1,663	1,026	1,152	1,039	638	458
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,941	2,382	2,312	1,828	1,810	1,873	2,059	2,417
Instruments		7,244	5,608	5,557	4,114	4,648	4,751	3,096	2,106
Landing Gear		1,926	1,345	2,053	1,501	1,290	967	553	668
Aviation Ordnance Equip		1,704	1,885	1,858	2,205	2,895	2,225	3,181	2,097
Avionics / Electronics		14,849	11,812	9,791	10,134	8,555	7,206	5,696	4,959
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		4,347	3,885	4,024	3,335	3,447	3,696	3,084	2,260
Total:		43,295	36,218	35,926	32,480	33,523	32,785	29,969	26,401

Table 3.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput							
		FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	33	1	1	0	0
Engine Components		11,765	11,237	12,176	11,877	11,864	10,842	10,317	10,317
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	1	9	6	1	1	1	1
Aircraft Structural		741	490	1,175	1,445	547	890	694	711
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,071	2,432	2,938	2,615	1,465	1,831	1,640	1,628
Instruments		2,379	1,925	1,837	1,137	984	890	838	837
Landing Gear		1,568	715	977	989	622	629	556	568
Aviation Ordnance Equip		1,102	885	2,205	1,820	1,160	1,574	965	974
Avionics / Electronics		5,612	4,867	4,515	3,772	3,648	3,401	3,115	3,112
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	54	94	81	75	71
Other		2,286	3,055	3,454	3,906	2,714	2,865	2,673	2,662
	Total:	27,524	25,607	29,286	27,654	23,100	23,005	20,874	20,881

NOTE: OTHER FUNDED - "Data not available to Commodity Detail" at NADOC. R

3. Components, continued

Table 3.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput							
		FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	33	1	1	0	0
Engine Components		11,765	11,237	12,176	11,877	11,864	10,842	10,317	10,317
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	1	9	6	1	1	1	1
Aircraft Structural		741	490	1,175	1,445	547	890	694	711
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,071	2,432	2,938	2,615	1,465	1,831	1,640	1,628
Instruments		2,379	1,925	1,837	1,137	984	890	838	837
Landing Gear		1,568	715	977	989	622	629	556	568
Aviation Ordnance Equip		1,102	885	2,205	1,820	1,160	1,574	965	974
Avionics / Electronics		5,612	4,867	4,515	3,772	3,648	3,401	3,115	3,112
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	54	94	81	75	71
Other		2,286	3,055	3,454	3,906	2,714	2,865	2,673	2,662
Total:		27,524	25,607	29,286	27,654	23,100	23,005	20,874	20,881

Table 3.1.c: Historic / Predicted Component Workload

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		225,745	211,349	253,034	240,794	235,913	263,011	306,431	302,602
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	35	0	0	0	0	13	6
Aircraft Structural		71,293	78,833	74,764	42,844	36,942	35,644	25,827	19,436
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		29,466	22,790	21,561	18,772	16,878	21,291	23,836	29,558
Instruments		84,608	61,585	64,131	50,737	51,749	43,456	25,597	24,500
Landing Gear		43,393	29,560	58,874	43,295	36,577	27,751	22,036	31,548
Aviation Ordnance Eqmt		51,125	38,448	38,051	37,699	52,435	45,847	61,311	35,956
Avionics / Electronics		149,107	132,938	121,598	136,593	132,356	126,462	129,383	140,188
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		41,709	33,014	39,104	34,418	33,503	39,767	39,391	29,087
	Total:	696,446	608,552	671,117	605,152	596,353	603,229	633,825	612,881

NOTE: OTHER FUNDED - "Data not available to Commodity Detail" at NADOC. R

3. Components, continued

Table 3.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		225,745	211,349	253,034	240,794	235,913	263,011	306,431	302,602
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	35	0	0	0	0	13	6
Aircraft Structural		71,293	78,833	74,764	42,844	36,942	35,644	25,827	19,436
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		29,466	22,790	21,561	18,772	16,878	21,291	23,836	29,558
Instruments		84,608	61,585	64,131	50,737	51,749	43,456	25,597	24,500
Landing Gear		43,393	29,560	58,874	43,295	36,577	27,751	22,036	31,548
Aviation Ordnance Eqmt		51,125	38,448	38,051	37,699	52,435	45,847	61,311	35,956
Avionics / Electronics		149,107	132,938	121,598	136,593	132,356	126,462	129,383	140,188
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		41,709	33,014	39,104	34,418	33,503	39,767	39,391	29,087
Total:		696,446	608,552	671,117	605,152	596,353	603,229	633,825	612,881

3. Components, continued

Table 3.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Component Workload**

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)							
		FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	250	78	78	0	0
Engine Components		344,442	295,321	308,087	293,479	315,134	282,468	271,655	271,819
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	6	75	181	4	4	4	4
Aircraft Structural		41,205	26,648	59,625	74,712	36,296	51,929	40,011	41,584
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		26,534	31,346	37,400	34,246	19,365	23,966	21,728	21,551
Instruments		24,257	21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302	7,864	7,833
Landing Gear		42,639	37,531	24,987	38,951	44,554	35,719	31,330	35,228
Aviation Ordnance Equip		14,913	13,300	42,254	26,771	11,774	22,554	10,078	10,242
Avionics / Electronics		173,377	111,817	109,043	116,090	136,820	98,583	100,754	98,644
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O / NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	0	310	527	454	418	399
Other		35,510	34,598	44,627	52,281	39,054	43,097	40,093	39,825
	Total:	702,877	572,308	646,052	647,670	612,736	567,154	523,935	527,129

3. Components, continued

3.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion of component production, by component type, that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both components worked and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 3.2.a: **Core Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	32	1	1	0	0
Engine Components		10,756	11,680	11,740	11,729	10,707	10,182	10,182
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Aircraft Structural		488	1,067	1,418	547	890	694	711
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,101	2,547	2,318	1,168	1,534	1,343	1,331
Instruments		1,545	1,460	811	726	632	580	579
Landing Gear		709	923	983	616	623	550	562
Aviation Ordnance Equip		800	1,970	1,694	1,078	1,492	883	892
Avionics / Electronics		4,748	4,356	3,681	3,557	3,310	3,024	3,021
Ground & ShipboardComm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	54	94	81	75	71
Other		2,577	2,741	3,299	2,118	2,267	2,075	2,064
	Total:	23,725	26,745	26,031	21,635	21,538	19,407	19,414

3. Components, continued

Table 3.2.b: **Core Component Workload**

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	236	78	78	0	0
Engine Components		280,103	291,895	289,529	311,184	278,518	267,705	267,869
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		6	6	6	4	4	4	4
Aircraft Structural		26,586	55,930	73,859	36,296	51,929	40,011	41,584
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		27,238	32,534	30,478	15,597	20,198	17,960	17,783
Instruments		18,525	16,744	7,362	6,503	5,675	5,237	5,206
Landing Gear		37,361	24,401	38,781	44,384	35,549	31,160	35,058
Aviation Ordnance Equip		12,143	37,300	24,720	10,658	21,438	8,962	9,126
Avionics / Electronics		108,526	105,375	113,289	134,019	95,782	97,953	95,843
Ground & ShipboardComm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		0	0	310	527	454	418	399
Other		28,216	34,470	43,746	30,602	34,618	31,614	31,346
	Total:	538,704	598,655	622,316	589,852	544,243	501,024	504,218

Revised pg

3.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 this NADEP could expand component operations based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of components and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by component type.

Table 3.3.a: **Maximum Potential Component Workload** **R**

Component Type		Units Throughput						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		15,417	15,432	15,438	15,408	15,416	15,411	15,411
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural		5,910	6,323	6,208	4,838	5,501	5,567	5,488
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,261	2,289	2,225	2,204	2,226	2,199	2,201
Instruments		1,925	1,837	1,137	984	890	838	837
Landing Gear		328	674	438	241	303	306	278
Aviation Ordnance Equip		5,488	4,186	5,403	7,792	5,519	7,573	7,521
Avionics / Electronics		20,899	21,146	17,076	13,940	18,066	16,203	16,535
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		1,871	1,871	1,871	1,916	1,916	1,927	1,911
Other		13,427	11,881	11,486	10,671	10,208	10,237	10,264
	Total:	67,526	65,639	61,282	57,994	60,045	60,261	60,446

3. Components, continued

3.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 this NADEP could expand component operations based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of components and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by component type.

Table 3.3.a: **Maximum Potential Component Workload**

Component Type		Units Throughput						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		15,366	15,503	15,513	15,475	15,466	15,529	15,463
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural		3,855	3,659	3,606	3,196	3,195	3,240	3,219
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		2,312	1,746	2,214	2,189	2,209	2,173	2,201
Instruments		1,649	1,561	783	634	538	484	483
Landing Gear		465	548	437	308	304	326	308
Aviation Ordnance Equip		6,047	4,139	5,344	5,985	5,476	5,432	5,451
Avionics / Electronics		21,881	23,404	17,655	19,780	20,149	20,608	19,977
Ground & Shipboard Comm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		1,894	1,894	1,808	1,914	1,918	1,928	1,911
Other		13,464	12,183	11,246	8,753	8,840	9,849	9,418
	Total:	66,933	64,637	58,606	58,234	58,095	59,569	58,431

Table 3.3.b: **Maximum Potential Component Workload** **R**

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		405,437	390,430	381,324	409,826	402,330	405,328	406,827
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural		186,447	186,107	185,977	185,983	185,983	185,983	185,983
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137
Instruments		21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302	7,864	7,833
Landing Gear		17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232
Aviation Ordnance Equip		82,470	80,216	79,468	79,091	79,091	79,091	79,091
Avionics / Electronics		465,938	496,500	506,829	508,626	509,454	508,892	509,923
Ground & ShipboardComm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740
Other		152,059	153,511	153,728	153,552	153,552	153,552	153,552
	Total:	1,371,201	1,383,827	1,374,834	1,403,317	1,395,821	1,397,819	1,400,318

Revised pg

Table 3.3.b: **Maximum Potential Component Workload** R

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		405,437	390,430	381,324	409,826	402,330	405,328	406,827
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural		321,447	321,107	320,977	320,983	320,983	320,983	320,983
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137
Instruments		21,741	19,954	10,399	9,130	8,302	7,864	7,833
Landing Gear		17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232
Aviation Ordnance Equip		82,470	80,216	79,468	79,091	79,091	79,091	79,091
Avionics / Electronics		480,141	510,703	521,032	522,829	523,657	524,095	524,126
Ground & ShipboardComm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740
Other		152,059	153,511	153,728	153,552	153,552	153,552	153,552
	Total:	1,520,404	1,533,030	1,524,037	1,552,520	1,545,024	1,548,022	1,549,521

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

REV - 26 JUL 1994

3. Components, continued

Table 3.3.b: **Maximum Potential Component Workload**

Component Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Dynamic Components		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engine Components		507,396	351,470	328,855	360,355	360,355	358,856	361,854
Blades / Vanes (Type 2)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
APU / Ground Generators		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aircraft Structural		186,932	186,592	186,462	186,468	186,468	186,468	186,468
Hydraulic / Pneumatic		29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137	29,137
Instruments		19,930	17,143	8,788	6,549	4,691	4,253	4,222
Landing Gear		17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232	17,232
Aviation Ordnance Equip		82,470	80,216	79,468	79,091	79,091	79,091	79,091
Avionics / Electronics		481,952	551,870	560,999	563,766	565,624	566,602	566,093
Ground & ShipboardComm & Electronic Equip	Radar	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Radio Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wire Comm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	EW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	NAVAIDs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	E-O/NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SC / SS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bearings		10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740	10,740
Other		139,785	141,237	141,454	141,278	141,278	141,278	141,278
	Total:	1,475,574	1,385,637	1,363,135	1,394,616	1,394,616	1,393,657	1,396,115

Revised pg

3.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased component workload at this NADEP.

A. NON-ENGINE COMPONENTS

The work position method was used in calculating the maximum of manhours per shop (work positions x 1615 x .95).

The impact of concurrent rework which is occasionally incurred from the Aircraft Programs was considered nonexistent. Concurrent rework is usually a result of non-availability of components from supply or for expediency. Since we were given the guidance to consider supply no obstacle to production, no concurrent rework would exist.

Data from the latest NADOC workload transition database was used to determine the workload mix. The categories that these components fell into was determined using a combination of PSC codes assigned to the shop workstations and the FSC in the components NSN.

The maximum number of work positions that could be gainfully occupied in a shop given unlimited equipment and skilled labor was used to calculate the maximum available hours for a shop. The latest capacity study results were used as a guideline for total shop work positions. The NADOC mix of workload was increased to fill the maximum available hours. The maximum workload mix was then divided by component HOURS/UNITS as provided by NAVAIR 04D on 7/6/94 to get units per year. **R**

Due to the complexity of analyzing the workload mix in Bulk shops, these shops were only looked at in a general way for any obvious limitations. Otherwise, Bulk shops were not considered to be a limiting factor to prime shop workload.

The maximum capacities were based on the assumption that the existing BRAC transition plans to transition equipment and execute MILCON's will occur in the appropriate time frames.

3. Components, continued

3.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased component workload at this NADEP.

A. NON-ENGINE COMPONENTS

The work position method was used in calculating the maximum of manhours per shop (work positions x 1615 x .95).

The impact of concurrent rework which is occasionally incurred from the Aircraft Programs was considered nonexistent. Concurrent rework is usually a result of non-availability of components from supply or for expediency. Since we were given the guidance to consider supply no obstacle to production, no concurrent rework would exist.

Data from the latest NADOC workload transition database was used to determine the workload mix. The categories that these components fell into was determined using a combination of PSC codes assigned to the shop workstations and the FSC in the components NSN.

The maximum number of work positions that could be gainfully occupied in a shop given unlimited equipment and skilled labor was used to calculate the maximum available hours for a shop. The latest capacity study results were used as a guideline for total shop work positions. The NADOC mix of workload was increased to fill the maximum available hours. The maximum workload mix was then divided by component HOURS/UNITS as provided by NAVAIR 04D on 5/9/94 to get units per year.

Due to the complexity of analyzing the workload mix in Bulk shops, these shops were only looked at in a general way for any obvious limitations. Otherwise, Bulk shops were not considered to be a limiting factor to prime shop workload.

The maximum capacities were based on the assumption that the existing BRAC transition plans to transition equipment and execute MILCON's will occur in the appropriate time frames.

B. ENGINE COMPONENTS AND ACCESSORIES

Capacity calculations are based upon existing facilities and structures without any significant reconfiguration or construction. Based on guidance provided, it is understood that maximum potential engine component capacity is not constrained by the requirement for additional tools, equipment or personnel. Work position driven capacity calculations were based upon a DLMH availability factor of 1615 hours, which was further reduced by a 95% facility availability factor in accordance with DoD 4151.15H, Capacity Handbook. Equipment driven capacity calculations were based upon a DLMH availability factor of 2080 hours, which was reduced by a 95% availability factor in accordance with DoD 4151.15H, Capacity Handbook. Preventive and corrective facility and equipment maintenance was assumed to be accounted for by the 95% facility availability reduction factor, or conducted outside the 40 hour work week production schedule.

Utilizing the projected FY95 engine component program workload for NADEP JAX, the data was sorted by extended manhours (quantity times workload standard). The data was then analyzed to identify the Family Item Identification Codes (FIIC) for the primary component workloads which were analyzed for capacity drivers. The top 26 FIIC's comprised 80% of the engine component workload for FY95 and were each evaluated to identify the bottleneck (work station or equipment) which defined the maximum potential capacity for that engine component. The engine program requirement for each of the 26 engine components was also evaluated to segregate the maximum potential engine component throughput units from the requirements of the maximum potential engine program throughput units. Additional major equipment required to support the maximum potential engine component capacity reflected within Tables 3.3.a and 3.3.b are identified below:

Equipment Name	Qty	Component Drivers
Vertical Balancer	4	J52 Compressors
High Speed Grinder (or 2 Engine Lathes)	1	F404 HPC Rotor
Ven Test Stand	1	F404 VEN Actuator, F404 Power Unit
Vertical Turning Center	2	F404 Case & Stator, F404 Combustion Liner

Adequate facility space is available to accommodate the additional equipment identified above through reconfiguration of existing shop layouts and use of space not currently assigned to production operations. Utilization of the existing TF41 engine shop space, approximately 6000 sq. ft., which is not required for the projected engine program workload mix is considered available for support of both engine/module and engine component programs. Approximately half of the shop space is planned for expansion of the engine machine shop.

3.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform component workload? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase component capabilities? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capabilities. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

The existing BRAC programmed changes are all that are recommended at this time. Return on Investment (ROI) and payback period calculations require information not available regarding workload being processed through hypothetical facility expansion projects. This would be a net present value analysis that considers productivity improvements, process flow changes, economies of scale and current value of money assumptions. The calculation of ROI and payback period must be done within the contest of the entire NADEP financial position (Production and G&A expense) and is subject to specific realignment scenarios such as evaluated in the Cost of Base Realignment Action (COBRA).

The additional equipment noted above would be added for the stated additional capacity. In order to expand capacity even further, additional facilities could be constructed to accommodate engine component workload. The actual size and cost of such facilities would be dependent on the type of components being supported and the volume of workload. Return on Investment (ROI) and payback period calculations require information not available regarding workload being processed through hypothetical facility expansion projects. This would be a net present value analysis that considers productivity improvements, process flow changes, economies of scale and current value of money assumptions. The calculation of ROI and payback period must be done within the context of the entire NADEP financial position (Production and G&A expense) and is subject to specific realignment scenarios such as evaluated in the Cost of Base Realignment Action (COBRA). Therefore, a quantitative increase determination, cost of facilities, payback period and return on investment cannot be made.

3.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of component workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

Primary environmental factors which may inhibit the development of component workloads is the unknown changes in emissions standards and other environmental regulations. However, NADEP JAX has been very proactive in pursuing environmentally safe process substitutions and establishing closed-loop, hazardous waste treatment plants and hazardous waste minimization projects.

Mission Area

4. Engines

4.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Engine Production, by engine type, that was executed in and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in both number of engines (units) worked (Tables 4.1.a and 4.1.b) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 4.1.c and 4.1.d).

Table 4.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Engine Workload**

Engine Type	Units Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
COMP J52 F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENG FLD TM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F404GE400	0	22	6	58	103	45	56	31
F404GE400A	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5
F404GE400C	0	0	0	37	26	62	67	128
F404GE400F	0	0	0	12	20	38	82	100
F404GE400H	0	0	0	6	23	29	73	46
F404GE400L	0	0	0	3	12	20	36	30
F404GE400S	0	0	4	2	2	16	16	14
F404GE402	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52 O/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52P408	80	77	75	79	51	43	20	16
J52P408A	0	0	0	1	41	55	81	37
J52P6B	45	64	65	86	55	11	0	0
J52P6C	0	0	0	0	9	41	20	2
J52P8B	99	128	101	95	78	96	76	56
J52P8B/C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52P8C	0	0	0	1	9	38	111	57

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Engine Type	Units Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
TF34GE400A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	42	32	36	45	39	11	0	0
TF41A2B	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A2C	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A2D	121	55	19	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A402D	40	110	70	87	78	40	16	25
Total:	456	493	376	512	546	548	657	547

4. Engines, continued

Table 4.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Engine Workload**

Engine Type	Units Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
COMP J52 F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENG FLD TM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F404GE400	32	51	46	45	39	46	36	36
F404GE400A	6	14	11	13	7	9	7	4
F404GE400C	162	105	77	30	17	13	20	9
F404GE400F	108	103	101	89	80	69	97	74
F404GE400H	31	74	90	80	63	76	68	58
F404GE400L	34	35	28	32	28	20	26	22
F404GE400S	17	33	35	93	76	60	76	60
F404GE402	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52 O/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52P408	42	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
J52P408A	38	43	24	47	28	47	45	42
J52P6B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52P6C	1	3	2	2	5	6	4	5
J52P8B	39	20	5	1	0	0	1	1
J52P8B/C	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0
J52P8C	17	54	44	34	0	0	6	5
TF34GE400A	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	1	0	50	36	52	56	55	72
TF41A2B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A2C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A2D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A402D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	532	558	527	504	396	403	442	389

4. Engines, continued

Table 4.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Engine Workload**

Engine Type	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
COMP J52 F	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENG FLD TM	0	2,417	3,349	2,560	735	16,221	391	152
F404GE400	0	1,382	16,469	38,756	66,852	37,432	43,990	27,874
F404GE400A	0	0	0	0	0	360	357	650
F404GE400C	0	0	0	22,775	35,350	17,050	18,492	30,720
F404GE400F	0	0	0	5,892	13,877	8,170	13,770	17,000
F404GE400H	0	0	0	540	2,070	2,610	5,058	3,634
F404GE400L	0	0	0	291	1,164	1,857	3,600	3,450
F404GE400S	0	0	1,648	112	112	896	848	406
F404GE402	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52 O/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52P408	78,667	99,416	85,087	92,523	47,991	39,341	19,110	15,429
J52P408A	0	0	0	1,300	46,310	58,655	112,180	35,400
J52P6B	46,530	86,775	83,965	107,644	48,392	9,620	0	0
J52P6C	0	0	0	0	8,934	39,360	24,915	1,784
J52P8B	110,645	168,405	123,097	123,408	69,442	82,836	72,405	53,348
J52P8B/C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52P8C	0	0	0	1,400	10,098	36,822	136,508	47,650
TF34GE400A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	17,895	14,720	15,480	19,350	16,029	10,118	8,993	4,216
TF41A2B	4,995	2,775	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A2C	11,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A2D	106,392	49,530	15,485	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A402D	27,027	76,335	50,820	62,529	29,640	15,200	9,824	15,350
Total:	403,351	501,755	395,400	479,080	396,996	376,548	470,441	257,063

Revised pg

Table 4.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Engine Workload** **R**

Engine Type	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
COMP J52 F	15,232	702	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENG FLD TM	6,946	8,815	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946	6,946	6,946
F404GE400	22,592	22,632	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150	19,724	19,720
F404GE400A	1,476	2,184	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733	1,347	768
F404GE400C	31,914	13,230	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024	3,108	1,392
F404GE400F	7,992	5,047	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177	5,885	4,482
F404GE400H	1,736	2,812	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544	3,160	2,694
F404GE400L	3,026	2,065	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444	1,882	1,594
F404GE400S	867	1,155	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544	3,220	2,528
F404GE402	2,824	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52 O/A	0	0	944	472	0	0	0	0
J52P408	53,100	615	1,516	1,516	756	756	756	756
J52P408A	27,538	30,345	20,396	36,916	22,236	36,196	34,436	32,396
J52P6B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52P6C	814	1,533	1,262	1,262	3,155	3,786	2,524	3,155
J52P8B	35,011	9,598	2,236	164	0	0	636	636
J52P8B/C	0	0	10,368	0	0	0	0	0
J52P8C	11,087	35,838	35,112	27,132	0	0	4,788	3,990
TF34GE400B	729	13,882	38,950	28,044	40,508	43,624	42,845	56,088
TF41A2B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A2C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A2D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A402D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	222,884	150,453	171,049	149,833	112,025	131,924	131,257	137,145

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Table 4.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Engine Workload**

Engine Type	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
COMP J52 F	15,232	702	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENG FLD TM	6,946	8,815	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946	6,946	6,946
F404GE400	22,592	22,632	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150	19,724	19,720
F404GE400A	1,476	2,184	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733	1,347	768
F404GE400C	31,914	13,230	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024	3,108	1,392
F404GE400F	7,992	5,047	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177	5,885	4,482
F404GE400H	1,736	2,812	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544	3,160	2,694
F404GE400L	3,026	2,065	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444	1,882	1,594
F404GE400S	867	1,155	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544	3,220	2,528
F404GE402	2,824	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52 O/A	0	0	944	472	0	0	0	0
J52P408	53,100	615	1,516	1,516	756	756	756	756
J52P408A	27,538	30,345	20,396	36,916	22,236	36,196	34,436	32,396
J52P6B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52P6C	814	1,533	1,262	1,262	3,155	3,786	2,524	3,155
J52P8B	35,011	9,598	2,236	164	0	0	636	636
J52P8B/C	0	0	10,368	0	0	0	0	0
J52P8C	11,087	35,838	35,112	27,132	0	0	4,788	3,990
TF34GE400A	0	13,882	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	729	0	38,950	28,044	40,508	43,624	42,845	56,088
TF41A2B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A2C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A2D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF41A402D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	222,884	150,453	171,049	149,833	112,025	131,924	131,257	137,145

4. Engines, continued

4.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Engine Production, by engine type, that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in both number of engines (units) worked and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

4.2.a: **Core Engine Workload**

Engine Type	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
F404GE400	48	46	45	39	46	36	36
F404GE400A	14	11	13	7	9	7	4
F404GE400C	105	77	30	17	13	20	9
F404GE400F	103	101	89	80	69	97	74
F404GE400H	74	90	80	63	76	68	58
F404GE400L	35	28	32	28	20	26	22
F404GE400S	33	35	93	76	60	76	60
F404GE402	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52P408	1	2	0	1	0	1	1
J52P408A	43	24	46	28	46	45	42
TF34GE400A	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	12	12	12	12	12	12
Total:	468	426	440	351	351	388	318

Table 4.2.b: **Core Engine Workload**

Engine Type	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
ENG FLD TM	8,815	6,982	6,954	6,946	6,946	6,946	6,946
F404GE400	21,300	25,208	24,660	21,356	25,150	19,724	19,720
F404GE400A	2,184	2,123	2,509	1,351	1,733	1,347	768
F404GE400C	13,230	12,012	4,680	2,648	2,024	3,108	1,392
F404GE400F	5,047	6,161	5,429	4,856	4,177	5,885	4,482
F404GE400H	2,812	4,230	3,760	2,941	3,544	3,160	2,694
F404GE400L	2,065	2,044	2,336	2,028	1,444	1,882	1,594
F404GE400S	1,155	1,505	3,999	3,244	2,544	3,220	2,528
F404GE402	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J52P408	615	1,516	0	756	0	756	756
J52P408A	30,345	20,396	35,920	22,236	35,200	34,436	32,396
TF34GE400A	7,572	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348	9,348
Total:	95,140	91,525	99,595	77,710	92,110	89,812	82,624

4. Engines, continued

4.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 this NADEP could expand engine operations based on the current and future planned work load mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of engines (units throughput) and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by engine type.

Table 4.3.a: **Maximum Potential Engine Workload**

Engine Type	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
F404GE400	246	242	240	255	247	203	180
F404GE400A	173	223	269	230	268	233	278
F404GE400C	539	492	365	320	287	349	323
F404GE400F	534	623	707	713	623	883	883
F404GE400H	430	531	628	634	627	637	733
F404GE400L	278	283	394	400	393	403	403
F404GE400S	306	311	669	675	668	678	678
J52P408	5	11	11	7	5	6	5
J52P408A	207	126	251	183	252	253	210
J52P6C	14	11	11	33	32	23	25
J52P8B	96	26	5	0	0	6	5
J52P8B/C	0	63	0	0	0	0	0
J52P8C	260	232	182	0	0	34	25
TF34GE400A	106	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	264	192	340	300	310	359
Total:	3,194	3,438	3,924	3,790	3,702	4,018	4,107

Table 4.3.b: **Maximum Potential Engine Workload**

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Engine Type	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
F404GE400	109,175	132,616	131,520	139,638	135,035	111,224	98,604
F404GE400A	26,988	43,039	51,917	44,390	51,617	44,829	53,376
F404GE400C	67,914	76,752	56,940	49,856	44,686	54,235	49,968
F404GE400F	26,166	38,003	43,127	43,279	37,692	53,598	53,510
F404GE400H	16,340	24,957	29,516	29,608	29,281	29,621	34,011
F404GE400L	16,402	20,659	28,762	28,960	28,375	29,177	29,218
F404GE400S	10,710	13,373	28,767	28,823	28,323	28,747	28,544
J52P408	3,075	8,338	8,338	5,292	3,780	4,536	3,780
J52P408A	146,080	107,075	197,135	145,320	194,065	193,596	161,973
J52P6C	7,154	6,941	6,941	20,823	20,192	14,513	15,775
J52P8B	46,070	11,627	820	0	0	3,816	2,680
J52P8B/C	0	54,432	0	0	0	0	0
J52P8C	172,562	185,136	145,236	0	0	27,132	19,950
TF34GE400A	66,886	0	0	0	0	0	0
TF34GE400B	0	205,656	149,568	264,860	233,700	241,490	279,661
Total:	715,522	928,604	878,587	800,849	806,746	836,514	831,050

4. Engines, continued

4.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased engine workload at this NADEP.

A. Maximum engine capacity within our current configuration of facilities and test cells (existing facilities) is based upon the current and future projected workload mix and provided within the Maximum Potential Engine Workload Tables 4.3.a and 4.3.b for engines by type, model, series (TMS) and/or module. Maximum engine potential capacity is based upon the assumption that full supply support is available with no bottlenecks or work stoppages occurring due to this factor. The calculations are also based upon our primary capacity limiter which is our Engine Testing Facility.

B. Total Engine Testing Facility capacity was determined by using 2080 hours [40 (hrs/wk) x 52(wks/yr)] as a standard year. The 2080 hours was multiplied by 2 to represent the total hours available in the two-cell, Engine Test Facility. Furthermore, calculations were based on a facility availability factor of 95% for the existing test cells in accordance with DoD 4151.15H, Capacity Handbook. The available capacity is therefore 3,952 hours per year.

C. In order to determine the maximum potential engine capacity, an annual multiplication factor had to be developed which insured the appropriate TMS engine mix was produced in accordance with projected engine workloads in Tables 4.1.a through 4.1.d. The factor was calculated by multiplying the quantity of each engine TMS by the minimum number of hours required to load, test and unload the engine in the test cell. The test standard was 4 hours for all TMS J52 and F404 engines. The test standard was 6 hours for all TMS TF34 engines. The total hours required to test all TMS engines for each year was totaled and divided into the maximum Engine Testing Facility hours (3,952) to determine the particular annual multiplication factor.

Sample Calculation for FY 99 Maximum Potential Engines:

Engine TMS	Projected Workload		Testing Hours		Total Test Hrs	Workload Mix		Max Capacity Factor (Note 1)		Max Potential Engines (Note 2)
F404-GE-400	46	x	4	=	184	46	x	5.37	=	247
F404-GE-402	0					0	x	5.37	=	0
J52-P-408	1	x	4	=	4	1	x	5.37	=	5
J52-P-408A	47	x	4	=	188	47	x	5.37	=	252
J52-P-6C	6	x	4	=	24	6	x	5.37	=	32
J52-P-8B	0					0	x	5.37	=	0
J52-P-8B/C	0					0	x	5.37	=	0
J52-P-8C	0					0	x	5.37	=	0
TF34-GE-400A	0					0	x	5.37	=	0
TF34-GE-400B	56	x	6	=	336	56	x	5.37	=	300
			TOTAL:		736					836

Note 1 - Max Test Hours/Annual Test Hrs = Max Capacity Factor
3952/736 = 5.37

Note 2 - Maximum potential engine workload by TMS and total is provided in Table 4.3.a.

The number of Direct Labor Manhours (DLMH) associated with the maximum potential engine workload was calculated using each year's TMS norm. The norms were determined by dividing the projected DLMH from Tables 4.1.c and 4.1.d for each TMS by the corresponding projected number of engines identified in Tables 4.1.a and 4.1.b. These norms were then multiplied by the maximum potential TMS engine workload for the respective year and the result is provided in Table 4.3.b.

The J52, F404 and TF34 engine disassembly/assembly shop space required to support the maximum engine potential workload was based upon matching the single shift Engine Testing Facility capacity. Remaining space within the Engine Processing Facility was allocated to enhancing the maximum potential capacity for F404 engine modules. Capacity calculations were based upon existing facilities and structures without any significant re-configuration or construction.

Work position driven capacity calculations were based upon a DLMH availability factor of 1615 hours, which is further reduced by a 95% facility availability factor in accordance with DoD 4151.15H, Capacity Handbook. Preventive and corrective facility and equipment maintenance was assumed to be accounted for by the 95% facility availability reduction factor, or conducted outside the 40 hour work week production schedule.

4.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform engine workload? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase engine capabilities? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capabilities. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

A. No additional major equipment is necessary. The primary investment to expand the depot's maximum potential engine capacity would be to enhance the existing two cell, Engine Testing Facility by adding an additional automated engine test cell. The addition would provide a third automated test cell and result in a corresponding increase of approximately 50% of the maximum potential engine capacity identified in Table 4.3.a, except for the F404 module workload which would remain unchanged. The estimated cost for construction of the proposed automated engine test cell is $14 million.

B. Return on Investment (ROI) and payback period calculations require information not available regarding workload being processed through hypothetical facility expansion projects. This would be a net present value analysis that considers productivity improvements, process flow changes, economies of scale and current value of money assumptions. The calculation of ROI and payback period must be done within the context of the entire NADEP financial position (Production and G&A expense) and is subject to specific realignment scenarios such as evaluated in the Cost of Base Realignment Action (COBRA).

4.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of engine workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

No other limiting factors such as AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc., are known. It is anticipated the issuance of permits would allow expanded test cell operations as described above, to continue and not inhibit further capacity development. Additional engine testing capacity may impact the maximum potential F404 module capacity identified within the engine workload tables.

Mission Area

5. Aircraft Service Support

5.1 For workload in Aircraft Service Support, by Service Type, given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide Units Throughput (where applicable) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) expended in and programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested.

Table 5.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Aircraft Service Support Workload**

Service Type		Workload (Units throughput)							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Calibration Type I									
Calibration Types II & III									
Sup-port Equip	TMDE								
	Non-avionics	NOT AVAILABLE							
Product Support									
Customer Service									
Field Teams									
Voyage Repairs									
Soft-ware	Tactical								
	Support Equip								
Other									
Total:		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5. Aircraft Service Support, continued

Table 5.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Aircraft Service Support Workload**

Service Type		Workload (Units Throughput)							
		FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Calibration Type I									
Calibration Types II & III									
Support Equip	TMDE								
	Non-avionics	NOT AVAILABLE							
Product Support									
Customer Service									
Field Teams									
Voyage Repairs									
Software	Tactical								
	Support Equip								
Other									
Total:		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Revised pg

Table 5.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Aircraft Service Support Workload** **R**

Service Type		Workload (DLMHs)							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Calibration Type I		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III		70,068	64,294	54,375	54,175	51,735	43,020	31,123	26,678
Support Equip	TMDE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Non-avionics	96,595	43,047	28,698	36,686	34,530	29,340	33,595	12,599
Product Support		312,230	291,495	335,029	438,239	523,741	535,368	598,330	655,032
Customer Service		1,968	1,964	1,517	583	11,352	13,866	256	302
Field Teams		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs		21,054	22,865	22,137	22,710	20,043	21,082	21,791	25,094
Software	Tactical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Support Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		128,140	153,674	207,265	243,717	210,036	189,130	209,441	276,647
Total:		630,055	577,339	649,021	796,110	851,437	831,806	894,536	996,352

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

5. Aircraft Service Support, continued

Table 5.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Aircraft Service Support Workload**

Service Type		Workload (DLMHs)							
		FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
Calibration Type I		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III		70,068	64,294	54,375	54,175	51,735	43,020	31,123	26,678
Support Equip	TMDE	* 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Non-avionics	* 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Product Support		312,230	291,495	335,029	438,239	523,741	535,368	598,330	655,032
Customer Service		1,968	1,964	1,517	583	11,352	13,866	256	302
Field Teams		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs		21,054	22,865	22,137	22,710	20,043	21,082	21,791	25,094
Software	Tactical	* 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Support Equip	* 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		224,735	196,721	235,963	280,403	244,566	218,470	243,036	289,246
Total:		630,055	577,339	649,021	796,110	851,437	831,806	894,536	996,352

*** Cannot be defined for 1986-1993; included in "Other".**

Revised pg

Table 5.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Aircraft Service Support Workload** **R**

Service Type		Workload (DLMHs)							
		FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Calibration Type I		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III		29,805	40,614	118,470	85,781	92,820	104,680	104,819	104,819
Support Equip	TMDE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Non-avionics	63,779	28,571	44,642	66,666	66,666	71,428	76,190	76,190
Product Support		686,307	1,210,820	1,380,493	1,494,191	1,647,926	1,498,453	1,485,440	1,485,440
Customer Service		477	645	714	943	943	943	943	943
Field Teams		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs		20,381	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software	Tactical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Support Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		223,661	594,583	413,181	383,266	389,453	388,608	372,655	372,655
Total:		1,024,410	1,997,933	2,080,200	2,153,547	2,320,508	2,186,812	2,162,747	2,162,747

N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

5. Aircraft Service Support, continued

Table 5.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Aircraft Service Support Workload**

Service Type		Workload (DLMHs)							
		FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Calibration Type I		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III		29,805	40,614	118,470	85,781	92,820	104,680	104,819	104,819
Support Equip	TMDE	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Non-avionics	63,779	28,571	44,642	66,666	66,666	71,428	76,190	76,190
[illegible]duct Support		686,307	1,210,820	1,380,493	1,494,191	1,647,926	1,498,453	1,485,440	1,485,440
[illegible]mer Service		477	645	714	943	943	943	943	943
Field Teams		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs		20,381	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software	Tactical	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Support Equip	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Other		223,661	594,583	413,181	383,266	389,453	388,608	372,655	372,655
Total:		1,024,410	1,997,933	2,080,200	2,153,547	2,320,508	2,186,812	2,162,747	2,162,747

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE Unable to identify the workload in these categories. Support Equipment (SE) Non-avionics is workload identified by the budget in this category and could be used for other SE workload such as TMDE.

5. Aircraft Service Support, continued

5.2 For workload in Aircraft Service Support, by Service Type, given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion, in Units Throughput (where applicable) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested.

Table 5.2.a: **Core Aircraft Service Support Workload**

Service Type		Workload (Units Throughput)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Calibration Type I								
Calibration Types II & III								
Support Equip	TMDE	NOT AVAILABLE						
	Non-avionics							
Product Support								
Customer Service								
Field Teams								
Voyage Repairs								
Soft-ware	Tactical							
	Support Equip							
Other								
Total:		0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5. Aircraft Service Support, continued

Table 5.2.b: **Core Aircraft Service Support Workload**

Service Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Calibration Type I		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III		33,714	101,520	68,831	75,870	87,730	87,869	87,869
Support Equip	TMDE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Non-avionics	28,571	30,642	52,666	52,666	57,428	62,190	62,190
Product Support		226,795	330,202	610,281	673,443	733,359	902,168	902,168
Customer Service		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Teams		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Voyage Repairs		122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Soft-ware	Tactical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Support Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		245,754	172,931	209,001	260,953	261,808	245,855	245,855
Total:		657,534	757,995	1,063,479	1,185,632	1,263,025	1,420,782	1,420,782

5. Aircraft Service Support, continued

5.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 you could expand Support Services based on your current/future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of units throughput (where applicable) and DLMHs that could be applied to support services at this NADEP by service type.

Table 5.3.a: **Maximum Potential Aircraft Service Support Workload**

Service Type		Workload (Units Throughput)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Calibration Type I								
Calibration Types II & III								
Sup-port Equip	TMDE	NOT AVAILABLE						
	Non-avionics							
Product Support								
Customer Service								
Field Teams								
Voyage Repairs								
Soft-ware	Tactical							
	Support Equip							
Other								
Total:		0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Revised 93

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 5.3.b: **Maximum Potential Aircraft Service Support Workload** **R**

Service Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Calibration Type I		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III		90,990	112,578	87,218	90,209	92,133	89,758	89,758
Support Equip	TMDE	64,010	42,422	67,782	64,791	62,867	65,242	65,242
	Non-avionics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Product Support		1,210,800	1,380,500	1,494,200	1,648,000	1,648,000	1,648,000	1,648,000
Customer Service (Note #1)		10,600	10,600	10,600	10,600	10,600	10,600	10,600
Field Teams (Note #2)		UNLTD	UNLTD	UNLTD	UNLTD	UNLTD	UNLTD	UNLTD
Voyage Repairs		122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Software	Tactical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Support Equip	24,500	36,700	50,800	50,800	50,800	50,800	50,800
Other		398,300	398,300	398,300	398,300	398,300	398,300	398,300
Total:		1,921,900	2,103,800	2,231,600	2,385,400	2,385,400	2,385,400	2,385,400

N/A - NOT APPLICABLE
NOTE 1 - Customer service hours are those predicted for OM&N customer funded. This work is same as component hours and maximum potential is shown in component data base.
NOTE 2 - The maximum capacity for field teams is unlimited constrained only by available personnel.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

5. Aircraft Service Support, continued

Table 5.3.b: **Maximum Potential Aircraft Service Support Workload**

Service Type		Workload (DLMHs)						
		FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Calibration Type I		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Calibration Types II & III		135,000	135,000	135,000	135,000	135,000	135,000	135,000
Sup-port Equip	TMDE	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
	Non-avionics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Product Support		1,210,800	1,380,500	1,444,200	1,648,000	1,648,000	1,648,000	1,648,000
Customer Service (Note #1)		10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Field Teams (Note #2)		UNLTD	UNLTD	UNLTD	UNLTD	UNLTD	UNLTD	UNLTD
Voyage Repairs		122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700	122,700
Soft-ware	Tactical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Support Equip	24,500	36,700	50,800	50,800	50,800	50,800	50,800
Other		398,100	398,100	398,100	398,100	398,100	398,100	398,100
Total:		1,921,100	2,103,000	2,180,800	2,384,600	2,384,600	2,384,600	2,384,600

N/A - NOT APPLICABLE
NOTE 1 - Customer service hours are those predicted for OM&N customer funded. This work is same as component hours and maximum potential is shown in component data base.
NOTE 2 - The maximum capacity for field teams is unlimited constrained only by available personnel.

5. Aircraft Service Support, continued

5.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased aircraft service support workload at this NADEP.

A. **CALIBRATION:** Calibration capacity is mainly dependent upon personnel as a significant portion is executed with Field Mod Teams. Under the basic assumptions of this data call, this area could be unlimited. In addition, in-house calibration capacity is intertwined with the Avionics Support Equipment capacity in that the workload is largely the same with different details of work and funding sources. Therefore, the bottom line is that our calibration laboratory has a maximum capacity of approximately 180K manhours, of which 25K manhours are required for in house support. This leaves 155K manhours available for calibration and avionics support equipment which is adjustable to the required mix. Since funding for these efforts is related to manhours and not units, and a units estimation would be misleading at best, the entry for a units calculation is N/A.

B. **PRODUCT SUPPORT:** Except for Test Program Set (TPS) support which would require additional depot shop space, capacity increases in the Product Support area are primarily driven by personnel. The increases in Product Support will primarily be engineering and logistics in support of the following systems: Consolidated Automated Support System (CASS) Operational Test Program Set development and off-load, E-6 TACAMO mission aircraft support; T-45 Trainer Aircraft; F-404 and F-414 engines; transfer of the F-14 and EA-6B programs from Norfolk to JAX; transfer of the P-3C aircraft and TF34 engine programs from Alameda to JAX; and transfer of the ASW (P), Bomb Racks/Launchers (T), and Air Refueling Stores (U) component cells to JAX. The projected increase also includes support for the Lead Maintenance Technology Center for the environment. An additional administration building is programmed (military construction project number P-220T) to accommodate the engineering and logistics personnel transferring to Jacksonville from closing NADEPs which accounts for the increase in product support capacity.

C. **VOYAGE REPAIR TEAM:** The Voyage Repair Team at present consists of 12 personnel and could easily be doubled given the nature of this field team service. As of October 1, 1994, the Voyage Repair effort in Norfolk (approx. 40 personnel) will come under NADEP JAX'S cognizance. Units do not apply in this application.

D. **OTHER:** The category "other" contains approximately 20 sub-elements. It includes National Aeronautics and Space Administration aircraft workload, automated data processing for the workload control system, foreign military sales (both administrative support and depot

rework of products), interservice, other Navy, capability establishment, and other miscellaneous product lines. Considering the mix of these categories, an exact determination of limitations, infrastructure, or equipment is not finitely measurable. A significant portion of these labor hours is personnel application to subject matter and administrative in nature. Constraints would vary from shop equipment and space to administrative space.

5.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform aircraft service support workload? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase service support capabilities? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capabilities. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

A. **CALIBRATION AND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT:** Additional equipment would be dependent on new peculiar support equipment (PSE) workload requirements. If significant change to equipment requirements, i.e. additional resources needed, are dictated, then infrastructure additions may be required. However, no additional Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would be needed to increase capacity of calibration and support equipment field team efforts.

B. **CUSTOMER SERVICE:** Customer service workload is driven by fleet un-programmed emergent needs. The type of workload (items) is diversified; therefore, associated equipment and space requirements cannot be identified. Also, the volume of hours normally executed in this category would not appreciably affect production rates nor create constraints during execution of scheduled workload. Increased capacity for this workload would be a trade off in other component work.

C. **VOYAGE REPAIR:** Voyage Repair Team workload assignments are not constrained by facilities or major equipment. Teams primarily use hand tools and welding equipment. The constraint to this service is number of personnel.

D. **OTHER:** Since the category "other" contains approximately 20 sub-elements that may or may not have constraints in infrastructure areas for enhanced support capabilities, requirements for infrastructure or equipment are not finitely measurable. The hardware issues would be similar, if not the same as, those described in aircraft, engines, and component sections.

E. **RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI):** Return on investment and payback period calculations require information not available regarding workload being processed through hypothetical facility expansion projects. This would be a net present value analysis that

considers productivity improvements, process flow changes, economies of scale and current value of money assumptions. The calculation of ROI and payback period must be done within the context of the entire NADEP financial position (Production and G&A expense) and is subject to specific realignment scenarios such as evaluated in the Cost of Base Realignment Action (COBRA).

Additional equipment would be dependent on new peculiar support equipment (PSE) workload requirements. Return on Investment (ROI) and payback period calculations require information not available regarding projected new workload from closing activities not yet determined.

5.6 Are there any ultimate and overriding limiting factors to expansion of this NADEP's Aircraft Service Support? If so, what are they?

There will not be any significant capacity limiting factors for this mission area. Manpower requirements are the driving factor.

5.7 Are there any environmental, legal,or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of aircraft service support workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

There are no limiting environmental, legal, or other factors that may inhibit expansion of customer service. Our closed loop wastewater treatment facilities will insulate this facility from environmental regulations which could inhibit future workload increases.

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Mission Area

6. Manufacturing

6.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the quantity of Manufacturing, by Manufacturing Process, that was executed in and programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 6.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Manufacturing Workload**

Process	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
DBOF NSF	28,844	36,638	64,992	41,940	36,791	44,671	17,310	23,147
DBOF OTHER	52,720	35,131	34,737	52,115	44,507	44,829	29,567	23,326
OTHER	31,329	8,435	12,091	76,750	125,939	11,881	84,926	52,316
Total:	112,893	80,204	111,820	170,805	207,237	101,381	131,803	98,789

Table 6.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Manufacturing Workload**

Process	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
DBOF NSF	24,904	64,200	80,400	80,395	81,682	81,682	81,682	81,682
DBOF OTHER	64,618	177,500	205,505	199,700	202,898	202,898	202,898	202,898
OTHER	42,983	99,700	90,500	87,400	88,800	88,800	88,800	88,800
Total:	132,505	341,400	376,405	367,495	373,380	373,380	373,380	373,380

NADOC IS CERTIFYING TOTALS ONLY. NADEP IS CERTIFYING BREAKOUT. R

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADOC & NADEP

Mission Area

7. Modifications

7.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, identify the modification production workload, by Type / Model / Series, that was executed in and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in both modifications worked (number of aircraft modifications incorporated as units throughput) (Tables 7.1.a and 7.1.b) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 7.1.c and 7.1.d).

Table 7.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Modifications Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Number of Aircraft Modifications Incorporated							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1993	FY 1993
	NOT AVAILABLE							
Total:								

Table 7.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Modifications Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Number of Aircraft Modifications Incorporated							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT AVAILABLE							
Total:								

7. Modifications, continued

Table 7.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Modifications Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
F/A-18	* N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	76,068	128,853	162,580	86,628
F-14	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	0	0	0
P-3	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	11,448	25,877	36,184	62,093
S-3	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	15,603	23,405	1,624	0
T-2	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	268	402	0	0
H-2	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	3,739	5,609	0	0
ENG J52	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	13,050	15,348	27,870	37,597
ENG F404	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	79,617	87,069	111,362	49,622
EP-3	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	0	0	8,298
EA-6B	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	0	0	0
Total:	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	199,793	286,563	339,620	244,238

*** N.A. - INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE**

Revised pg

Table 7.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Modifications Workload** **R**

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
F/A-18	111,238	71,879	56,079	38,945	40,942	38,642	0	0
F-14	28,953	129,902	277,072	258,795	216,012	275,012	153,170	151,910
P-3	42,885	53,974	51,438	53,004	58,892	70,670	77,342	130,352
S-3	0	0	0	20,350	27,500	13,890	7,610	0
T-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
H-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENG J52	43,869	24,587	13,343	14,147	0	0	0	0
ENG F404	30,172	33,287	20,625	20,958	0	0	0	0
EP-3	199,140	41,488	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	0	0	0	0	420	840	840	0
Total:	456,257	355,117	418,557	406,199	343,766	399,054	238,962	282,262

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY AIR-415

Table 7.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Modifications Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
F/A-18	111,238	71,879	56,079	38,945	40,942	38,642	38,642	38,642
F-14	28,953	129,902	277,072	258,795	216,012	275,012	153,170	151,910
P-3	42,885	53,974	51,438	53,004	58,892	70,670	77,342	130,352
S-3	0	0	0	20,350	27,500	13,890	7,610	0
T-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
H-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ENG J52	43,869	24,587	13,343	14,147	0	0	0	0
ENG F404	30,172	33,287	20,625	20,958	20,958	20,958	20,958	20,958
EP-3	199,140	41,488	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	0	0	0	0	420	840	840	0
Total:	456,257	355,117	418,557	406,199	364,724	420,012	298,562	341,862

Revised pg

7.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, identify the Core portion of the modification production workload, by Type / Model / Series, that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in both modifications worked (number of aircraft modifications incorporated as units throughput) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 7.2.a: **Core Modification Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Numbers of Aircraft Modifications Incorporated						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE						
Total:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 7.2.b: **Core Modifications Workload** **R**

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
F/A-18	10,782	11,216	10,515	10,236	12,365	0	0
F-14	19,485	55,414	69,875	54,003	88,004	53,610	53,169
P-3	8,096	10,288	14,311	14,723	22,614	27,070	45,623
S-3	0	0	5,495	6,875	4,445	2,664	0
ENGJ52	3,688	2,669	3,820	0	0	0	0
ENGF404	4,993	4,125	5,659	0	0	0	0
EP-3	6,223	0	0	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	0	0	0	105	269	294	0
Total:	53,267	83,712	109,675	85,942	127,697	83,638	98,792

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

7. Modifications, continued

7.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, identify the Core portion of the modification production workload, by Type / Model / Series, that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in both modifications worked (number of aircraft modifications incorporated as units throughput) and Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 7.2.a: **Core Modification Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Numbers of Aircraft Modifications Incorporated						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 7.2.b: **Core Modifications Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

7. Modifications, continued

7.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 this NADEP could expand modification operations based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of modifications and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by type, model, and series.

Table 7.3.a: **Maximum Potential Modification Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Numbers of Aircraft Modifications Incorporated						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:							

Table 7.3.b: **Maximum Potential Modifications Workload**

Type/ Model/ Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
P-3	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
F/A-18	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
F-14	77,941	166,723	155,277	129,607	165,007	91,902	91,146
EA-6B	0	0	0	252	504	504	0
J52	118,262	70,303	75,670	92,768	75,689	79,920	70,713
F404	160,564	108,513	111,768	137,037	112,533	118,187	104,796
TF34	4,569	7,102	7,853	50,524	28,380	16,709	20,966
Total:	481,336	472,641	470,568	530,188	502,113	427,222	407,621

7. Modifications, continued

7.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased aircraft modification workload at this NADEP.

A. GENERAL

Manhours based on historical average.
These figures are for mods performed at NADEP JAX in-house only.
The maximum capacity for field modifications is limited. The only restriction in this area is the number of field modifications and funding to support this program for a specific period of time.

B. P-3 AIRCRAFT

3 workstations available
25,000 manhours average per mod

C. F/A-18 AIRCRAFT

6 workstations available
1,500 manhours average per mod

D. F-14 & EA-6B AIRCRAFT

The F-14 and EA-6B aircraft maximum potential modifications workload is based on depot level manhours identified by NADOC, 5-13-94.

Methodology:

Maximum potential engine modification workload capacity was based on the assumption that all modification workload is incorporated into the engines already inducted for repair. Therefore, the number of engines requiring test remains the same and does not impact the maximum potential engine workload capacity which is driven by our automated Jet Engine Test Facility.

The maximum potential units and DLMHs for engine modifications was calculated based on norms for each engine type by fiscal year. The norm was generated by dividing the projected workload hours for each engine type by the projected number of engines by type. The norm for

each fiscal year was then applied to the maximum potential number of engines for the respective engine type to determine the maximum potential engine modification workload DLMHs.

Since TF34 projected engine modification workload DLMHs was not provided, we assumed the mod program hours would be similar to the J52 mod program. Therefore, we prorated the TF34 mod workload from the TF34 engine program using the same percentage basis as the J52 program.

7.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform aircraft modifications? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase your aircraft modification capability? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capability. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

R

ITEMS A THRU H REFER TO THE AIRCRAFT MODIFICATION PROGRAM

R

A. Additional aircraft workstands and ground support equipment for assembly and disassembly operations would be required.

B. Repair voids in hangar 101 deck to increase weight bearing potential and allow heavier aircraft in affected areas.

C. Construct new hangar (approx. 100,000 sq. ft.).

D. The void repairs would increase P-3 capacity by 2 workstations.

E. The additional hangar would increase P-3 capacity by 10 workstations or increase F/A-18, F-14, EA6B capacity by 20 workstations.

F. Void repairs cost = $700K.

G. Estimated costs for new 100,000 sq. ft. hangar would be $10M.

H. Return on Investment (ROI) and payback period calculations require information not available regarding workload being processed through hypothetical facility expansion projects. This would be a net present value analysis that considers productivity improvements, process flow changes, economics of scale and current value of money assumptions. The calculation of

each fiscal year was then applied to the maximum potential number of engines for the respective engine type to determine the maximum potential engine modification workload DLMHs.

Since TF34 projected engine modification workload DLMHs was not provided, we assumed the mod program hours would be similar to the J52 mod program. Therefore, we prorated the TF34 mod workload from the TF34 engine program using the same percentage basis as the J52 program.

7.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform aircraft modifications? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase your aircraft modification capability? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capability. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

A. Additional workstands and ground support equipment for assembly and disassembly operations would be required.

B. Repair voids in hangar 101 deck to increase weight bearing potential and allow heavier aircraft in affected areas.

C. Construct new hangar (approx. 100,000 sq. ft.).

D. The void repairs would increase P-3 capacity by 2 workstations.

E. The additional hangar would increase P-3 capacity by 10 workstations or increase F/A-18, F-14, EA6B capacity by 20 workstations.

F. Void repairs cost = $700K.

G. Estimated costs for new 100,000 sq. ft. hangar would be $10M.

H. Return on Investment (ROI) and payback period calculations require information not available regarding workload being processed through hypothetical facility expansion projects. This would be a net present value analysis that considers productivity improvements, process flow changes, economics of scale and current value of money assumptions. The calculation of ROI and payback period must be done within the context of the entire NADEP financial position (production and G&A expense) and is subject to specific realignment scenarios.

Revised 19

ROI and payback period must be done within the context of the entire NADEP financial position (production and G&A expense) and is subject to specific realignment scenarios.

R

ITEM I REFERS TO THE AIRCRAFT ENGINE MODIFICATION PROGRAM

I. The existing facility space for engine, engine module and engine modification program requirements has been allocated to maximize the potential capacity for those respective programs as reflected within tables 4.3.a, 4.3.b, 7.3.a and 7.3.b. In order to increase engine/module or engine modification capacity, additional facilities would be necessary. The primary investment would be to enhance the existing two cell, Engine Testing Facility by adding an additional automated engine test cell. The addition would provide a third automated test cell and result in a corresponding increase of approximately 50% of the maximum potential engine capacity identified in Table 4.3.a, except for the F404 module workload which would remain unchanged. The estimated cost for construction of the proposed automated engine test cell is $14 million. An additional 15,000 square feet of assembly/disassembly shop space would also be required to support the increased engine/module and engine modification program capability. The estimated cost for construction of the shop space expansion is $1.5 million.

7.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of modification workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

A. Maximum potential capacity numbers shown in this data call fall within the environmental restrictions limits at NADEP JAX.

B. Wastewater treatment facilities currently on-line further reduce our non domestic industrial wastewater discharge.

R

C. No other limiting factors such as AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc., are known. It is anticipated the issuance of permits would allow expanded test cell operations as described above, to continue and not inhibit further capacity development. Engine testing requirements associated with increased engine and engine modification programs would be accommodated by the additional facilities identified above. Maximum potential F404 module capacity identified within tables 4.3.a and 4.3.b would remain the same with the limited facility expansions proposed above.

I. No additional major equipment is necessary. The primary investment to expand the depot's maximum potential engine capacity would be to enhance the existing two cell, Engine Testing Facility by adding an additional automated engine test cell. The addition would provide a third automated test cell and result in a corresponding increase of approximately 50% of the maximum potential engine capacity identified in Table 4.3.a, except for the F404 module workload which would remain unchanged. The estimated cost for construction of the proposed automated engine test cell is $14 million.

7.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of modification workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

A. Maximum potential capacity numbers shown in this data call fall within the environmental restrictions limits at NADEP JAX.

B. Wastewater treatment facilities currently on-line further reduce our non domestic industrial wastewater discharge.

C. No other limiting factors such as AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc., are known. It is anticipated the issuance of permits would allow expanded test cell operations as described above, to continue and not inhibit further capacity development. Additional engine testing capacity may impact the maximum potential F404 module capacity identified within the engine workload tables.

Mission Area

8. Training

8.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, identify the formal training workload, by Course Identification Number (CIN), that was executed in and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both number of students (units throughput) (Tables 8.1.a and 8.1.b) and in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 8.1.c and 8.1.d) expended by the NADEP in providing the class.

Table 8.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Training Workload** **R**

CIN	Number of Students Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
N7010013	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	296	296
N7010014	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	272	272
N6020037	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	42	42
N6027093	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	22	22
N6020034	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	34	34
N6020056	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	102	102
N6008012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	12	12
N6020017	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	8	8
N6030310	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	44	44
N6030503	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	23	23
N7010003	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	24	24
N7010004	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	24	24
N7010005	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	24	24
N7010006	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	12	12
N7010011	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	24	24
N7010012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	24	24

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

Mission Area

8. Training

8.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, identify the formal training workload, by Course Identification Number (CIN), that was executed in and is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both number of students (units throughput) (Tables 8.1.a and 8.1.b) and in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 8.1.c and 8.1.d) expended by the NADEP in providing the class.

Table 8.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Training Workload**

CIN	Number of Students Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
N7010013	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	296	296
N7010014	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	272	272
6020037	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	42	42
6027093	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	22	22
6020034	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	34	34
6020056	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	102	102
6008012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	12	12
6020017	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	8	8
6030310	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	44	44
6030503	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	23	23
7010003	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	24	24
7010004	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	24	24
7010005	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	24	24
7010006	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	12	12
7010011	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	24	24
7010012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	24	24
7010007	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	32	32

K

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

CIN	Number of Students Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
N7010007	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	32	32
N7010008	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	210	210
N7010009	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	56	56
N70100010	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	110	110
Total:	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,395	1,395

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

CIN	Number of Students Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
7010008	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	210	210
7010009	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	56	56
70100010	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	110	110
Total:	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,395	1,395

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE

R

Table 8.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Training Workload** **R**

CIN	Number of Students Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
N7010013	296	560	560	560	560	560	560	560
N7010014	272	484	484	484	484	484	484	484
N6020037	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
N6027093	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
N6020034	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
N6020056	102	148	148	148	148	148	148	148
N6008012	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
N6020017	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
N6030310	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44
N6030503	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
N7010003	24	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
N7010004	24	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
N7010005	24	48	48	48	48	48	48	48
N7010006	12	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
N7010011	24	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
N7010012	24	53	53	53	53	53	53	53
N7010007	32	66	66	66	66	66	66	66
N7010008	210	212	212	212	212	212	212	212
N7010009	56	85	85	85	85	85	85	85
N70100010	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Total:	1,395	2,091	2,091	2,091	2,091	2,091	2,091	2,091

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

8. Training, continued

Table 8.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Training Workload**

CIN	Number of Students Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
N7010013	296	560	560	560	560	560	560	560
N7010014	272	484	484	484	484	484	484	484
6020037	42	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
6027093	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
6020034	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
6020056	102	148	148	148	148	148	148	148
6008012	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
6020017	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
6030310	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44
6030503	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
7010003	24	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
7010004	24	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
7010005	24	48	48	48	48	48	48	48
7010006	12	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
7010011	24	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
7010012	24	53	53	53	53	53	53	53
7010007	32	66	66	66	66	66	66	66
7010008	210	212	212	212	212	212	212	212
7010009	56	85	85	85	85	85	85	85
70100010	110	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
Total:	1,395	2,091	2,091	2,091	2,091	2,091	2,091	2,091

R

Table 8.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Training Workload** **R**

CIN	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
N7010013	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2255	1943
N7010014	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2072	1786
N6020037	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	320	276
N6027093	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	168	144
N6020034	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	259	223
N6020056	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	777	670
N6008012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	91	79
N6020017	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	61	53
N6030310	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	335	289
N6030503	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	175	151
N7010003	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
N7010004	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
N7010005	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
N7010006	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	91	79
N7010011	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
N7010012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
N7010017	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	244	210
N7010018	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1598	1376
N7010019	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	427	368
N7010010	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	838	722
* Total:	25,341	23,916	17,898	17,346	13,999	9,477	10,626	9,159

N.A. - DETAIL NOT AVAILABLE
FY92 & FY93 DETAIL CERTIFIED BY NADEP
*** TOTALS CERTIFIED BY NADOC**

Revised pg

Table 8.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Training Workload** **R**

CIN	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
N7010013	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2255	1943
N7010014	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2072	1786
6020037	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	320	276
6027093	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	168	144
6020034	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	259	223
6020056	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	777	670
6008012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	91	79
6020017	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	61	53
6030310	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	335	289
6030503	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	175	151
7010003	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
7010004	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
7010005	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
7010006	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	91	79
7010011	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
7010012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
7010017	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	244	210
7010018	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1598	1376
7010019	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	427	368
7010010	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	838	722
* Total:	25,341	23,916	17,898	17,346	13,999	9,477	10,626	9,159

N.A. - DETAIL NOT AVAILABLE
FY92 & FY93 DETAIL CERTIFIED BY NADEP
*** TOTALS CERTIFIED BY NADOC**

8. Training, continued

Table 8.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Training Workload**

CIN	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
N7010013	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2255	1943
N7010014	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2072	1786
6020037	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	320	276
6027093	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	168	144
6020034	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	259	223
6020056	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	777	670
6008012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	91	79
6020017	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	61	53
6030310	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	335	289
6030503	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	175	151
7010003	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
7010004	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
7010005	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
7010006	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	91	79
7010011	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
7010012	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	183	158
7010017	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	244	210
7010018	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1598	1376
7010019	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	427	368
7010010	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	838	722
Total:	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	10,626	9,159

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE

R

Table 8.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Training Workload** R

CIN	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
N7010013	1,885	7,391	8,804	9,711	9,710	9,780	9,780	9,780
N7010014	1,732	6,389	7,616	8,395	8,393	8,393	8,393	8,393
N6020037	267	554	660	726	728	728	728	728
N6027093	140	290	343	383	381	381	381	381
N6020034	216	449	541	594	590	590	590	590
N6020056	649	1,954	2,323	2,562	2,566	2,566	2,566	2,566
N6008012	76	158	185	211	208	208	208	208
N6020017	51	106	132	132	139	139	139	139
N6030310	280	581	686	765	763	763	763	763
N6030503	146	304	356	396	399	399	399	399
N7010003	153	449	541	594	590	590	590	590
N7010004	153	396	475	502	520	520	520	520
N7010005	153	634	752	832	832	832	832	832
N7010006	76	343	409	448	451	451	451	451
N7010011	153	660	792	872	867	867	867	867
N7010012	153	700	832	924	919	919	919	919
N7010007	204	870	1,043	1,148	1,144	1,144	1,144	1,144
N7010008	1,338	2,798	3,326	3,683	3,677	3,677	3,677	3,677
N7010009	357	1,122	1,333	1,478	1,474	1,474	1,474	1,474
N7010010	700	1,452	1,729	1,902	1,907	1,907	1,907	1,907
Total:	8,882	27,600	32,878	36,258	36,258	36,328	36,328	36,328

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 8.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Training Workload** R

CIN	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
N7010013	1,885	7,391	8,804	9,711	9,710	9,780	9,780	9,780
N7010014	1,732	6,389	7,616	8,395	8,393	8,393	8,393	8,393
6020037	267	554	660	726	728	728	728	728
6027093	140	290	343	383	381	381	381	381
6020034	216	449	541	594	590	590	590	590
6020056	649	1,954	2,323	2,562	2,566	2,566	2,566	2,566
6008012	76	158	185	211	208	208	208	208
6020017	51	106	132	132	139	139	139	139
6030310	280	581	686	765	763	763	763	763
6030503	146	304	356	396	399	399	399	399
7010003	153	449	541	594	590	590	590	590
7010004	153	396	475	502	520	520	520	520
7010005	153	634	752	832	832	832	832	832
7010006	76	343	409	448	451	451	451	451
7010011	153	660	792	872	867	867	867	867
7010012	153	700	832	924	919	919	919	919
7010007	204	870	1,043	1,148	1,144	1,144	1,144	1,144
7010008	1,338	2,798	3,326	3,683	3,677	3,677	3,677	3,677
7010009	357	1,122	1,333	1,478	1,474	1,474	1,474	1,474
7010010	700	1,452	1,729	1,902	1,907	1,907	1,907	1,907
Total:	8,882	27,600	32,878	36,258	36,258	36,328	36,328	36,328

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

R - 27 JUNE 1994

8. Training, continued

Table 8.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Training Workload**

CIN	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
N7010013	1885	7391	8804	9711	9710	9710	9710	9710
N7010014	1732	6389	7616	8395	8393	8393	8393	8393
6020037	267	554	660	726	728	728	728	728
6027093	140	290	343	383	381	381	381	381
6020034	216	449	541	594	590	590	590	590
6020056	649	1954	2323	2562	2566	2566	2566	2566
6008012	76	158	185	211	208	208	208	208
6020017	51	106	132	132	139	139	139	139
6030310	280	581	686	765	763	763	763	763
6030503	146	304	356	396	399	399	399	399
7010003	153	449	541	594	590	590	590	590
7010004	153	396	475	502	520	520	520	520
7010005	153	634	752	832	832	832	832	832
7010006	76	343	409	448	451	451	451	451
7010011	153	660	792	872	867	867	867	867
7010012	153	700	832	924	919	919	919	919
7010007	204	870	1043	1148	1144	1144	1144	1144
7010008	1338	2798	3326	3683	3677	3677	3677	3677
7010009	357	1122	1333	1478	1474	1474	1474	1474
7010010	700	1452	1729	1902	1907	1907	1907	1907
Total:	8,882	27,600	32,878	36,258	36,258	36,258	36,258	36,258

8. Training, continued

8.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, identify the Core portion of formal training workload, by Course Identification Number (CIN), that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FYs) requested in both number of students (units throughput) and in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) expended by the NADEP in providing the class.

Table 8.2.a: **Core Training Workload**

CIN	Numbers of Students Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 8.2.b: **Core Training Workload**

CIN	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

8. Training, continued

8.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 this NADEP could expand the formal training conducted, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of students and DLMHs that could be accomplished at this NADEP.

Table 8.3.a: **Maximum Potential Training Workload**

CIN	Numbers of Students Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
N7010013	560	667	736	736	739	739	739
N7010014	484	577	636	636	637	637	637
6020037	42	50	55	55	55	55	55
6027093	22	26	29	29	29	29	29
6020034	34	41	45	45	45	45	45
6020056	148	176	194	194	194	194	194
6008012	12	14	16	16	16	16	16
6020017	8	10	10	10	10	10	10
6030310	44	52	58	58	58	58	58
6030503	23	27	30	30	30	30	30
7010003	34	41	45	45	45	45	45
7010004	30	36	38	38	38	38	38
7010005	48	57	63	63	63	63	63
7010006	26	31	34	34	34	34	34
7010011	50	60	66	66	66	66	66
7010012	53	63	70	70	70	70	70
7010007	66	79	87	87	87	87	87
7010008	212	252	279	279	280	280	280
7010009	85	101	112	112	112	112	112
7010010	110	131	144	144	144	144	144
Total:	2,091	2,491	2,747	2,747	2,752	2,752	2,752

Revised Pg

Table 8.3.b: Maximum Potential Training Workload R

CIN	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
N7010013	7,391	8,804	9,711	9,711	9,755	9,755	9,755
N7010014	6,389	7,616	8,395	8,395	8,408	8,408	8,408
6020037	554	660	726	726	726	726	726
6027093	290	343	383	383	383	383	383
6020034	449	541	594	594	594	594	594
6020056	1,954	2,323	2,562	2,562	2,562	2,562	2,562
6008012	158	185	211	211	211	211	211
6020017	106	132	132	132	132	132	132
6030310	581	686	765	765	765	765	765
6030503	304	356	396	396	396	396	396
7010003	449	541	594	594	594	594	594
7010004	396	475	594	594	594	594	594
7010005	634	752	832	832	832	832	832
7010006	343	409	448	448	448	448	448
7010011	660	792	872	872	872	872	872
7010012	700	832	924	924	924	924	924
7010007	870	1,043	1,148	1,148	1,148	1,148	1,148
7010008	2,798	3,326	3,683	3,683	3,696	3,696	3,696
7010009	1,122	1,333	1,478	1,478	1,478	1,478	1,478
7010010	1,452	1,729	1,902	1,902	1,902	1,902	1,902
Total:	27,600	32,878	36,350	36,350	36,420	36,420	36,420

(R- 97-2001 TOTALS ONLY CHANGED DUE TO CALCULATION ERROR)

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

Table 8.3.b: Maximum Potential Training Workload

CIN	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
N7010013	7,391	8,804	9,711	9,711	9,755	9,755	9,755
N7010014	6,389	7,616	8,395	8,395	8,408	8,408	8,408
6020037	554	660	726	726	726	726	726
6027093	290	343	383	383	383	383	383
6020034	449	541	594	594	594	594	594
6020056	1,954	2,323	2,562	2,562	2,562	2,562	2,562
6008012	158	185	211	211	211	211	211
6020017	106	132	132	132	132	132	132
6030310	581	686	765	765	765	765	765
6030503	304	356	396	396	396	396	396
7010003	449	541	594	594	594	594	594
7010004	396	475	594	594	594	594	594
7010005	634	752	832	832	832	832	832
7010006	343	409	448	448	448	448	448
7010011	660	792	872	872	872	872	872
7010012	700	832	924	924	924	924	924
7010007	870	1,043	1,148	1,148	1,148	1,148	1,148
7010008	2,798	3,326	3,683	3,683	3,696	3,696	3,696
7010009	1,122	1,333	1,478	1,478	1,478	1,478	1,478
7010010	1,452	1,729	1,902	1,902	1,902	1,902	1,902
Total:	27,600	32,878	36,258	36,258	36,328	36,328	36,328

8. Training, continued

8.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased formal training at this NADEP.

Maximum number of students/course manhours was based on NADOC provided fiscal year manhours. Also based on NADOC manhours, NADEP JAX will need approximately 30 more instructors and additional area for 25 classrooms.

8.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what equipment would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to accomplish formal training? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase your training capability? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capability. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

New audio visual equipment - additional overhead projectors, film projectors, typewriters, furniture - tables, chairs, desks, chalk free chalkboards. Some need official training manuals to pass to students. Classrooms without interruptions - A lot of classrooms are open bay, would need closed-in classrooms. If any additional classes (B-shift) are included all would have to be stocked with furniture, audio visual equipment, etc.

8.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of training workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

NONE

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Mission Area

9. Workload Summary

9.1 Predicted Workload Variance. Bring forward the information from Tables "#.1" and "#.3" of Sections 1 through 8 above into the Tables below and calculate the variance between projected and potential workloads.

Table 9.1.a: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1995** **R**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	64	112	48	929,794	1,459,042	529,248
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	25,607	67,526	41,919	572,308	1,520,404	948,096
Engines	558	3,194	2,636	150,453	715,552	565,099
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,997,933	1,921,900	-76,033
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	341,400	241,203	-100,197
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	355,117	481,336	126,219
Training	2,091	2,091	0	27,600	27,600	0
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	4,374,605	6,367,037	1,992,432

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

Mission Area

9. Workload Summary

9.1 Predicted Workload Variance. Bring forward the information from Tables "#.1" and "#.3" of Sections 1 through 8 above into the Tables below and calculate the variance between projected and potential workloads.

Table 9.1.a: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1995**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	64	112	48	929,794	1,391,802	462,008
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	25,607	66,933	41,326	572,308	1,475,574	903,266
Engines	558	3,194	2,636	150,453	715,552	565,099
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,997,933	1,921,100	-76,833
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	341,400	241,203	-100,197
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	355,117	481,336	126,219
Training	2,091	2,091	0	27,600	27,600	0
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	4,374,605	6,254,167	1,879,562

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 9.1.b: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1996**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	75	130	55	1,302,647	2,019,176	716,529
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	29,286	65,639	36,353	646,052	1,533,030	886,978
Engines	527	3,438	2,911	171,049	928,604	757,555
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A	N.A.	2,080,200	2,103,800	23,600
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	376,405	241,203	-135,202
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	418,557	472,641	54,084
Training	2,091	2,491	400	32,878	32,878	0
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	5,027,788	7,331,332	2,303,544

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.1.b: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1996**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	75	130	55	1,302,647	2,019,176	716,529
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	29,286	64,637	35,351	646,052	1,385,637	739,585
Engines	527	3,438	2,911	171,049	928,604	757,555
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A	N.A.	2,080,200	2,103,000	22,800
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	376,405	241,203	-135,202
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	418,557	472,641	54,084
Training	2,091	2,491	400	32,878	32,878	0
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	5,027,788	7,183,139	2,155,351

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

Table 9.1.c: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1997** R

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	71	120	49	1,360,089	1,854,567	494,478
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	27,654	61,282	33,628	647,670	1,524,037	876,367
Engines	504	3,924	3,420	149,833	878,587	728,754
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2,153,547	2,231,600	78,053
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	367,495	241,203	-126,292
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	406,199	470,568	64,369
Training	2,091	2,747	656	36,258	36,350	92
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	5,121,091	7,236,912	2,115,821

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.1.c: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1997**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	71	120	49	1,360,089	1,854,567	494,478
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	27,654	58,606	30,952	647,670	1,363,135	715,465
Engines	504	3,924	3,420	149,833	878,587	728,754
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2,153,547	2,180,800	27,253
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	367,495	241,203	-126,292
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	406,199	470,568	64,369
Training	2,091	2,747	656	36,258	36,258	0
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	5,121,091	7,025,118	1,904,027

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 9.1.d: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1998** R

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	71	118	47	1,309,587	1,750,374	440,787
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	23,100	57,994	34,894	612,736	1,552,520	939,784
Engines	396	3,790	3,394	112,025	800,849	688,824
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2,320,508	2,385,400	64,892
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	373,380	241,203	-132,177
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	343,766	530,188	186,422
Training	2,091	2,747	656	36,258	36,350	92
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	5,108,260	7,296,884	2,188,624

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.1.d: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1998**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	71	118	47	1,309,587	1,683,134	373,547
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	23,100	58,234	35,134	612,736	1,394,616	781,880
Engines	396	3,790	3,394	112,025	800,849	688,824
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2,320,508	2,384,600	64,092
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	373,380	241,203	-132,177
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	364,724	530,188	165,464
Training	2,091	2,747	656	36,258	36,258	0
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	5,129,218	7,070,848	1,941,630

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

Table 9.1.e: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1999** R

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	68	115	47	1,250,438	1,641,063	390,625
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	23,005	60,045	37,040	567,154	1,545,024	977,870
Engines	403	3,702	3,299	131,924	806,746	674,822
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A	2,186,812	2,385,400	198,588
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	373,380	241,203	-132,177
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	399,054	502,113	103,059
Training	2,091	2,752	661	36,328	36,420	92
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	4,945,090	7,157,969	2,212,879

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.1.e: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1999**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	68	115	47	1,250,438	1,641,063	390,625
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	23,005	58,095	35,090	567,154	1,394,616	827,462
Engines	403	3,702	3,299	131,924	806,746	674,822
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A	2,186,812	2,384,600	197,788
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	373,380	241,203	-132,177
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	420,012	502,113	82,101
Training	2,091	2,752	661	36,258	36,328	70
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	4,965,978	7,006,669	2,040,691

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

Table 9.1.f: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 2000** R

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	66	117	51	1,200,401	1,670,941	470,540
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	20,874	60,261	39,387	523,935	1,548,022	1,024,087
Engines	442	4,018	3,576	131,257	836,514	705,257
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2,162,747	2,385,400	222,653
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	373,380	241,203	-132,177
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	238,962	427,222	188,260
Training	2,091	2,752	661	36,328	36,420	92
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	4,667,010	7,145,722	2,478,712

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.1.f: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 2000**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	66	119	53	1,200,401	1,636,466	436,065
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	20,874	59,569	38,695	523,935	1,393,657	869,722
Engines	442	4,018	3,576	131,257	836,514	705,257
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2,162,747	2,384,600	221,853
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	373,380	241,203	-132,177
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	298,562	427,222	128,660
Training	2,091	2,752	661	36,258	36,328	70
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	4,726,540	6,955,990	2,229,450

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised 19

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 9.1.g: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 2001** **R**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	66	116	50	1,221,432	1,656,002	434,570
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	20,881	60,446	39,565	527,129	1,549,521	1,022,392
Engines	389	4,107	3,718	137,145	831,050	693,905
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2,162,747	2,385,400	222,653
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	373,380	241,203	-132,177
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	282,262	407,621	125,359
Training	2,091	2,752	661	36,328	36,420	92
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	4,740,423	7,107,217	2,366,794

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.1.g: **PREDICTED WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 2001**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	66	116	50	1,221,432	1,621,527	400,095
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	20,881	58,431	37,550	527,129	1,396,115	868,986
Engines	389	4,107	3,718	137,145	831,050	693,905
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	2,162,747	2,384,600	221,853
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	373,380	241,203	-132,177
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	341,862	407,621	65,759
Training	2,091	2,752	661	36,258	36,328	70
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	4,799,953	6,918,444	2,118,491

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

9.2 Core Workload Variance. Bring forward the information from Tables "#.2" and "#.3" of Sections 1 through 8 above into the Tables below and calculate the variance between projected and potential workloads.

Table 9.2.a: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1995** **R**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	25	112	87	477,980	1,459,042	981,062
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	23,725	67,526	43,801	538,704	1,520,404	981,700
Engines	468	3,194	2,726	95,140	715,552	620,412
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	657,534	1,921,900	1,264,366
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	337,700	241,203	-96,497
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	53,268	481,336	428,068
Training	0	2,091	2,091	0	27,600	27,600
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	2,160,326	6,367,037	4,206,711

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

9. Workload Summary, continued

9.2 Core Workload Variance. Bring forward the information from Tables "#.2" and "#.3" of Sections 1 through 8 above into the Tables below and calculate the variance between projected and potential workloads.

Table 9.2.a: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1995**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	25	112	87	477,980	1,391,802	913,822
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	23,725	66,933	43,208	538,704	1,475,574	936,870
Engines	468	3,194	2,726	95,140	715,552	620,412
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	657,534	1,921,100	1,263,566
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	337,700	241,203	-96,497
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	481,336	481,336
Training	0	2,091	2,091	0	27,600	27,600
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	2,107,058	6,254,167	4,147,109

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 9.2.b: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1996** R

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	36	130	94	679,581	2,019,176	1,339,595
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	26,745	65,639	38,894	598,655	1,533,030	934,375
Engines	426	3,438	3,012	91,525	928,604	837,079
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A	N.A.	757,995	2,103,800	1,345,805
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	374,005	241,203	-132,802
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	83,712	472,641	388,929
Training	0	2,491	2,491	0	32,878	32,878
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	2,585,473	7,331,332	4,745,859

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.2.b: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1996**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	36	130	94	679,581	2,019,176	1,339,595
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	26,745	64,637	37,892	598,655	1,385,637	786,982
Engines	426	3,438	3,012	91,525	928,604	837,079
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A	N.A.	757,995	2,103,000	1,345,005
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	374,005	241,203	-132,802
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	472,641	472,641
Training	0	2,491	2,491	0	32,878	32,878
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	2,501,761	7,183,139	4,681,378

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

Table 9.2.c: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1997** R

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	35	120	85	773,104	1,854,567	1,081,463
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	26,031	61,282	35,251	622,316	1,524,037	901,721
Engines	440	3,924	3,484	99,595	878,587	778,992
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,063,479	2,231,600	1,168,121
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	365,195	241,203	-123,992
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	109,675	470,568	360,893
Training	0	2,747	2,747	0	36,350	36,350
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	3,033,364	7,236,912	4,203,548

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.2.c: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1997**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	35	120	85	773,104	1,854,567	1,081,463
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	26,031	58,606	32,575	622,316	1,363,135	740,819
Engines	440	3,924	3,484	99,595	878,587	778,992
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,063,479	2,180,800	1,117,321
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	365,195	241,203	-123,992
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	470,568	470,568
Training	0	2,747	2,747	0	36,258	36,258
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	2,923,689	7,025,118	4,101,429

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 9.2.d: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1998** R

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	35	118	83	739,250	1,750,374	1,011,124
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	21,635	57,994	36,359	589,852	1,552,520	962,668
Engines	351	3,790	3,439	77,710	800,849	723,139
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,185,632	2,385,400	1,199,768
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	371,043	241,203	-129,840
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	85,942	530,188	444,246
Training	0	2,747	2,747	0	36,350	36,350
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	3,049,429	7,296,884	4,247,455

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.2.d: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1998**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	35	118	83	739,250	1,683,134	943,884
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	21,635	58,234	36,599	589,852	1,394,616	804,764
Engines	351	3,790	3,439	77,710	800,849	723,139
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,185,632	2,384,600	1,198,968
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	371,043	241,203	-129,840
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	530,188	530,188
Training	0	2,747	2,747	0	36,258	36,258
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	2,963,487	7,070,848	4,107,361

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 9.2.e: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1999** **R**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	32	115	83	694,433	1,641,063	946,630
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	21,538	60,045	38,507	544,243	1,545,024	1,000,781
Engines	351	3,702	3,351	92,110	806,746	714,636
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A	1,263,025	2,385,400	1,122,375
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	371,043	241,203	-129,840
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	127,697	502,113	374,416
Training	0	2,752	2,752	0	36,420	36,420
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	3,092,551	7,157,969	4,065,418

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.2.e: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 1999**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	32	115	83	694,433	1,641,063	946,630
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	21,538	58,095	36,557	544,243	1,394,616	850,373
Engines	351	3,702	3,351	92,110	806,746	714,636
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A	1,263,025	2,384,600	1,121,575
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	371,043	241,203	-129,840
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	502,113	502,113
Training	0	2,752	2,752	0	36,328	36,328
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	2,964,854	7,006,669	4,041,815

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.2.f: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 2000**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	34	119	85	724,311	1,636,466	912,155
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	19,407	59,569	40,162	501,024	1,393,657	892,633
Engines	388	4,018	3,630	89,812	836,514	746,702
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,420,782	2,384,600	963,818
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	371,043	241,203	-129,840
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	427,222	427,222
Training	0	2,752	2,752	0	36,328	36,328
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	3,106,972	6,955,990	3,849,018

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised pg

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 9.2.g: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 2001** **R**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	33	116	83	713,090	1,656,002	942,912
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	19,414	60,446	41,032	504,218	1,549,521	1,045,303
Engines	318	4,107	3,789	82,624	831,050	748,426
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,420,782	2,385,400	964,618
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	371,043	241,203	-129,840
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	98,792	407,621	308,829
Training	0	2,752	2,752	0	36,420	36,420
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	3,190,549	7,107,217	3,916,668

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

9. Workload Summary, continued

Table 9.2.g: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 2001**

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	33	116	83	713,090	1,621,527	908,437
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	19,414	58,431	39,017	504,218	1,396,115	891,897
Engines	318	4,107	3,789	82,624	831,050	748,426
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,420,782	2,384,600	963,818
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	371,043	241,203	-129,840
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0	407,621	407,621
Training	0	2,752	2,752	0	36,328	36,328
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	3,091,757	6,918,444	3,826,687

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

Revised 19

Features and Capabilities

10 Facility Measures

10.1 For the following Category Code Numbers (CCN), provide the adequate, substandard, and inadequate facility quantities in thousands of square feet (KSF) per condition category within each entry.

Table 10.1.a: **Facility Conditions** **R**

CCN	Facility Type	Condition			Comments
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
211-03	Corrosion Control Hangar	0	0	0	
211-04 thru 211-07	Maintenance Hangar	0	0	0	
211-10 thru 211-14	Overhaul/Repair/ Corrosion Shops	409.2	0	0	
211-20 thru 211-27	Aircraft Engine Shops	174.7	0	0	
	Table 10.1.a Total	583.9	0	0	

Features and Capabilities

10 Facility Measures

10.1 For the following Category Code Numbers (CCN), provide the adequate, substandard, and inadequate facility quantities in thousands of square feet (KSF) per condition category within each entry.

Table 10.1.a: **Facility Conditions**

CCN	Facility Type	Condition			Comments
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
211-03	Corrosion Control Hangar	0	0	0	
211-04 thru 211-07	Maintenance Hangar	0	0	0	
211-10 thru 211-14	Overhaul/Repair/ Corrosion Shops	409.2	0	0	
211-20 thru 211-27	Aircraft Engine Shops	174.7	0	0	
	Table 10.1.a Total	583.9	0	0	

10. Facility Measures, continued

Table 10.1.b: **Facility Conditions**

CCN	Facility Type	Condition			Comments
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
211-30 thru 211-39	Engine Accessory and Component Shops	312.5	0	0	
211-40 thru 211-44	Electronics/ Avionics Shops	85.3	0	0	
211-50 thru 211-53	Aircraft Weapons Shops	8.7	1.1	0	
211-60 thru 211-64	Support Equipment Shops	29.2	0	0	
211-70 thru 211-76	Manufacturing and Repair Shops	205.7	0	0	
Table 10.1.b Total		641.4	1.1	0	

Revised pg

Table 10.1.b: **Facility Conditions** **R**

CCN	Facility Type	Condition			Comments
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
211-30 thru 211-39	Engine Accessory and Component Shops	312.5	0	0	
211-40 thru 211-44	Electronics/ Avionics Shops	85.3	0	0	
211-50 thru 211-53	Aircraft Weapons Shops	8.7	1.1	0	
211-60 thru 211-64	Support Equipment Shops	29.2	0	0	
211-70 thru 211-76	Manufacturing and Repair Shops	205.8	0	0	
	Table 10.1.b Total	641.5	1.1	0	

Revised pg

Table 10.1.c: **Facility Conditions** **R**

CCN	Facility Type	Condition			Comments
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
211-80 thru 211-87 211-92 211-94 211-98 211-99	Test and Calibration Shops	83.5	0	0	
211-83 thru 211-89 211-92 211-94 211-98 211-99	Test Facilities	0	0	0	
211-90 211-93 211-97	Other Support	96.5	0	0	
211-95 211-96	Storage Facilities	133.8	0.7	30.8	
	Table 10.1.c Total	313.8	0.7	30.8	
	Table 10.1.a Total	583.9	0	0	
	Table 10.1.b Total	641.5	1.1	0	
Activity Total		1,539.2	1.8	30.8	

10. Facility Measures, continued

Table 10.1.c: **Facility Conditions**

CCN	Facility Type	Condition			Comments
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
211-80 thru 211-87 211-92 211-94 211-98 211-99	Test and Calibration Shops	83.5	0	0	
211-83 thru 211-89 211-92 211-94 211-98 211-99	Test Facilities	0	0	0	
211-90 211-93 211-97	Other Support	90.5	0	0	
211-95 211-96	Storage Facilities	133.8	0.7	30.8	
	Table 10.1.c Total	307.8	.07	30.8	
	Table 10.1.a Total	583.9	0	0	
	Table 10.1.b Total	641.4	1.1	0	
Activity Total		1,533.1	1.8	30.8	

10. Facility Measures, continued

10.2 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 identified in Tables 10.1.a through 10.1.c, above where inadequate facilities are identified provide the following information:

a. Facility type/code:
b. What makes it inadequate?
c. What use is being made of the facility?
d. What is the cost to upgrade the facility to substandard?
e. What other use could be made of the facility and at what cost?
f. Current improvement plans and programmed funding:
g. Has this facility condition resulted in C3 or C4 designation on your BASEREP?

ANSWERS:

a. Storage facilities / 211-95 & 211-96
b. Many of the storage facilities are of galvanized steel construction - due to age and weather deterioration the roof support columns and siding have rusted and require replacement. Technologically obsolete engine test cells are also utilized for storage. The walls are cracked and the roof requires replacement.
c. Still used for storage
d. $1.78M
e. None in present condition
f. None
g. No

Revised pg

10.3 Identify the facility and equipment values for your activity in the Table below, as executed and budgeted for the period requested. As applied herein:

- Maintenance of Real Property (MRP) is the budgetary term gathering the expenses or budget requirements for facility work and includes recurring maintenance, major repairs and 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) refer to incorporates Class 2 Real Property and is the hypothetical dollar amount required to replace a Class 2 facility in kind at today's dollars (e.g.: the cost today to replace an existing wood frame barracks with another barracks, also wood frame).

- Acquisition Cost of Equipment (ACE) reports the total cumulative acquisition cost of all "Personal Property" equipment which includes the cost of installed equipments directly related to mission execution (such as lab test equpiment). Class 2 installed capital equipment which is integral to the facility should not be reported as ACE.

Table 10.3: **Expenditures and Equipment Values** **R**

FY	MRP ($ K)	CPV ($ K)	ACE ($ K)
1986	3,455	162,900	N.A.
1987	3,045	169,400	N.A.
1988	4,222	208,000	N.A.
1989	2,902	246,600	N.A.
1990	4,235	266,200	N.A.
1991	2,996	285,300	N.A.
1992	3,547	285,500	N.A.
1993	4,889	293,100	122,703
1994	4,496	311,600	112,063
1995	4,199	316,100	115,201
1996	5,215	348,200	118,542
1997	4,637	358,000	122,098

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

10. Facility Measures, continued

10.3 Identify the facility and equipment values for your activity in the Table below, as executed and budgeted for the period requested. As applied herein:

- Maintenance of Real Property (MRP) is the budgetary term gathering the expenses or budget requirements for facility work and includes recurring maintenance, major repairs and 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) refer to incorporates Class 2 Real Property and is the hypothetical dollar amount required to replace a Class 2 facility in kind at today's dollars (e.g.: the cost today to replace an existing wood frame barracks with another barracks, also wood frame).

- Acquisition Cost of Equipment (ACE) reports the total cumulative acquisition cost of all "Personal Property" equipment which includes the cost of installed equipments directly related to mission execution (such as lab test equpiment). Class 2 installed capital equipment which is integral to the facility should not be reported as ACE.

Table 10.3: **Expenditures and Equipment Values**

FY	MRP ($ K)	CPV ($ K)	ACE ($ K)
1986	3,455	162,900	N.A.
1987	3,045	169,400	N.A.
1988	4,222	208,000	N.A.
1989	2,902	246,600	N.A.
1990	4,235	266,200	N.A.
1991	2,996	285,300	N.A.
1992	3,547	285,500	N.A.
1993	4,889	293,100	121,702
1994	4,496	311,600	112,063
1995	4,199	316,100	114,977
1996	5,215	348,200	118,311
1997	4,637	369,400	121,860

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE

Revised pg

Features and Capabilities

11. Manpower Factors

11.1 For the following Shops and Work Stations, provide your most current work force summary broken out in the categories below. Add other critical Shops/Work Stations and their work force make-up below the listed facility types.

Table 11.1: **Manpower Factors** **R**

Facility Type	Work Force Breakout			
	Management	Leadingmen	Journeymen	Apprentices
Corrosion Control Hangar	0	0	0	0
Maintenance Hangar	0	0	0	0
Overhaul / Repair / Corrosion Shops	9	24	594	0
Aircraft Engine Shops	2	7	154	0
Engine Accessory and Component Shops	0	10	301	0
Electronics / Avionics Shops	3	5	140	0
Aircraft Weapons Shops	0	1	15	0
Support Equipment Shops	0	0	94	0
Manufacturing and Repair Shops	2	9	182	0
Test and Calibration Shops	1	1	22	0
Storage Facilities	0	0	0	0
(1) Activity Total:	17	57	1,502	0

Features and Capabilities

11. Manpower Factors

11.1 For the following Shops and Work Stations, provide your most current work force summary broken out in the categories below. Add other critical Shops/Work Stations and their work force make-up below the listed facility types.

Table 11.1: **Manpower Factors**

Facility Type	Work Force Breakout			
	Management	Leadingmen	Journeymen	Apprentices
Corrosion Control Hangar	0	0	0	0
Maintenance Hangar	0	0	0	0
Overhaul / Repair / Corrosion Shops	9	24	594	0
Aircraft Engine Shops	2	7	154	0
Engine Accessory and Component Shops	0	10	301	0
Electronics / Avionics Shops	3	5	140	0
Aircraft Weapons Shops	0	1	15	0
Support Equipment Shops	0	0	94	0
Manufacturing and Repair Shops	2	9	182	0
Test and Calibration Shops	1	1	22	0
Storage Facilities	0	0	0	0
(1) Activity Total:	17	57	1,502	0

Revised pg

Features and Capabilities

12. Space for Industrial Support

12.1 Identify space available for expansion by building type for those facility category code numbers (CCNs) (five digits) that are most important to your mission. An activity's expansion capability is a function of its ability to reconfigure / rehabilitate existing underutilized facilities to accept new or increased requirements.

Table 12.1: **Space Available for Expansion** **R**

Building ID / Type	CCN	Installation Space (KSF)			Total
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
A/C REWORK SHOP	211-32	0	0	25	25
ORDNANCE SHOP	211-32	0	1.1	1.1	2.2
	Total:	0	1.1	26.1	27.2

12.2 Expansion Potential. For the spaces identified above as available for expansion, identify what may be the appropriate uses for those spaces.

211-32 Old plating shop being demolished could accommodate repair of components.

211-32 Weapons Range Bldg 101P currently 211-83 could be refurbished to accommodate component repair.

Features and Capabilities

12. Space for Industrial Support

12.1 Identify space available for expansion by building type for those facility category code numbers (CCNs) (five digits) that are most important to your mission. An activity's expansion capability is a function of its ability to reconfigure / rehabilitate existing underutilized facilities to accept new or increased requirements.

Table 12.1: **Space Available for Expansion**

Building ID / Type	CCN	Installation Space (KSF)			Total
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
A/C REWORK SHOP	211-32	0	0	25	25
ORDNANCE SHOP	211-32	0	1.1	1.1	1.1
	Total:	0	1.1	26.1	26.1

12.2 Expansion Potential. For the spaces identified above as available for expansion, identify what may be the appropriate uses for those spaces.

211-32 Old plating shop being demolished could accommodate repair of components.

211-32 Weapons Range Bldg 101P currently 211-83 could be refurbished to accommodate component repair.

12. Space for Industrial Support, continued

12.3 What is the actual quantity in total SF of applicable floor space in appropriate structures for facilities to perform industrial support functions? What is the planned requirement (to support planned aircraft maintenance and modification over the next five years) in total SF of applicable floor space in appropriate structures for facilities to perform industrial support functions? Given the foregoing, what is the surplus physical space in total SF of applicable floor space in appropriate structures for facilities to perform industrial support functions?

Table 12.3: **Industrial Support Physical Space**

Categories of Space	Actual Capacity (SF)	Required Capacity (SF)	Surplus Capacity (SF)
Office, warehouse, and external storage for procurement, storage, security, issue, packaging, and shipment, etc.	165,339	215,339	0
Office space for command, management, and administrative, etc.	193,907	293,907	0
Office space for drafting, work planning, engineering, and computer aided design, etc.	3,355	3,355	0
Storage for technical manuals and drawings of equipment and components for life-cycle management, etc.	5,499	5,499	0
Activity Total	368,100	518,100	0

12. Physical Space for Industrial Support

12.4 Identify in the table below the real estate resources which have the potential to facilitate future development and for which you are the plant account holder 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. 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" areas that are 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 "Other" entry (e.g. "submerged lands").

Table 12.4: **Real Estate Resources**

Site Location: NAS JACKSONVILLE

Land Use	Total Acres	Developed Acreage	Available for Development	
			Restricted	Unrestricted
Maintenance	27.5	6.2	0.3	21.0
Operational	0	0	0	0
Training	0	0	0	0
R & D	0	0	0	0
Supply & Storage	0	0	0	0
Admin	0	0	0	0
Housing	0	0	0	0
Recreational	0	0	0	0
Navy Forestry Program	0	0	0	0
Navy Agricultural Outlease Program	0	0	0	0
Hunting/Fishing Programs	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
Total:	27.5	6.2	0.3	21.0

Features and Capabilities

13. Facility Limitations

13.1 Provide the maximum number of units that can be simultaneously worked in the present NADEP facilities. Provide the maximum number of units that could be simultaneously worked in the NADEP if it were expanded to maximum production capability.

Table 13.1: **Production Maximums**

Commodity Type	Number of Units Simultaneously Worked		
	Present Configuration	Maximum Production	Limiting Factors
Airframes	67	67	
Missiles	0	0	
Components	886	921	Existing BRAC programmed changes
Engines	242	242	Test Cell Capacity plus floor space
Aircraft Service Support	0	0	
Manufacturing	0	0	
Modifications	0	0	
Training	0	0	

13.2 What recruiting, staffing, hiring limits, apprenticeship training, industrial work standards, promotion policies, personnel support facilities, etc., constrain the productive output of the facility?

Only constraints are personnel/equipment/program movement imposed by BRAC-93 monetary/execution policies.

Features and Capabilities

14. Regional Maintenance Concept

14.1 If applicable, describe your activity's role, relationships, and functions under the Regional Maintenance Concept (RMC). Based on your current workload mix and capabilities, provide details on anticipated annual throughput associated with the RMC (workload transfers both in and away from your activity). For gained workload, report only workload projected in addition to workload identified previously in this Data Call. Utilize the applicable Joint Cross Service Group-Depot Maintenance Commodities Group List (provided at the beginning of this Data Call) as a base line for grouping workload. Add additional categories/commodity areas as required. Provide your answer by Units Throughput (as applicable) and Direct Labor Man Hours in the tables below. Identify the activity from which or into which the workload is expected to transfer in the last column.

The Regional Maintenance Concept is in its earliest stages. The Southeast Region is unique in that it has only one major industrial facility. It is the ideal laboratory because it has all communities surface, subsurface ground and aviation as well as all levels of maintenance "I", "O", and "D". As the only major industrial facility in the region NADEP Jacksonville expects to see increases of workload in the following areas; Calibration, Plating, MIS management, Painting and Stripping, Gas Turbine Engines, and Avionics/Electronics.

NADEP Jacksonville is actively involved in the Regional Maintenance Center concept for the southeast region. The NADEP is currently participating in, and chairing, a number of Process Action Teams (PAT) and Quality Management Boards.

The initial meetings of the Capabilities PAT focused on the potential consolidation candidates in the region. These candidates were then classified by their potential for consolidation and ranked into three categories. These categories were identified as high, medium, and low potential. The high and medium candidates are in the analysis process with preliminary reports due in the June/July time frame. The low potential candidates will follow.

The NADEP currently has members seated on the Capabilities PAT and numerous sub-PATs such as:

* **Calibration**
* **Battery (Aviation/Sea/Shore)**
* **Optic Repair**
* **Communication (Local Area Network)**

Table 14.1: **Workload Transfers Resulting From RMC**

Commodity Group	Workload (Units Throughput)							Losing / Gaining Activity
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	
	NOT AVAILABLE							
Total:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Table 14.2: **Workload Transfers Resulting From RMC**

Commodity Group	Workload (DLMHs)							Losing / Gaining Activity
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	
	NOT AVAILABLE							
Total:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Activity Listing:

Type	Title	Location
Naval Aviation Depot	NADEP Cherry Point	MCAS Cherry Point NC
Naval Aviation Depot	NADEP Jacksonville	NAS Jacksonville FL
Naval Aviation Depot	NADEP North Island	NAS North Island CA

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT THIRTEEN

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

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR AVIATION INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITIES
Title — 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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

NAME (Please type or print) — Signature

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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

NAME (Please type or print) — Signature

COMMANDER — 20 Dec 94
Title — 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) — Signature

Title — 1/5/95
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT THIRTEEN

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

11/8/94
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

CAPACITY ANALYSIS:
Amendment One
DATA CALL #8 WORK SHEET FOR NAVAL AVIATION DEPOTS

Questions for the Activities

Category	**Industrial Activities**
Type	**Naval Aviation Depots (NADEPs)**
Claimant	**COMNAVAIRSYSCOM**

Notes:
In the context of this Data Call:

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 NADEP 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. Core workloads are to be calculated 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").

If any responses are classified, so annotate the applicable question and include those responses in a separate classified annex.
This document has been prepared in WordPerfect 5.1/5.2.

CAPACITY ANALYSIS:
Amendment One
DATA CALL #8 WORK SHEET FOR NAVAL AVIATION DEPOTS

Questions for the Activities

Table of Contents

Mission Area 3

1. Dynamic Components Workload 3

2. Rotor Blades Workload 11

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

Primary UIC: N65886
(Use this number as Activity Identification at top of every page)

Note: These questions should be answered consistent with the previously identified workload, as submitted in response to Data Call Eight. This Data Call does not request workload additional to that previously identified; it only arrays that workload differently from the presentations in the earlier Data Call. This Amendment is required to facilitate Depot Maintenance analyses across the DoD.

Mission Area

1. Dynamic Components Workload

1.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Dynamic Components production by Type/Model/Series that were executed in and are 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).

Table 1.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Dynamic Component Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
			NOT APPLICABLE					
Total:								

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

1. **Dynamic Component Workload, continued**

Table 1.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Dynamic Component Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:								

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

1. Dynamic Components Workload, continued

Table 1.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Dynamic Components Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
			NOT APPLICABLE					
Total:								

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

Table 1.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Dynamic Components Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:								

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

1. Dynamic Components Workload, continued

1.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion of the Dynamic Components production by Type/Model/Series that are programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in units throughput and in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 1.2.a: **Core Dynamic Components Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE					
Total:							

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

Table 1.2.b: **Core Dynamic Components Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE					
Total:							

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

1. Dynamic Components Workload, continued

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 Dynamic Components operations could be expanded at this NADEP, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of units and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by type/model/series.

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Dynamic Components Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE					
Total:							

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

Table 1.3.b: **Maximum Potential Dynamic Components Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE					
Total:							

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

1. Dynamic Components Workload, continued

1.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased Dynamic Components workload at this NADEP.

Not Applicable

1.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform Dynamic Components workload? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase these capabilities? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capabilities. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

Not Applicable

1.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of Dynamic Components workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

Not Applicable

1.7 Identify any specialized, unique, or peculiar characteristics about the facilities, equipment, or skills at this NADEP for Dynamic Component work. Specify those that are one of a kind within the Department of the Navy and/or the Department of Defense.

Not Applicable

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

Mission Area

2. Rotor Blades Workload

2.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Rotor Blades productions by Type/Model/Series that were executed in and are programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in units throughput (Tables 2.1.a and 2.1.b) and in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs) (Tables 2.1.c and 2.1.d).

Table 2.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Rotor Blades Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
		NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:								

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

2. Rotor Blades Workload, continued

Table 2.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Rotor Blades Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:								

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

2. Rotor Blades Workload, continued

Table 2.1.c: **Historic / Predicted Rotor Blades Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
		NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:								

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

Table 2.1.d: **Historic / Predicted Rotor Blades Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE						
Total:								

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

2. Rotor Blades Workload, continued

2.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion of the Rotor Blades production by Type/Model/Series that are programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in units throughput and in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 2.2.a: **Core Rotor Blades Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE					
Total:							

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

2. Rotor Blades Workload, continued

Table 2.2.b: **Core Rotor Blades Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE					
Total:							

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

2.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 Rotor Blades operations could be expanded at this NADEP, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of units and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by type/model/series.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

2. Rotor Blades Workload, continued

Table 2.3.a: **Maximum Potential Rotor Blades Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE					
Total:							

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

Table 2.3.b: **Maximum Potential Rotor Blades Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
		NOT APPLICABLE					
Total:							

Not Applicable because Jacksonville has no Helicopter Component or Rotor Blade Workload

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

2. Rotor Blades Workload, continued

2.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased Rotor Blades workload at this NADEP.

Not Applicable

2.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform Rotor Blades workload? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase these capabilities? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capabilities. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

Not Applicable

2.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of Rotor Blades workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

Not Applicable

2.7 Identify any specialized, unique, or peculiar characteristics about the facilities, equipment, or skills at this NADEP for Rotor Blade work. Specify those that are one of a kind within the Department of the Navy and/or the Department of Defense.

Not Applicable

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY NADEP

DATA CALL #8 FOR CAPACITY ANALYSIS
Amendment One
Naval Aviation Depots

Activity Listing:

Type	Title	Location
Naval Aviation Depot	NADEP Cherry Point	MCAS Cherry Point NC
Naval Aviation Depot	NADEP Jacksonville	NAS Jacksonville FL
Naval Aviation Depot	NADEP North Island	NAS North Island CA

Headquarters Listing:

Type	Title
Naval Aviation Depot	Commander, Naval Air Systems Command

Data Call # 8
Amendment One

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.R. BOTT
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER
FOR AVIATION DEPOTS (ACTING)
Title

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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROGER GOODSON
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR
LOGISTICS AND FLEET SUPPORT (ACTING)
Title

8/24/94
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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

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

Signature

COMMANDER,
NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title

24 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)

Signature

Title

9/1/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 AMENDMENT 1

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

22 AUG 1994
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAVNOTE 11000 of 08 December 1993

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

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

CAPT A. W. ROSSITER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Commanding Officer
Title

1 August 94
Date

Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville
Activity

CAPACITY ANALYSIS: DATA CALL WORK SHEET FOR NAVAL AVIATION DEPOTS

Questions for the Activities

NAVAL AVIATION DEPOT
JACKSONVILLE

ORIGINAL

1 JUNE 1994

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Occupation	Number of Civilian Employees	Percent of Civilian Employees
9. Production Occupations	164	5.55
10. Transportation & Material Moving	25	.85
11. Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers and Laborers (not included elsewhere)	61	2.06
TOTAL	2,957	100 %

Source of Data (1.g.) Classification By Occupation Data): Defense Civilian Personnel Data Systems retrieved by HRO Jacksonville, Fl.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

1. Airframes, continued

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 airframe operations could be expanded at this NADEP, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of airframes and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by type/model/series.

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	10	10	2	0	0	0	0
EA-6B	8	13	11	11	8	13	12
EP-3A	6	0	0	6	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	6	6	6	6	6	6
EP-3J	0	3	0	6	0	0	0
F-14A	18	28	24	30	29	28	24
F-14B	0	14	14	8	11	8	7
F-14D	0	3	7	7	5	9	14
P-3	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
P-3C	50	46	41	32	50	50	50
RP-3A	0	0	0	6	6	6	6
T-2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	6	4	6	6	0	0	0
*** Total:**	112	130	120	118	115	120	119

*** NOTE: The maximum potential airframe workload data above does not include the impact of an additional 77,000 - 114,000 sq. ft. of existing high bay aircraft assembly spaces that could be made available to NADEP JAX as additional workload materializes. This is an addition to the minimum of 80,000 sq. ft. promised to NADEP JAX by NAS JAX after completion of Hangar MILCON.**

Table of Acronyms

ADMIN	Administration; administrative
AICUZ	Air Installations Compatible Use Zone
APU	Auxiliary Power Unit
CCN	Category Code Number
COMM	Communications
COMNAVAIRSYSCOM	Commander Naval Air Systems Command
DLMH	Direct Labor Man Hour
DoD	Department of Defense
DON	Department of the Navy
ELEC	Electrical, electric
E-O/NV	Electro-Optics / Night Vision
ESQD	Explosive Safety Quantity Distance
EW	Electronic Warfare
FY	Fiscal Year
HERF	Hazardous Electronic Radiation - Fuel
HERO	Hazardous Electronic Radiation - Ordnance
HERP	Hazardous Electronic Radiation - Personnel
IPE	Industrial Plant Equipment
K	Thousands
MCAS	Marine Corps Air Station
N / A	Not applicable
NADEP	Naval Aviation Depot
NAS	Naval Air Station
NAVAID	Navigational Aids
POM	Program Objective Memorandum
RCM	Reliability Centered Maintenance
SC/SS	Satellite Control / Space Sensors
SF	Square Feet
T / M / S	Type / Model / Series
UIC	Unit Identification Code

Mission Area

6. Manufacturing

6.1 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the quantity of Manufacturing, by Manufacturing Process, that was executed in and programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 6.1.a: **Historic / Predicted Manufacturing Workload**

Process	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993
DBOF NSF	28,844	36,638	64,992	41,940	36,791	44,671	17,310	23,147
DBOF OTHER	52,720	35,131	34,737	52,115	44,507	44,829	29,567	23,326
OTHER	31,329	8,435	12,091	76,750	125,939	11,881	84,926	52,316
Total:	112,893	80,204	111,820	170,805	207,237	101,381	131,803	98,789

Table 6.1.b: **Historic / Predicted Manufacturing Workload**

Process	Workload (DLMHs)							
	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
DBOF NSF	24,904	64,200	80,400	80,395	81,682	81,682	81,682	81,682
DBOF OTHER	64,618	177,500	205,505	199,700	202,898	202,898	202,898	202,898
OTHER	42,983	99,700	90,500	87,400	88,800	88,800	88,800	88,800
Total:	132,505	341,400	376,405	367,495	373,380	373,380	373,380	373,380

Revised pg

6.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion of the quantity of Manufacturing, by Manufacturing Process, that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 6.2: **Core Manufacturing Workload**

Process	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
DBOF NSF	64,200	80,400	80,395	81,682	81,682	81,682	81,682
DBOF OTHER	177,500	205,505	199,700	202,898	202,898	202,898	202,898
OTHER	96,000	88,100	85,100	86,463	86,463	86,463	86,463
Total:	337,700	374,005	365,195	371,043	371,043	371,043	371,043

NADOC IS CERTIFYING TOTALS ONLY. NADEP IS CERTIFYING BREAKOUT. R

6. Manufacturing, continued

6.2 Given the current configuration and operation of the NADEP, provide the Core portion of the quantity of Manufacturing, by Manufacturing Process, that is programmed for the Fiscal Years (FY) requested in Direct Labor Man Hours (DLMHs).

Table 6.2: **Core Manufacturing Workload**

Process	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
DBOF NSF	64,200	80,400	80,395	81,682	81,682	81,682	81,682
DBOF OTHER	177,500	205,505	199,700	202,898	202,898	202,898	202,898
OTHER	96,000	88,100	85,100	86,463	86,463	86,463	86,463
Total:	337,700	374,005	365,195	371,043	371,043	371,043	371,043

6.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 you could expand manufacturing operations based on current/future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of DLMHs that could be applied to manufacturing production at this NADEP by Manufacturing Process.

Table 6.3: **Maximum Potential Manufacturing Workload** **R**

Process	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
DBOF NSF	83,545	83,545	83,545	83,545	83,545	83,545	83,545
DBOF OTHER	213,161	213,161	213,161	213,161	213,161	213,161	213,161
OTHER	93,699	93,699	93,699	93,699	93,699	93,699	93,699
Total:	390,405	390,405	390,405	390,405	390,405	390,405	390,405

6. Manufacturing, continued

6.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 you could expand manufacturing operations based on current/future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of DLMHs that could be applied to manufacturing production at this NADEP by Manufacturing Process.

Table 6.3: **Maximum Potential Manufacturing Workload**

Process	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
DBOF NSF	24,120	24,120	24,120	24,120	24,120	24,120	24,120
DBOF OTHER	21,708	21,708	21,708	21,708	21,708	21,708	21,708
OTHER	195,375	195,375	195,375	195,375	195,375	195,375	195,375
Total:	241,203	241,203	241,203	241,203	241,203	241,203	241,203

6. Manufacturing, continued

6.4 Provide details of your calculations including assumptions on additional space utilized, major equipment required, production rates, and constraints that limit increased manufacturing workload at this NADEP.

Total available work positions (WP) for each shop utilized by manufacturing x 1615 Total Manhours per year x .95 availability x the percent of that shops total direct used for manufacturing.

The three programs NSF/DBOF NSF was 10%, NIF/DBOF Other was 9%, and Other was 81%. The maximum capacity was then multiplied by these percentages to determine the projected manhours for each program.

6.5 Given an environment unconstrained by funds or manning, what Industrial Plant Equipment (IPE) would you change (add, delete, or modify) to increase your NADEP's capability to perform manufacturing workload? What other investments in the industrial infrastructure would you make to increase manufacturing capability? Describe quantitatively how the changes above would increase your depot's capability. What would the associated costs be? What would be the payback period and return on investment?

1. <u>INDUSTRIAL EQUIPMENT CHANGES:</u>

A. SHEET METAL MANUFACTURING SHOP

Upgrade the strippit machine with a serial tape punch for operator programming capabilities.

Replace/Modify the seam welder.

Replace/Modify the spot welder.

B. GENERAL MACHINING AREA

Replace three drill presses.

C. N/C MACHINING AREA

Add (1) N/C Pantograph machine.

Add (1) 5 axis Moduline Machining center.

Replace (3) series 2 Bridgeport mills.

Add (1) 20-40 ft. 12" N/C lathes.

Add (2) Warner Swasey 12" N/C lathes.

Add (2) Warner Swasey 6" N/C lathes.

Add (1) VMC-150 Horizontal machining center.

Add (1) VMC-200 Horizontal machining center

Add (1) N/C router.

2. OTHER INVESTMENTS IN THE INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDE:

A. Increase Component Finish Shop area by 1500 sq. ft. for staging work.

B. Upgrade paint booths in Component Finish Shop to provide humidity control.

3. CHANGES WOULD INCREASE DEPOTS CAPACITY BY:

A. Sheet Metal Manufacturing Shop:

By adding operator programming capabilities on the strippit machine, proveout time would be reduced.

State of the art seam welder and spot welder should reduce set up time and down time.

B. General Machining Area:

Old drill presses are showing signs of wear, new ones will improve the quality of holes drilled in this area and improve throughput.

C. N/C Machining Area:

Replacing the pantograph with state of the art equipment would improve productivity. The CNC equipment can be programmed at the machine by the operator. This would eliminate the need for engraving templates.

Adding a 20-40 ft. N/C Spar Mill would reduce turn-around-time on wing spars and wing planks by approximately 75%.

Adding N/C equipment in this area would reduce bottleneck situations and reduce production lead times.

Work positions for additional paint booths can be added to increase the capacity in this area.

Shop space is occupied by parts drying after paint. The humidity levels in this area can cause extended drying times for some items. A humidity controlled area would improve the painting process and reduce drying time from 72 hours to 24 hours.

4. ASSOCIATED COSTS INCLUDE:

A. Component Finish (1500 sq. ft. x $75.00 = $187,500)
NOTE: $75.00 per sq. ft. based on latest industrial building costs.

B. Upgrade component finish (Humidity Control) Cost = $50,000

C. Replace or modify Seam Welder - Replacement Cost = $60,000

D. Add (1) NC Pantograph - Cost= $70,000

5. RETURN ON INVESTMENT (ROI) AND PAYBACK PERIOD

Calculations require information not available regarding workload being processed through hypothetical facility expansion projects. This would be a net present value analysis that considers productivity improvements, process flow changes, economies of scale and current value of money assumptions. The calculation of ROI and payback period must be done within the context of the entire NADEP financial position (Production and G&A expense) and is subject to specific realignment scenarios such as evaluated in the Cost of Base Realignment Action (COBRA).

6.6 Are there any environmental, legal, or otherwise limiting factors that inhibit further the development of manufacturing workload at this NADEP (AICUZ encroachment, pollutant discharge, etc.)?

Maximum yearly application of paint is 71,120 lbs. per year. Historical data reflects approximately 24,900 lbs. application yearly. Increased capacity and additional paint application would fall well below upper limit.

Revised pg

Table 9.2.f: **CORE WORKLOAD VARIANCE FOR FY 2000** R

Commodity Type	Product (units)			DLMHs		
	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance	Predicted Workload	Potential Workload	Variance
Airframes	34	117	83	724,311	1,670,941	946,630
Air Missiles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Components	19,407	60,261	40,854	501,024	1,548,022	1,046,998
Engines	388	4,018	3,630	89,812	836,514	746,702
Aircraft Service Support	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	1,420,782	2,385,400	964,618
Manufacturing	N / A	N / A	N / A	371,043	241,203	-129,840
Modifications	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	83,638	427,222	343,584
Training	0	2,752	2,752	0	36,420	36,420
Other[1]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	N / A	N / A	N / A	3,190,610	7,145,722	3,955,112

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

N.A. - NOT AVAILABLE
N/A - NOT APPLICABLE

R

NOTE: NADEP Jacksonville future/core manufacturing workload appears to exceed out stated maximum capacity, however, manufacturing capacity is shared by other programs. Since manufacturing workload is very unpredictable, we choose to show the excess capacity in the component program, not manufacturing. This Command is confident we could execute all the manufacturing workload projected in the out years.

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADOC

MEASURES OF MERIT

Facilities and Equipage

6. Unique or Peculiar Facilities

6.1 List unique or peculiar testing facilities, excluding equipment (e.g. runways, railheads, ports, tracks, ponds, etc.).

Test Facility	Describe Uniqueness/Peculiarity
Old engine test cells	Uniquely suited for "dangerous" testing and for storage of explosives.
Engine Testing Facility.	The NADEP JAX engine test facility is one of the most modern in the industry. It utilizes advanced computerized systems to provide rapid, accurate and efficient testing. The facility consists of two adjacent concrete turbojet/turbofan engine test cells with a common control room and computer room. Through the use of automated data acquisition systems, automated control systems, software driven test and calibration equipment, and efficient material handling systems, the test cells have provided the high volume capacity of much larger facilities. To provide for continuous updating and testing developments required by NAVAIR and vendors, a software support station is located in the main computer room. Future jet engine requirements and applications are developed and functional tests are made without impact on production. An on-site calibration system is integrated into the system and is traceable to the National Bureau of Standards. Engineering personnel are permanently located at the facility to provide continuous software, hardware,and maintenance support. A 25,000 gallon underground fuel supply is supplied through two independent control systems, a wet closed-loop augmenter spray-quenching, pollution abatement system is also provided for each cell, a central fire alarm system consisting of heat sensors, smoke alarms, sprinkler heads, and manual pull stations controls zones containing water, halon, or carbon dioxide extinguishing agents.

A 6300 square foot engine preparation area is provided adjacent to the test cells where all engine connections are made while an engine is being tested, a monorail engine handling system allows rapid interchange of tested engines with prepped engines which results in rapid and efficient turn around time.

Fuel Accessory Building

The NADEP JAX Fuel Accessory building was designed specifically to support the repair, overhaul, and testing of jet engine fuel accessories and components. The building is divided into three sections: disassembly, assembly/overhaul, and testing. All components are disassembled in the disassembly area and then routed for cleaning. Assembly and overhaul is completed in the large central clean room. The testing area is located in an explosion proof environment around the perimeter of the building and is provided with several safety systems (blow-out panels, individual test stand fire suppression systems, central fire alarm, etc,) to protect personnel and equipment.

Presently J52, F404, and some TF41 fuel accessories are processed and tested, expansion room is available to accept a minimum of two new programs, and engineering personnel are available to design and modify existing equipment for unique and special types of developmental tests.

A software development room is available to support NAVAIR engineering changes. Hard copies of component test parameters are provided for trend analysis and record keeping purposes. Software generated tests remotely control test stand parameters and traceable calibration equipment ensures accurate and efficient testing.

Acoustical Aircraft Encl.

10,000 sq. ft. state of the art noise abatement facility used for testing of jet aircraft at full military power.

6,200 s.f. class 100 clean rm	particulate/temperature controlled
1,000 s.f. class 10,000 clean rm	particulate/temperature controlled
3,000 s.f. class 100,000 clean rm	particulate/temperature controlled
ATE performance ground grid	when performance grounding ATE, grid prevents ground loops
6 laser safe rooms for E-O testing	enclosed, lite tight, and interlocked laser safe facilities
compact radar range	absorber installed to prevent radar signal emissions
microminiature circuit card repair	lighting and ventilation for fine skill-level and soldering
flat cable repair facility	controlled environment
flat cable manufacture facility	facility for operation and containment and ventilation of automated mfg. equipment
shielded room	calibration of emergency emitting equipment and sensitive receiving equipment
vibration pads for F/A-18 E-O	30' deep vibration isolation pilings

6.2 Indicate the reasons that these facilities are required by the depot maintenance function.

Test Facility	Reasons Required for Maintenance
Old engine test cells 1,2,3,4,6	Seat Shop -- Electronically fired seats, such as NACES, require special conditions, such as electrostatic flooring. Large capacity required for storage of/working with seat ordnance (Class 3 CADS).
Old engine test cell 5	NDI Shop -- lead-lined X-ray room
Old engine test cells 7,8	O2 & Hyd Shop -- ultra high pressure pneumatic testing
Old engine test cell 11	ARS Shop -- Ram Air Turbine (RAT) Wind Tunnel
Old engine test cell 12	ARS Shop -- Hose Reel Test Stand
Engine Testing Facility	To provide efficient, accurate testing of engines which meet or exceed all environmental requirements.
Fuel Accessory Building	To provide testing of fuel accessories and components in an environment which will provide safety for personnel and equipment.
6,200 s.f. class 100 clean	gyros, bearings
1,000 s.f. class 10,000 clean	E-O optical testing
3,000 s.f. class 100,000 clean	optical/dimensional type 2 calibration
ATE performance ground grid	required to ensure acceptable ATE performance
6 laser safe rooms for E-O testing	safe operation of E-O test equipment
2 compact radar ranges	APQ-126/158
microminiature circuit card repair	repair of electronic aircraft SRA's

flat cable repair facility	E-O FLIR systems and miscellaneous fleet support
flat cable manufacture facility	automates E-O FLIR cable manufacture
shielded room	to prevent equipment signal transmissions outside of facility while testing
vibration pads for F/A-18 E-O	to protect adjacent equipment from vibration
Acoustical Aircraft Enclosure	Facility required for jet aircraft high power engine turn-up prior to and after maintenance.

6.3 How could the depot maintenance functions be performed without these specialized facilities?

Test Facility	Describe Testing Facilities
Old engine test cells 1,2,3,4,6	Seat Shop -- could not be performed
Old engine test cell 5	NDI Shop -- lead-lined room required for employee safety
Old engine test cell 7,8	O2 & Hyd Shop -- could not be performed without jeopardizing employee safety
Old engine test cell 11	ARS Shop -- RATs could not be tested without the wind tunnel
Old engine test cell 12	ARS Shop -- test stand could be placed outside with the danger of environmental damage due to test-oil spills
Engine Testing Facility	Engines could be tested in the hush house or portable facilities designed for specific engine types. Exceptions to noise abatement and pollution abatement regulations would be required.
Fuel Accessory Building	Limited testing with non-volatile fluids in non-hazardous rated areas would be required. Upgrading of normal buildings could be accomplished at great additional expense.
Acoustical Aircraft Encl	Jet aircraft could not be tested outside because of noise abatement.

7. Buildings and Their Condition

7.1 List the buildings used to perform the depot maintenance functions by category code numbers (five or six digit CCNs), identifying their current condition (adequate, substandard, and inadequate) in Table 7.1 in thousands of square feet (KSF).

Table 7.1: **Facility Conditions** **R**

CCN	Facility Type	Condition / Area (# KSF)			Comments
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
211-10 thru 211-14	Overhaul/repair corrosion shops	409.2	0	0	
211-20 thru 211-17	A/C Engine Shops	174.7	0	0	
211-30 thru 211-39	Engine Accessory & Component	312.5	0	0	
211-40 thru 211-44	Electronics and Avionics shops	85.3	0	0	
211-50 thru 211-53	A/C Weapons Shops	8.7	1.1	0	
211-60 thru 211-64	Support Equipment Shops	29.2	0	0	
211-70 thru 211-76	Manufacturing and Repair shops	205.8	0	0	
211-83/92/94 thru 211-98/99	Test and Calibration shops	83.5	0	0	
211-93 211-97	Other support	96.5	0	0	
211-95 211-96	Storage Facilities	133.8	0.7	30.8	
	Total	1,539.2	1.8	30.8	

Facilities and Equipage, continued

7. Buildings and Their Condition

7.1 List the buildings used to perform the depot maintenance functions by category code numbers (five or six digit CCNs), identifying their current condition (adequate, substandard, and inadequate) in Table 7.1 in thousands of square feet (KSF).

Table 7.1: **Facility Conditions**

CCN	Facility Type	Condition / Area (# KSF)			Comments
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
211-10 thru 211-14	Overhaul/repair corrosion shops	409.2	0	0	
211-20 thru 211-17	A/C Engine Shops	174.7	0	0	
211-30 thru 211-39	Engine Accessory & Component	312.5	0	0	
211-40 thru 211-44	Electronics and Avionics shops	85.3	0	0	
211-50 thru 211-53	A/C Weapons Shops	8.7	1.1	0	
211-60 thru 211-64		29.2	0	0	
211-70 thru 211-76	Manufacturing and Repair shops	205.7	0	0	
211-83/92/94 thru 211-98/99	Test and Calibration shops	83.5	1.1	0	
211-93 211-97	Other support	90.5	0	0	
211-95 211-96	Storage Facilities	133.8	0.7	30.8	
	Total	1,533.1	86.1	30.8	

Revised pg

7.2 In Table 7.2.a, identify space available for expansion by building type for those facility category code numbers (five or six digit CCNs) that are most important to your mission. An activity's expansion capability is a function of its ability to reconfigure/rehabilitate existing underutilized facilities to accept new or increased requirements.

Table 7.2.a: **Space Available for Expansion**

Building ID / Type	CCN	Installation Space (KSF)			Total
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
Component Repair	211-32	0	0	25	25
Ordnance Shop	211-33	0	1.1	0	1.1
	TOTAL:	0	1.1	25	26.1

<u>211-32</u> Old plating shop, Building 101, being demolished could accommodate repair A/C components. **R**

<u>211-33</u> Weapons Range, building 101P, currently 211-52 could be refurbished to accommodate A/C component repair. **R**

Facilities and Equipage, continued

7.2 In Table 7.2.a, identify space available for expansion by building type for those facility category code numbers (five or six digit CCNs) that are most important to your mission. An activity's expansion capability is a function of its ability to reconfigure/rehabilitate existing underutilized facilities to accept new or increased requirements.

Table 7.2.a: **Space Available for Expansion**

Building ID / Type	CCN	Installation Space (KSF)			Total
		Adequate	Substandard	Inadequate	
Component Repair	211-32	0	0	25	25
Ordnance Shop	211-33	0	1.1	0	1.1
	TOTAL:	0	1.1	25	26.1

211-32 Old plating shop being demolished could accommodate repair A/C components.

211-33 Weapons Range, building 101P, currently 211-83 could be refurbished to accommodate A/C component repair.

Facilities and Equipage, continued

8. Unique and/or Peculiar Capabilities and Capacities

8.1 What unique and/or peculiar capabilities and capacities does the depot maintenance activity possess?

Unique Capability	Describe Why Unique/Peculiar
Lead Maintenance Technology Center	NADEP Jacksonville is the Navy's only Lead Maintenance Technology Center for the Environment (LMTCE). The LMTCE unique mission is to facilitate the continuous reduction of hazardous waste by changing materials and processes used in Naval Aviation maintenance while ensuring product quality and integrity.
Flex Cable	NADEP Jacksonville is the only site with capability to repair flexible cables (flat cables). The artisans working in this field developed most of the technology used in this type of repair; therefore, making the process unique to this Depot. Our Flat Cable repair capability supports high tech Electro-Optics workload (such as AAS-33/36/37/38 & AAR-42/45). This capability requires a unique combination of artisan skills, equipment and facilities.
Electro-Optics	Our Electro-Optics (EO) lab is the sole support for the Navy and Marine Corps through the rework and repair of modules and circuit card assemblies for the AN/AAS-33, AN/AAS-36, AN/AAS-37, AN/AAS-38, AN/ASQ-173 and the OR-263. These Infrared Detecting, Ranging and Laser Targeting systems are utilized onboard the A6E, F/A-18, OV-10, P3C and the S3B aircraft. There are approximately 700 pieces of equipment used for this effort with an equipment cost in excess of $30M.
Modification Design	P-3 Aircraft Modification: NADEP Jacksonville is the lead field and Integration activity in design, program management, kit fabrication and kit integration of numerous P-3 modification programs. NADEP Jacksonville has the design and maintenance engineering/logistics expertise and experience to prepare ECP's, proposals, statements of work and implement fleet modifications. Installation designs have been performed for active Navy

squadrons, Naval Research Laboratory, Naval Air Test Center, National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), and Naval Training Systems Command.

Electronic Warfare	NADEP Jacksonville has established complete depot capability for the Navy's TACAIR electronic warfare systems including Weapons Control High Speed Radiation Missile Command Launch Computer Systems. (These systems include ALE-29, ALE-39, ALQ-126A, ALR-45F, ALR-D, ALR-50, CP-1001A/AWG, CP-1269A/AWG-25, ALR-67, ALQ-126-B, ALQ-162, ALE-37, ALQ142, ALQ-76C, ALQ-78, ALH-6, ALQ-100, ALQ-108, ALQ-157, ALQ-167, ALQ-55, ALQ-86C, ALQ-99, ALR-66 Countermeasures). NADEP Jacksonville Calibration Lab is the primary electronic warfare systems repair site for over 25 special EW test systems that consist of multi-bay automatic test consoles with test program sets and bench top testers.
AMAD Test Stand	One of two Navy AMAD test stands producing for ASO, fleet, and McAir
F-14 Wingsweep TS	Only Navy test stand for these components
P-3 Ballscrew TS	Only Navy P-3 Ballscrew test stand
EA-6B NLG TS	Only Navy EA-6B NLG test stand
F-14 LDG TS	Only Navy F-14 LDG test stand
F-18 Blowdown TS	Only Navy F-18 Blowdown test stand installed
Seat Repair	Large capacity for seat ordnance storage/handling
RAT Wind Tunnel	Only Navy RAT Wind Tunnel
Hose Reel TS	Only Navy Hose Reel test stand
ARS Repair	Only Navy depot level ARS Shop
Ordnance Repair	Only Navy depot level Bomb Rack/Missile Launcher Shop

Waste Water Treatment #1	Allows "Closed Loop" process for aircraft painting by recycling waste rinse water from painting and conversion coating processes.
Waste Water Treatment #2	Allows "Closed Loop" process for aircraft stripping and recycles rinse water. Only known "Closed Loop" facility for stripping.
Waste Water Treatment #3	Allows "Closed Loop" process for plating and cleaning.
Large Autoclave	Large enough to work large F-14 surfaces
Real-Time X-Ray	Peculiar equipment capable of inspecting large F-14 surfaces
Optical Scanner	Only Navy facility with optical scanner capable of non-contact measurement of sheetmetal parts
Automatic Die Loader	Uniquely safe process for loading large/heavy dies onto press brakes
Engine Complex	NADEP JAX is the Navy's premier engine depot facility. Our consolidated power plant complex is designed and built specifically for depot repair of gas turbine engines. The complex encompasses modern, efficient, environmentally compliant facilities, totaling 338,185 sq. ft., that contain production processes used in engine repair.
Engine Processing	Disassembly, inspection, assembly, preservation, and component repairs (i.e. machining, grinding, milling, welding, brazing, heat treating and stress relieving, etc.) for engines take place in our new Engine Processing Facility, 159,333 sq. ft., the heart of our Power Plant Complex. It also features an automated material storage and handling system to manage work-in-process materials and Government-furnished parts.
Cleaning & Plating	The Cleaning and Plating Facility, 81,656 sq. ft., houses all cleaning, plating, plasma spray, coating, and NDT/I operations required for depot repair. Its close proximity to the Engine Processing Facility reduces flow time for routed parts. The plating and cleaning shops are specially structured to minimize any environmental impact. All hazardous chemical solutions used in the facility are controlled and properly segregated by a unique diking system, sump collection area, and treatment process via the

new treatment facility. Air pollution control is maintained by a specially designed scrubber system which filters the air prior to release to the outside environment.

Waste Water Treatment

The new Waste Water Treatment Plant is a 5,000 sq. ft., state-of-the-art, hazardous waste treatment facility. The treatment plant chemically treats and filters the hazardous acid/alkali, chromic acid and cyanide waste streams from the Cleaning and Plating Facility to remove contaminants from the water. The treated water is then piped back to the Cleaning and Plating Facility shops as nonpotable water for reuse within the production processes. This closed-loop treatment process has significantly reduced our hazardous wastewater discharge and ensures continued compliance with increasingly stringent environmental regulations.

Fuel Accessories

Fuel controls, pumps, valves, and other accessories are repaired or overhauled in the Fuel Accessory Facility, 58,378 sq. ft., which is dedicated to the processing of engine accessory components. The building contains all test equipment and flow benches required to perform complete functional testing of J52, F404 and some TF41 engine accessories. Upon completion of necessary modifications and installation of test equipment, the facility will also support complete functional testing of TF34 engine accessories as a result of BRAC 93 decisions.

Engine Test

Our state-of-the-art Engine Test Cell, 38,818 sq. ft., is capable of testing engines through their entire operating envelope, in both automated and manual modes. The test cell is capable of testing all jet engines within the Navy inventory (as well as various Air Force engines and represents an extremely versatile facility). This test cell meets all required state and local air pollution/noise authorizations.

Bearing Facility

The Bearing Shop Clean Room is a 2,657 square-foot environmentally controlled (Class 100,000) facility with humidity maintained at 40 percent$\pm$ 5 percent, and temperature at 70 degrees Fahrenheit $\pm$ 5 degrees Fahrenheit, which complies with NAVAIR 01-1A-503. Jet engine bearings are cleaned, inspected, repaired or replaced, preserved/packed and returned to service.

P-3 SDLM/Mod	Only DoD Depot Repair Point and Cognizant Field Activity for the P-3 aircraft with unique experience in; - Wing replacement - Empennage Replacement - Wing Spar-cap Replacement - Wing Plank Replacement - Special Mods..P-3C Update III, NRL, VP's, TP's, Birdeye etc.
A-7 SDLM/Mod	Only DoD Depot Repair Point and Cognizant Field Activity for the A-7 aircraft - Maintenance Manuals and Technical Publications
T-2 SDLM/SIP	Only DoD Depot Repair Point and Cognizant Field Activity for the T-2 aircraft - Maintenance Manuals and Technical Publications
F-14 SDLM/Mod	Only DoD Depot Repair Point and Cognizant Field Activity for the F-14 aircraft after BRAC 93 transition.
EA-6B SDLM/Mod	Only DoD Depot Repair point and Cognizant Field Activity for the EA-6B aircraft after BRAC 93 transition.
F/A-18 Repair/Mod	East Coast repair site for the F/A-18 aircraft with specialized experience in; - Vertical Stab removal/installation - Vertical Stab skin replacement - Engine inlet removal/installation - Full wing repair capability
Flat Cable Manufacturing	Only depot automated manufacturing system
AN/USM-449 (V2)	Only refurbishment operation
AN/AAM-60 Refurbisment	Only refurbishment operation
AN/AWM-23 Rework	Only refurbishment operation
APQ-126/158 Repair	Only range facility design for this application
AnitSubmarine Warfare	Only depot testing and repair

Aircraft Radome Testing	Only depot radome range
Voyage Repair Team NAS Mayport and NAS Norfolk	Maintains, repairs, troubleshoots, modifies, and tests shipboard and field aircraft launching and retrieval systems and related components such as remote closed circuit television cameras and receivers, fresnel lens, flight deck lighting systems, and launch valves. Maintains a ready alert to deploy to needed areas at sea, overseas, and at other bases.

Revised pg

8.2 Separately list the depot maintenance facilities and equipment which are one of a kind within the Service and/or DoD.

Unique Facility	Description
Cleaning and Plating	The Cleaning and Plating Facility includes 86,156 sq. ft. and houses all cleaning, plating, plasma spray, coating, and NDT/I operations required for depot repair. The facility design includes closed-loop plating processes, eliminate hazardous wastewater discharges and ensure continued compliance with increasingly stringent environmental regulations.
	R
Special Access Program Support	NADEP Jacksonville has unique facilities to support Special Access Programs (SAP) including approximately 5400 sq. ft. of secure work space certified for open storage. In addition, a certified secure access wide-area telecommunications network has been established for CALS-compliant digital data management for programmatic, engineering, and logistics support. Originally developed for the A-12 Program, this network has been a core of the AFX Program and expansion to other applications is being pursued.
	R
Engine Process Facility	NADEP Jacksonville is the premier J52 and F404 Engine Depot Repair facility, 338,185 sq. ft., in the world. The Power Plant Complex is currently performing all J52 and F404 engine repairs, including all engine components and accessories. Our state-of-the-art Kemen Engine Cell is capable of testing engines through their entire operating envelope, in both automated and manual modes. This test cell meets all required state and local air pollution/noise authorizations.
F/A-18 AMAD Test Stand	One of two DOD F/A-18 AMAD test stands producing components for fleet, ASO, and McAIR
F-14 Wingsweep TS	Only DOD test stand for these components
P-3 Ballscrew TS	Only DOD P-3 Ballscrew test stand
Only DoD EA-6B NLG TS	Only DOD EA-6B NLG test stand

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

8.2 Separately list the depot maintenance facilities and equipment which are one of a kind within the Service and/or DoD.

Unique Facility	Description
Cleaning and Plating	The Cleaning and Plating Facility includes 86,156 sq. ft. and houses all cleaning, plating, plasma spray, coating, and NDT/I operations required for depot repair. The facility design includes closed-loop plating processes, eliminate hazardous wastewater discharges and ensure continued compliance with increasingly stringent environmental regulations.
Secure Access Program Support	NADEP Jacksonville has unique facilities to support secure access programs including approximately 5400 sq. ft. of secure work space certified for open storage. In addition, a certified secure access wide-area telecommunications network has been established for CALS-compliant digital data management for programmatic, engineering, and logistics support. Originally developed for the A-12 Program, this network has been a core of the AFX Program and expansion to other applications is being pursued.
Engine Process Facility	NADEP Jacksonville is the premier J52 and F404 Engine Depot Repair facility, 342,685 sq. ft., in the world. The Power Plant Complex is currently performing all J52 and F404 engine repairs, including all engine components and accessories. Our state-of-the-art Kemen Engine Cell is capable of testing engines through their entire operating envelope, in both automated and manual modes. This test cell meets all required state and local air pollution/noise authorizations.
F-18 AMAD Test Stand	One of two DOD F-18 AMAD test stands producing components for fleet, ASO, and McAIR
F-14 Wingsweep TS	Only DOD test stand for these components
P-3 Ballscrew TS	Only DOD P-3 Ballscrew test stand
Only DoD EA-6B NLG TS	Only DOD EA-6B NLG test stand

F-14 LDG TS	Only DOD F-14 LDG test stand
F-18 Blowdown TS	Only DOD F-18 Blowdown test stand installed -- NORIS TS does not produce
RAT Wind Tunnel	Only Navy RAT Wind Tunnel
ARS Hose Reel TS	Only Navy Hose Reel test stand
Waste Water Treatment #2	Only "Closed Loop" facility for aircraft stripping.
Missile Launcher TS	Only Navy Missile Launcher test stand
P-3 Sonobuoy TS	Only Navy P-3 Sonobuoy test stands
Aircraft Paint Hangar	Only Navy depot facility capable of painting P-3 size aircraft
Bearing Facility	Unique capability to clean deep dirty engine, gearbox, and airframe bearings
Optical Scanner	Only Navy facility with optical scanner capable of non-contact measurement of sheetmetal parts
IVD Process	The Ion Vapor Deposition (IVD) Room contains two systems which apply aluminum coating to engine and aircraft components for corrosion prevention. The IVD process is an environmentally safer substitute for cadmium plating and also reduces waste disposal costs.

TEST STANDS

Power Lever Control	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives
Afterburner Fuel Control	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives
Compressor Inlet Temp	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives
Variable Exhaust Nozzle	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives
Main Fuel Pump	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives
Afterburner Fuel Pump	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives

Revised pg

Fuel Accessories	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives	
Main Fuel Control	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives	
Lube and Scavenge Pump	Only DoD Repair site for the F404 and its derivatives	
Hush House	Aircraft run-up for noise abatement	
Two Paint Facilities	Paint a/c meets state/local air pollution requirements. Large enough to paint P-3 aircraft.	R
Real-Time X-Ray Radiography	Unique among Materials Engineering Facilities in DOD	
KRATOS Model	Computer controlled ultra high vacuum	
Thermo Jarrell Ash ICAP 61	Simultaneous plasma emission spectrometer	
Instron Model 1128 Materials TS	High capacity mechanical testing of material samples and aerospace components.	
Wastewater Treatment Plants 1, 2 & 3	Closed loop facilities for aircraft and engine programs.	
Electro-Optics	AAS-33/36/37/38 repair largest E-O repair depot in support of the Navy complete with 7 laser-safe rooms, 1 clean room, confidential facility, 25 million dollars of unique equipment to test AAS-33/36/37/38 FLIR. **Applicable Aircraft:** F/A-18, OV-10, P-3, S-3, A-6E **Equipment:** Vacuum Bake T/S (2 ea.) Proof Pressure T/S FLIR Subassembly Alignment & Bond T/S FLIR/Laser Boresight T/S (2 ea.) LRD Transmitter Alignment T/S Scan Mikrror Run-In T/S Laser Purge and Fill T/S	

INFORMATION ON THIS PAGE CERTIFIED BY NADEP

Facilities and Equipage, continued

9. Acreage Available for Building

9.1 What acreage on the installation does the government own in the proximity of the depot maintenance area that could be used for future expansion? Identify in the table below the real estate resources which have the potential to facilitate future development and for which you are the plant account holder or into which, though a tenant, your activity could reasonably expect to expand. Developed area is defined as land currently with buildings, roads, and utilities where further development is not possible without demolition of existing improvements. Report in "Restricted" areas that are 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.

Table 9.1: **Real Estate Resources**

Land Use	Total Acres	Developed Acreage	Available for Development	
			Restricted	Unrestricted
Maintenance	27.5	6.2	wetlands 0.3	21.0
Operational	0	0	0	0
Training	0	0	0	0
R & D	0	0	0	0
Supply & Storage	0	0	0	0
Admin	0	0	0	0
Housing	0	0	0	0
Recreational	0	0	0	0
Forestry Program	0	0	0	0
Agricultural Outlease Program	0	0	0	0
Hunting/Fishing Programs	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
Total:	27.5	6.2	0.3	21.0

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Data Call # 8

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT L. JORDAN, CAPT, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR AVIATION DEPOTS
Title

7 JUN 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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

BRUCE L. HAWK, CAPT, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR LOGISTICS AND FLEET SUPPORT (ACTING)
Title

7 June 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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

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

Signature

COMMANDER, NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title

8 JUN 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)

R. R. SAREERAM
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ACTING
Title

17 JUN 1994
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 pg 37 (JUL)

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT L. JORDAN, CAPT, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER
FOR AVIATION DEPOTS
Title

21 JUN 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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

BRUCE L. HAWK, CAPT USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR
LOGISTICS AND FLEET SUPPORT (ACTING)
Title

21 JUN 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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

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

Signature

COMMANDER,
NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title

22 JUN 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)

R. R. SAREERAM
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ACTING
Title

28 JUN 1994
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 page 37 (JIM)

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

6/21/94
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 REVISED

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT L. JORDAN, CAPT, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR AVIATION DEPOTS
Title

8/1/94
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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

WILLIAM J. TINSTON, JR. RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR LOGISTICS AND FLEET SUPPORT
Title

8/1/94
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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

DONALD V. BOECKER, RADM USN
~~W.C. BOWES, VADM, USN~~
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

COMMANDER, NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title (ACTING)

2 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)

Signature

Title

8/10/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 8 REVISED

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

7-28-94
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 1.3.b: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	92,715	92,715	18,543	0	0	0	0
EMER RPR	165,398	194,153	302,615	262,809	262,809	262,809	262,809
EA-6B	134,451	194,207	164,329	164,329	134,451	164,329	149,390
EP-3A	13,448	0	0	13,448	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	12,731	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	26,896	13,448	26,896	13,448	40,344	26,896
EP-3J	0	13,448	0	13,448	0	0	0
F-14A	250,445	269,710	288,975	397,180	377,530	340,459	321,136
F-14B	0	134,855	154,120	59,283	138,327	79,044	98,805
F-14D	0	19,265	96,325	98,805	59,283	79,044	158,088
P-3	0	48,000	48,000	0	0	0	0
P-3C	324,220	295,950	286,085	266,355	305,815	295,950	286,085
RP-3A	0	0	0	13,448	13,448	13,448	13,448
T-2	86,954	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	26,896	13,448	13,448	13,448	0	0	0
Total:	1094527	1302647	1398619	1329449	1305111	1275427	1316657

12/21/94 11:31 ☎904 772 2712 Business Office 008

R

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

1. Airframes, continued

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 airframe operations could be expanded at this NADEP, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of airframes and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by type/model/series.

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A7E	5	5	1	0	0	0	0
EA6B	9	13	11	11	9	11	10
EP3A	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
EP3B	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
EP3E	0	2	1	2	1	3	2
EP3J	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
F14A	13	14	15	20	19	17	16
F14B	0	7	8	3	7	4	5
F14D	0	1	5	5	3	4	8
P3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
P3C	29	30	29	27	31	30	29
RP3A	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
T2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP3A	2	1	1	1	0	0	0
Total:	73	75	73	72	71	70	71

~~*NOTE: NAS Jax has agreed to provide a minimum 80,000 square feet of existing high bay airframe workspace to NADEP Jax as required to accommodate BRAC 93. An additional 114,000 square feet may be provided to accommodate BRAC 95 airframe workload.~~

BRAC/BIT
K. Bethiat
12/21/94

Detail

R

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAVNOTE 11000 of 08 December 1993

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

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

CAPT A. W. ROSSITER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

COMMANDING OFFICER
Title

20 December 1994
Date

NAVAL AVIATION DEPOT, JAX
Activity

R

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (if applicable)

ROBERT W. SMITH, RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Robert W. Smith
Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR
~~AVIATION INDUSTRIAL CAPABILTIES~~
Title

21 Dec 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.

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

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

Signature

COMMANDER
Title

21 Dec 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)

Signature

Title

2/10/95
Date

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

Table 1.3.b: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Workload (DLMHs)						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A-7E	92,715	92,715	18,543	0	0	0	0
EMER RPR	165,398	194,153	302,615	262,809	262,809	262,809	262,809
EA-6B	134,451	194,207	164,329	164,329	134,451	164,329	149,390
EP-3A	13,448	0	0	13,448	0	0	0
EP-3B	0	0	12,731	0	0	0	0
EP-3E	0	26,896	13,448	26,896	13,448	40,344	26,896
EP-3J	0	13,448	0	13,448	0	0	0
F-14A	250,445	269,710	288,975	397,180	377,530	340,459	321,136
F-14B	0	134,855	154,120	59,283	138,327	79,044	98,805
F-14D	0	19,265	96,325	98,805	59,283	79,044	158,088
P-3	0	48,000	48,000	0	0	0	0
P-3C	324,220	295,950	286,085	266,355	305,815	295,950	286,085
RP-3A	0	0	0	13,448	13,448	13,448	13,448
T-2	86,954	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP-3A	26,896	13,448	13,448	13,448	0	0	0
Total:	1094527	1302647	1398619	1329449	1305111	1275427	1316657

ACTIVITY UIC: N65886
JACKSONVILLE

1. Airframes, continued

1.3 Assuming (a) the current projected total 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 airframe operations could be expanded at this NADEP, based on the current and future planned workload mixes? Please provide your response in the absolute maximum number of airframes and DLMHs that could be processed at this NADEP by type/model/series.

Table 1.3.a: **Maximum Potential Airframe Workload**

Type / Model / Series	Units Throughput						
	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
A7E	5	5	1	0	0	0	0
EA6B	9	13	11	11	9	11	10
EP3A	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
EP3B	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
EP3E	0	2	1	2	1	3	2
EP3J	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
F14A	13	14	15	20	19	17	16
F14B	0	7	8	3	7	4	5
F14D	0	1	5	5	3	4	8
P3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
P3C	29	30	29	27	31	30	29
RP3A	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
T2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
UP3A	2	1	1	1	0	0	0
Total:	73	75	73	72	71	70	71

*NOTE: NAS Jax has agreed to provide a minimum 80,000 square feet of existing high bay airframe workspace to NADEP Jax as required to accommodate BRAC 93. An additional 114,000 square feet may be provided to accommodate BRAC 95 airframe workload.

112

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (if applicable)

ROBERT W. SMITH, RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Assistant Commander for Aviation Industrial Capabilities
Title

28 Dec 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.

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

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

Signature

Commander
Title

28 Dec 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)

Signature

Title

1/11/95
Date

R

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAVNOTE 11000 of 08 December 1993

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

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

CAPT A. W. ROSSITER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

COMMANDING OFFICER
Title

12/21/94
Date

NAVAL AVIATION DEPOT, JAX
Activity

Document Separator

R

DATA CALL 64

CONSTRUCTION COST AVOIDANCES

Table 1: Military Construction (MILCON) Projects (Excluding Family Housing Construction Projects)

Installation Name:	**JACKSONVILLE NADEP**
Unit Identification Code (UIC):	**N65886**
Major Claimant:	**NAVAIR**

Project FY	Project No.	Description	Appn	Project Cost Avoid ($000)
1995	219T	COMPONENT REWORK FACILITY REHAB *	BRAC	3,184
1995	224T	AIRCRAFT ACOUSTICAL ENCL FACILITY	BRAC	2,800
		Sub-Total - 1995		**5,984**
1996	220T	ADMINISTRATION BUILDING	BRAC	11,000
		Sub-Total - 1996		**11,000**
		Grand Total		**16,984**

(Revised 9 Dec 94) *(* - Cost Avoidance is less than project programmed amount)*

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

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

MICHAEL D. THORNTON
NAME (Please type or print)

CDR, CEC, USN
Title

MILCON PROGRAMMING DIVISION
Division

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
Activity

MD Thornton
Signature

9 Dec 94
Date

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

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

J. E. BUFFINGTON, RADM, CEC, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

COMMANDER
Title

12/9/94
Date

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING 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)

Signature

Title

12/7/94
Date

Document Separator

DATA CALL 64

CONSTRUCTION COST AVOIDANCES

Table 1: Military Construction (MILCON) Projects (Excluding Family Housing Construction Projects)

Installation Name:	JACKSONVILLE NADEP
Unit Identification Code (UIC):	N65886
Major Claimant:	NAVAIR

Project FY	Project No.	Description	Appn	Project Cost Avoid ($000)
1995	219T	COMPONENT REWORK FACILITY REHAB	BRAC	3,176
1995	224T	AIRCRAFT ACOUSTICAL ENCL FACILITY	BRAC	2,800
		Sub-Total - 1995		**5,976**
1996	220T	ADMINISTRATION BUILDING	BRAC	2,627
		Sub-Total - 1996		**2,627**
		Grand Total		**8,603**

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

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

J. E. BUFFINGTON, RADM, CEC, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

COMMANDER
Title

7/13/94
Date

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING 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)

Signature

Title

7/18/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

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

MARK E. DONALDSON
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

CDR, CEC, USN
Title

12 July 1994
Date

MILCON PROGRAMMING DIVISION
Division

FACILITIES PROGRAMMING AND CONSTRUCTION DIRECTORATE
Department

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
Activity

Enclosure (1)

BRAC DATA CALL NUMBER 64
CONSTRUCTION COST AVOIDANCE

Information on cost avoidance which could be realized as the result of cancellation of on-going or programmed construction projects is provided in Tables 1 (MILCON) and 2 (FAMILY HOUSING). These tables list MILCON/FAMILY HOUSING projects which fall within the following categories:

1. all programmed construction projects included in the FY1996 - 2001 MILCON/FAMILY HOUSING Project List,

2. all programmed projects from FY1995 or earlier for which cost avoidance could still be obtained if the project were to be canceled by 1 OCT 1995, and,

3. all programmed BRAC MILCON/FAMILY HOUSING projects for which cost avoidance could still be obtained if the project were to be canceled by 1 OCT 1995.

Projects listed in Tables 1 and 2 with potential cost avoidance were determined as meeting any one of the following criteria:

Projects with projected Work in Place (WIP) less than 75% of the Current Working Estimate (CWE) as of 1 OCT 1995 .

Projects with projected completion dates or Beneficial Occupancy Dates subsequent to 31 March 1996.

Projects with projected CWE amount greater than $15M.

The estimated cost avoidance for projects terminated after construction award would be approximately one-half of the CWE for the remaining work. Close-out, claims and other termination costs can consume the other half.

Document Separator

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Description of Occupational Categories used in Table 1.g. The following list identifies public and private sector occupations included in each of the major occupational categories used in the table. Refer to these examples as a guide in determining where to allocate appropriated fund civil service jobs at the activity.

1. **Executive, Administrative and Management.** Accountants and auditors; administrative services managers; budget analysts; construction and building inspectors; construction contractors and managers; cost estimators; education administrators; employment interviewers; engineering, science and data processing managers; financial managers; general managers and top executives; chief executives and legislators; health services managers; hotel managers and assistants; industrial production managers; inspectors and compliance officers, except construction; management analysts and consultants; marketing, advertising and public relations managers; personnel, training and labor relations specialists and managers; property and real estate managers; purchasing agents and managers; restaurant and food service managers; underwriters; wholesale and retail buyers and merchandise managers.
2. **Professional Specialty.** Use sub-headings provided.
3. **Technicians and Related Support.** Health Technologists and Technicians sub-category - self-explanatory. Other Technologists sub-category includes aircraft pilots; air traffic controllers; broadcast technicians; computer programmers; drafters; engineering technicians; library technicians; paralegals; science technicians; numerical control tool programmers.
4. **Administrative Support & Clerical.** Adjusters, investigators and collectors; bank tellers; clerical supervisors and managers; computer and peripheral equipment operators; credit clerks and authorizers; general office clerks; information clerks; mail clerks and messengers; material recording, scheduling, dispatching and distributing; postal clerks and mail carriers; records clerks; secretaries; stenographers and court reporters; teacher aides; telephone, telegraph and teletype operators; typists, word processors and data entry keyers.
5. **Services.** Use sub-headings provided.
6. **Agricultural, Forestry & Fishing.** Self explanatory.
7. **Mechanics, Installers and Repairers.** Aircraft mechanics and engine specialists; automotive body repairers; automotive mechanics; diesel mechanics; electronic equipment repairers; elevator installers and repairers; farm equipment mechanics; general maintenance mechanics; heating, air conditioning and refrigeration technicians; home appliance and power tool repairers, industrial machinery repairers; line installers and cable splicers; millwrights; mobile heavy equipment mechanics; motorcycle, boat and small engine mechanics; musical instrument repairers and tuners; vending machine servicers and repairers.
8. **Construction Trades.** Bricklayers and stonemasons; carpenters; carpet installers; concrete masons and terrazzo workers; drywall workers and lathers; electricians; glaziers; highway maintenance; insulation workers; painters and paperhangers; plasterers; plumbers and pipefitters; roofers; sheet metal workers; structural and reinforcing ironworkers; tilesetters.
9. **Production Occupations.** Assemblers; food processing occupations; inspectors, testers and graders; metalworking and plastics-working occupations; plant and systems operators, printing occupations; textile, apparel and furnishings occupations; woodworking occupations; miscellaneous production operations.
10. **Transportation & Material Moving.** Bus drivers; material moving equipment operators; rail transportation occupations; truck drivers; water transportation occupations.
11. **Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers and Laborers** (not included elsewhere). Entry level jobs not requiring significant training.

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

h. Employment of Military Spouses. Complete the following table to provide estimated information concerning **military spouses** who are also employed in the area defined in response to question 1.b., above. **Do not fill in shaded area.**

1. Percentage of Military Employees Who Are Married:	.85
2. Percentage of Military Spouses Who Work Outside of the Home:	.61
3. Break out of Spouses' Location of Employment (Total of rows 3a. through 3d.) should equal 100% and reflect the number of spouses used in the calculation of the "Percentage of Spouses Who Work Outside of the Home".	
3a. Employed "On-Base" - Appropriated Fund:	0
3b. Employed "On-Base" - Non-Appropriated Fund:	0
3c. Employed "Off-Base" - Federal Employment:	.07
3d. Employed "Off-Base" - Other Than Federal Employment	.93

3c. This represents a military spouse who is a member of the military and stationed aboard the USS ROOSEVELT.

Source of Data (1.h.) Spouse Employment Data):	Sherry L. Watson, Military Service Clerk

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

2. Infrastructure Data. For each element of community infrastructure identified in the two tables below, rate the community's ability to accommodate the relocation of additional functions and personnel to your activity. Please complete each of the three columns listed in the table, reflecting the impact of various levels of increase (20%, 50% and 100%) in the number of personnel working at the activity (and their associated families). In ranking each category, use one of the following three ratings:

A - Growth can be accommodated with little or no adverse impact to existing community infrastructure and at little or no additional expense.

B - Growth can be accommodated, but will require some investment to improve and/or expand existing community infrastructure.

C - Growth either cannot be accommodated due to physical/environmental limitations or would require substantial investment in community infrastructure improvements.

Table 2.a., "Local Communities": This first table refers to the local community (i.e., the community in which the base is located) and its ability to meet the increased requirements of the installation.

Table 2.b., "Economic Region": This second table asks for an assessment of the infrastructure of the economic region (those counties identified in response to question 1.b., (page 3) - taken in the aggregate) and its ability to meet the needs of additional employees and their families moving into the area.

For both tables, annotate with an asterisk (*) any categories which are wholly supported on-base, i.e., are not provided by the local community. These categories should also receive an A-B-C rating. Answers for these "wholly supported on-base" categories should refer to base infrastructure rather than community infrastructure.

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

a. Table A: Ability of the local community to meet the expanded needs of the base.

1) Using the **A - B - C** rating system described above, complete the table below.

Category	20% Increase	50% Increase	100% Increase
Off-Base Housing	A	B	B
Schools - Public	B	C[1]	C[1]
Schools - Private	A	B	B
Public Transportation - Roadways	A	A	B
Public Transportation - Buses/Subways	A	B	B
Public Transportation - Rail	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fire Protection*	B[2]	C[2]	C[2]
Police*	A[3]	B[3]	B[3]
Health Care Facilities	A	A	B
Utilities:			
Water Supply	A	A	A
Water Distribution	A	A	A
Energy Supply	A	A	A
Energy Distribution	A	A	A
Wastewater Collection	A	A	A
Wastewater Treatment	A	A	A
Storm Water Collection	A	A	A
Solid Waste Collection and Disposal	A	A	A
Hazardous/Toxic Waste Disposal	A	A	A
Recreational Activities	A	A	B

Remember to mark with an asterisk any categories which are wholly supported on-base.

The same data was used by NAS Jacksonville and should not be double counted.
Table A considers 4,580 personnel and was added to NAS, Jacksonville's submission.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

2) For each rating of "C" identified in the table on the preceding page, attach a brief narrative explanation of the types and magnitude of improvements required and/or the nature of any barriers that preclude expansion.

*1 For increases in Naval personnel of 50% or 100%, schools in Duval County would need to accommodate the additional students by one or a combination of the following means:

a. Constructing new schools
b. Redrawing attendance boundaries
c. Successfully encouraging students to attend magnet schools
d. Implementing a modified calendar schedule.
e. Capping enrollment and transporting students to other schools

*2 Ability of the base infrastructure to meet the expanded needs.

Fire Protection	20% Increase - B
	50% Increase - C
	100% Increase - C

A 50% increase in the number of personnel working at the activity (and their associated families) would increase the activity fire load beyond what the present structured capabilities could absorb. Present fire flow rating is 500 gallons per minute (gpm) below the calculated 2/3 risk rule, relying heavily on mutual response from the surrounding community. Increase by this percentage would require as a minimum, opening a recent closed fire station aboard the command with personnel and equipment to meet the additional fire load.

A 100% increase in the number of personnel working at the activity (and their associated families) would increase the activity fire load beyond what the present structured capabilities could absorb. Present fire flow rating is fixed at 500 gpm below the 2/3 rule, calculated risk. Support for Fire Protection is relied upon through a mutual aid agreement with the surrounding community. Increase by this percentage would require as a minimum, opening a recently closed fire station aboard the activity with personnel and equipment. Restructuring the fire department by increase of personnel and equipment to accommodate a fire load doubled the present capacity would be determined by performing an updated risk assessment. Consolidation and expansion of present functions would create the need for additional space added to the present fire facilities and/or new construction of a major consolidated facility. Should an increase in personnel working aboard the activity result in new construction of facilities, additional square footage will impact the numbers of fire prevention inspector personnel and associated equipment.

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

*[3] Ability of the base infrastructure to meet the expanded needs.

Police	20% Increase - A
	50% Increase - B
	100% Increase - B

Source of Data (2.a. 1) & 2) - Local Community Table):
Housing: City of Jacksonville Planning and Development Department, 1994
Public Schools: Duval County Public Schools, 1994
Private Schools: Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce, 1994
Public Transportation: Jacksonville Transportation Authority, 1994
Fire Protection: City of Jacksonville Fire & Rescue Department, 1994
Health Care Facilities: Northeast Florida Health Planning Council, 1994
Utilities: City of Jacksonville Public Utilities Department, 1994;
Jacksonville Electric Authority, 1994
Recreational Activities: City of Jacksonville Parks, Recreation & Entertainment Dept, 1994

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

b. Table B: Ability of the region described in the response to question 1.b. (page 3) (taken in the aggregate) to meet the needs of additional employees and their families relocating into the area.

1) Using the **A - B - C** rating system described above, complete the table below.

Category	20% Increase	50% Increase	100% Increase
Off-Base Housing	A	B	B
Schools - Public	B	B	B
Schools - Private	A	B	B
Public Transportation - Roadways	A	A	A
Public Transportation - Buses/Subways	A	A	A
Public Transportation - Rail	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fire Protection*	B[1]	C[1]	C[1]
Police*	A[2]	B[2]	B[2]
Health Care Facilities	A	A	B
Utilities:			
Water Supply	A	A	A
Water Distribution	A	A	A
Energy Supply	A	A	A
Energy Distribution	A	A	A
Wastewater Collection	A	A	A
Wastewater Treatment	A	A	A
Storm Water Collection	A	A	A
Solid Waste Collection and Disposal	A	A	A
Hazardous/Toxic Waste Disposal	A	A	A
Recreation Facilities	A	A	A

Remember to mark with an asterisk any categories which are wholly supported on-base.
The same data was used by NAS Jacksonville and should not be double counted.
Table B considers 4,580 personnel and was added to NAS, Jacksonville's submission.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

2) For each rating of "C" identified in the table on the preceding page, attach a brief narrative explanation of the types and magnitude of improvements required and/or the nature of any barriers that preclude expansion.

NOT APPLICABLE

[1] Ability of the base infrastructure to meet the expanded needs.

Fire Protection	20% Increase - B
	50% Increase - C
	100% Increase - C

A 50% increase in the number of personnel working at the activity (and their associated families) would increase the activity fire load beyond what the present structured capabilities could absorb. Present fire flow rating is 500 gallons per minute (gpm) below the calculated 2/3 risk rule, relying heavily on mutual response from the surrounding community. Increase by this percentage would require as a minimum, opening a recent closed fire station aboard the command with personnel and equipment to meet the additional fire load.

A 100% increase in the number of personnel working at the activity (and their associated families) would increase the activity fire load beyond what the present structured capabilities could absorb. Present fire flow rating is fixed at 500 gpm below the 2/3 rule, calculated risk. Support for Fire Protection is relied upon through a mutual aid agreement with the surrounding community. Increase by this percentage would require as a minimum, opening a recently closed fire station aboard the activity with personnel and equipment. Restructuring the fire department by increase of personnel and equipment to accommodate a fire load doubled the present capacity would be determined by performing an updated risk assessment. Consolidation and expansion of present functions would create the need for additional space added to the present fire facilities and/or new construction of a major consolidated facility. Should an increase in personnel working aboard the activity result in new construction of facilities, additional square footage will impact the numbers of fire prevention inspector personnel and associated equipment.

[2] Ability of the base infrastructure to meet the expanded needs.

Police	20% Increase - A
	50% Increase - B
	100% Increase - B

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Source of Data (2.b. 1) & 2) - Regional Table):
Housing: City of Jacksonville Planning and Development Department, 1994
Public Schools: Duval County Public Schools, 1994
Private Schools: Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce, 1994
Public Transportation: Jacksonville Transportation Authority, 1994
Fire Protection: City of Jacksonville Fire & Rescue Department, 1994
Health Care Facilities: Northeast Florida Health Planning Council, 1994
Utilities: City of Jacksonville Public Utilities Department, 1994;
Jacksonville Electric Authority, 1994
Recreational Activities: City of Jacksonville Parks, Recreation & Entertainment Dept, 1994

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

3. Public Facilities Data:

a. **Off-Base Housing Availability.** For the counties identified in the response to question 1.b. (page 3), in the aggregate, estimate the current average vacancy rate for community housing. Use current data or information identified on the latest family housing market analysis. For each of the categories listed (rental units and units for sale), combine single family homes, condominiums, townhouses, mobile homes, etc., into a single rate:

Rental Units: 9.7% VACANCY RATE

Units for Sale: 5% VACANCY RATE

Source of Data (3.a. Off-Base Housing): Jacksonville Planning & Development Department, Northeast Florida Apartment Council, 1994
Jacksonville Association of Realtors, 1994

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

b. **Education.**

1) Information is required on the current capacity and enrollment levels of school systems serving employees of the activity. Information should be keyed to the counties identified in the response to question 1.b. (page 3).

School District	County	Number of Schools			Enrollment		Pupil-to-Teacher Ratio		Does School District Serve Gov't Housing Units? *
		Elementary	Middle	High	Current	Max. Capacity	Current	Max. Ratio	
DUVAL/JACKSONVILLE	DUVAL	99	22	17	119,404	122,600	20:1	29.5:1	YES
CLAY SCHOOLS	CLAY	15	5	4	24,000	26,000	27.5:1	29.5:1	YES
ST. JOHNS	ST. JOHNS	12	5	2	13,600	15,600	20:1	32:1	YES

* Answer "Yes" in this column if the school district in question enrolls students who reside in government housing.

Source of Data (3.b.1) Education Table): Duval County Public Schools, 1994
Clay County Public Schools, 1994
St. Johns County Public Schools, 1994

2) Are there any on-base "Section 6" Schools? If so, identify number of schools and current enrollment.

NOT APPLICABLE

Source of Data (3.b.2) On-Base Schools):

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

3) For the counties identified in the response to question 1.b. (page 3), in the aggregate, list the names of undergraduate and graduate colleges and universities which offer certificates, Associate, Bachelor or Graduate degrees :

Within a close proximity of NAS Jacksonville, there are seven colleges and universities serving over 100,000 people in both credit and non-credit courses. These schools are the University of North Florida, Edward Waters College, Jacksonville University, Flagler College, Jones College, Florida Community College and St. Johns River Community College. All seven institutions offer day and night classes.

Adult high school is offered at the Florida Community College and adult high school is offered at Orange Park High School for the military personnel and dependents living in Clay County.

Technical and vocational programs are offered at Florida Community College in the areas of business, data processing, emergency medical technology, office systems specialists, paramedic, job preparation, job skill upgrades and a variety of apprenticeships.

Florida Community College and St. Johns River Community College offer over 80 associate in arts and associate in science degree programs. These programs include: accounting technology, automotive service management technology, aviation administration, biomedical equipment engineering technology, building construction technology, business administration and management, business data processing, civil engineering technology, computer engineering technology (digital), computer information systems analysis (integrated systems specialist), computer programming and analysis, electronics engineering technology (robotics), fire science technology, industrial management technology, nursing (associate degree) R.N., telecommunication engineering technology.

A wide variety of undergraduate courses and degrees are offered at all seven institutions listed above. Degree programs include: biology, chemistry, counseling psychology, economics, English, history, mathematics, mathematical sciences, political science, psychology, public administration, sociology, statistics, business administration, management, marketing, transportation and logistics, computer and information sciences, electrical engineering, health, health administration, nursing, aviation management, aviation management and flight operations, environmental science, information systems, international business, management, marine science, mechanical engineering.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

The University of North Florida and Jacksonville University offer graduate degrees. Degree programs include: Criminal Justice MA, English MA, Mathematical Sciences MA, Public Administration MPA, Business Administration MBA, Health Administration MHA, Health Science MSH.

Special Programs of Note:

Jacksonville University's College of Business offers a weekend program for executive MBA students and a night program for traditional MBA students. Weekend programs are offered through the College of Weekend Studies for nontraditional aged undergraduates. The Division of Education offers two professional development programs; one of which, the "Second Career as a Teacher," is taught to military personnel at NAS Jacksonville who are nearing retirement, already hold a bachelor's degree or higher and want to become a secondary school teacher once they leave the Navy.

Florida Community College's Open Campus offers non-traditional education via telecourses, weekend college and the military education institute which is located at NAS Jacksonville.

Source of Data (3.b.3) Colleges):	Catalogues of the seven Colleges and Universities, 1993-1994

4) For the counties identified in the response to question 1.b. (page 3), in the aggregate, list the names and major curriculums of vocational/technical training schools:

Advanced Career Training Jacksonville, FL	Travel and Tourism
Advanced Computer Training Jacksonville, FL	Basic-Advanced Classes Desktop Publishing Graphics Spreadsheets Word Processing

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Amaro School of Modeling Jacksonville, FL	Acting Workshop Children's Modeling Children's TV Commercial Course Professional Fashion Modeling
American Welding Schools & Certification Laboratory	Pipe Fitter/Welder (Certification Level) Plate & Structural Welder
Arlington Beauty Academy Jacksonville, FL	Cosmetology
Beauty Care Academy of Hair Design Jacksonville, FL	Cosmetology
H&R Block Jacksonville, FL	Income Tax Preparation
Career Com School of Business Jacksonville, FL	Medical Transcriptionist Nursing Assistant Office Automation Specialist Security Career
Denise Carol Modeling & Finishing School Jacksonville, FL	Adult Professional Modeling Basic Studio Modeling Male Modeling Professional Studio Professional Modeling
Concorde Career Institute Jacksonville, FL	Dental Assistant Medical Assistant Medical Office Management
Duval County School Board Jacksonville, FL	A/C Refrigeration and Heating Mechanic Advertising Services Automotive Mechanics Basic Auto Body Repair and Refinishing Basic Cabinet Making & Milwork

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Duval County School Board (cont'd)
Jacksonville, FL

Basic Electronics
Basic Gasoline Engine Mechanics
Basic Sheet Metal
Basic Welding
Brick & Block Laying
Building Maintenance
Business Computer Programming
Business Management & Law
Business Ownership
Child Care Assisting
Child Care Supervisor
Clothing Production
Commercial Foods
Computerized Machining Technology
Consumer Electronic Repair
Cosmetology
Criminal Justice
Dental Lab Assisting
Diesel Engine Mechanics
Fashion Merchandising
Fire Service Aide
Food Production & Services
Forestry
General Drafting
General Machining
Health Unit Coordinator
Home Health Aide
Marine Mechanics
Marketing & Distribution
Medical Lab Assisting
Micro Computer Electronics
Nursery Operations
Nursing Assistant
Nutrition & Food
Office Procedures
Ornamental Horticulture

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Duval County School Board (cont'd) Jacksonville, FL	Practical Appliance Service Practical Electrical/Electronics Practical Engine Mechanics Practical Financial Skills Practical Health Skills Practical Home Maintenance Practical Keyboarding skills Principles of Drafting Technologies Principles of Electronics Principles of Energy, Power Technician Principles of Engineering Technician Principles of Public Services Recordkeeping Residential Appliance & Refrig Repair Residential Carpentry Residential Electric Wiring Residential Plumbing Shorthand Turfgrass Operations Typing Vision Care Assistant Warehousing Word Processing
Elkins Institute in Jacksonville Jacksonville, FL	Electronics/Computer Technology Radio Broadcasting Software Applications Technology
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University Jacksonville, FL	Airframe Mechanic Powerplants Mechanic
Emerson Vocational Academy, Inc. Jacksonville, FL	Massage Therapy Private Investigation
ERA School of Real Estate Jacksonville, Florida	In-house Sales Training Real Estate Sales License Course

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Flagler Career Institute Jacksonville, FL	Home Health Aide Respiratory Therapist Program Respiratory Therapy Technician
Florida Beauty College, Inc. Jacksonville, FL	Cosmetology
Florida Technical College Jacksonville, FL	Computer Information Science Electronics/Computer Technology
Genell's School of Hair Design Jacksonville, FL	Cosmetology
ITT Technical Institute Jacksonville, FL	Electronic Engineering Technology
International Bartending Institute Jacksonville, FL	Bartending
Jacksonville Job Corps Center Jacksonville, FL	Advanced Career Training Educational Training Program GED Vocational Skills Training
Jacksonville School of Massage Jacksonville, FL	Colonic Therapy Massage Therapy
Mandarin School of Chinese Medicine Jacksonville, FL	Acupuncture Training Program Professional Massage Training Cocktail Serving Professional Bartending
Northside Beauty Care Academy of Cosmetology Jacksonville, FL	Cosmetology

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Normandy Beauty School Jacksonville, FL	Cosmetology
North Florida College of Cosmetology, Inc. Jacksonville, FL	Cosmetology
PC Learning Center, Inc. Jacksonville, FL	Computer
Professional Service School Jacksonville, FL	Professional Bartending
Quality Business Systems Jacksonville, FL	Business Equipment Vocational Education
Rice Institute Jacksonville, FL	Administrative Office Assistant Nursing Assistant
Riverside Hairstyling Academy Jacksonville, FL	Cosmetology
Roffler Hair Design College - Jacksonville Jacksonville, FL	Barber Program Cosmetology Facial Technology Nail Technology
Scarborough Enterprises Custom Rug Instruction Jacksonville, FL	Carpet Carving Custom Rug Manufacturing

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Sessions Studio, Inc., Jacksonville Jacksonville, FL	Basic Modeling Children & Professional Modeling Commercial Acting I (age 11-over) Commercial Acting II (age 11-over) Fashion Merchandising Male Modeling Advanced Modeling
Stenotype Institute of Jacksonville, Inc. Jacksonville, FL	Court Reporting (Home Study) Court Reporting (Resident)
Troutman's College of Hair Design Jacksonville, FL	Cosmetology Program
University Medical Center Jacksonville, FL	Radiologic Technology Training Program 2 Year Hospital based Certificate Program 2 Year Associate Degree Program 4 Year Baccalaureate Program Radiographer
Central Michigan University Center at NAS JAX Jacksonville, FL	Business Administration
Florida Community College at Jacksonville Jacksonville, FL	A/C Refrigeration & Heating Accounting Technology Air Traffic Management Aircraft Airframe Mechanic Architectural Engineering Technology Auto Body Repair Automotive Light Truck Mechanics Automotive Machine Shop Aviation Administration Bank Teller Training Biomedical Equipment Engineering Technology Building Construction Technology

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Florida Community College at Jacksonville (cont'd) Jacksonville, FL	Business Administration Business Administration & Management Carpentry Cashier Sales Checking Center of Electronic Emphasis Center of Electronic Specialization Child Care Aide Child Care Center Operations Child Care Services Civil Engineering Services Communication Engineering Technology Computer Engineering Computer Programming & Analysis Cosmetology Criminal Justice Technology Dental Assisting Dental Hygiene
S&S Industries Orange Park, FL	Tool & Die Maker
Amaro School of Modeling Orange Park, FL	Childrens' Modeling Childrens' TV Commercial Course Commercial Course Professional Fashion Modeling TV Commercial Course/Children
Clay County School Board Orange Park, FL	Public Education
National Training, Inc. Orange Park, FL	Heavy & Small Equipment Operations
St. Johns River Community College Orange Park, FL	Accounting Clerk Emergency Medical Technician Executive Secretary

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

St. Johns River Community College (cont'd) Orgage Park, FL	General Business Instrumentation Technology Marketing Management Mid-Management Marketing Postal Management Small Business Management
Flagler College St. Augustine, FL	Introduction to Word Perfect Child Care Assisting Clerk Typist Computer Electronics Technology Cosmetology Specialist Drafting/Architectural Electricity Commercial/Industrial Electronic Technology Emergency Medical Technician Industrial Foremanship & Supervisor Industrial Mechanic/Maintenance & Repair Machining Management Sanitation Medical Transcription (Medical Secretary) Nursery Operations Photography/Commercial Typing Turfgrass Operation/Landscaping/ Colorscaping
St. Johns River Community College St. Augustine, FL	Business English Humanities

Source of Data (3.b.4) Vo-tech Training: Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce, Partnership for Workforce Preparation

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

c. **Transportation.**

1) Is the activity served by public transportation?

	Yes	No
Bus:	X	
Rail:		X
Subway:		X
Ferry:		X

Source of Data (3.c.1) Transportation): Jacksonville Transportation Authority, 1994

2) Identify the location of the nearest passenger railroad station (long distance rail service, not commuter service within a city) and the distance from the activity to the station.

The AMTRAK station in Jacksonville, is located at 3570 Clifford Lane on the City's west side. It is 11 miles from NAS Jacksonville.

Source of Data (3.c.2) Transportation): Jacksonville Transportation Authority, 1994

3) Identify the name and location of the nearest commercial airport (with public carriers, e.g., USAIR, United, etc.) and the distance from the activity to the airport.

The Jacksonville International Airport is located on Airport Road, 2.5 miles west of I-95 on the City's northside. The Airport is 24.1 miles from NAS Jacksonville.

Source of Data (3.c.3) Transportation): Jacksonville Port Authority, 1994

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

4) How many carriers are available at this airport?

The Jacksonville International Airport is served by eight (8) major airlines and five (5) regional carriers, offering 127 daily flights throughout the U.S.

Source of Data (3.c.4) Transportation): Jacksonville Port Authority, 1994

5) What is the Interstate route number and distance, in miles, from the activity to the nearest Interstate highway?

NAS Jacksonville is 2.6 miles from I-295, 8 miles from I-10 and 9 miles from I-95.

Source of Data (3.c.5) Transportation): Jacksonville Transportation Authority, 1994

6) Access to Base:

a) Describe the quality and capacity of the road systems providing access to the base, specifically during peak periods. (Include both information on the area surrounding the base and information on access to the base, e.g., numbers of gates, congestion problems, etc.)

Naval Air Station Jacksonville is located on US Highway 17 (Roosevelt Blvd) and can be reached from the north or south via Interstate 95, and from the west by Interstate 10. The main gate of NAS Jacksonville is located approximately three miles north of the intersection of Highway 17 and Interstate 295.

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

The quality of US Highway 17, which serves NAS Jacksonville as the primary artery, is excellent. The maximum peak capacity for US Highway 17 from the Clay County line to Timuquana Road is 6,330 trips. The peak hour traffic is 3,816 trips, both with a Level of Service (LOS) A*. There are three gates providing access to NAS Jacksonville. A reversible lane use system allows six lanes of traffic to feed throughout the secondary roads throughout the station.

b) Do access roads transit residential neighborhoods? NO

c) Are there any easements that preclude expansion of the access road system? NO

d) Are there any man-made barriers that inhibit traffic flow (e.g., draw bridges, etc.)? NO

*LOS A = Average stopped delay (seconds/vehicle) is less than 5 seconds and reserves capacity per lane (passenger cars/hour is greater than 400).

Source of Data (3.c.6) Transportation):	Naval Air Station Jacksonville Directory and Guide/NAS Safety

d. **Fire Protection/Hazardous Materials Incidents.** Does the activity have an agreement with the local community for fire protection or hazardous materials incidents? Explain the nature of the agreement and identify the provider of the service.

NAS Jacksonville has an agreement with the local community for fire protection. A Mutual Aid Fire Fighting Assistance Agreement exists between NAS Jacksonville and the City of Jacksonville, FL. The agreement to provide mutual aid fire fighting assistance is between the Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, and the Director of Public Safety and the City of Jacksonville, Florida. Mutual Aid Assistance Agreements are required by the following references:

- OPNAVINST 11320.23D Shore Activities Fire Protection Program of February 12, 1987.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

- DODINST 6055.6 Department of Defense Fire Protection Program of August 1, 1988.

- NAVFAC P-1021 Navy Shore Establishment Fire Protection/Prevention Program of February 1989.

The present Mutual Aid Assistance Agreement in place provides for occasional utilization of mutual aid only for the fighting of large fires. Normally, the Naval Air Station Fire Department provides assistance to the City of Jacksonville for control and extinguishment of large petroleum fires with AFFF extinguishing agents. City of Jacksonville provides backup pumper apparatus's and manpower to contain large structural fires.

Primary fire protection is being provided for:

1. Naval Supply Center, Jacksonville Fuel Terminal, Heckscher Drive, Jacksonville, FL on a no-cost lease agreement. The Navy provides apparatus, housing, extinguishing agents, mogas and lubricants. The City of Jacksonville provides manpower.

2. A 25,000 square foot rental warehouse in Orange Park, FL housing Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville aircraft parts. There is a verbal agreement with the Town of Orange Park, FL for mutual support of fire fighting services.

3. A 40,000 square foot warehouse at the Imeson Industrial Park, Jacksonville, FL for fleet readiness storage. Fire protection is provided by a mutual aid fire fighting assistance agreement with the City of Jacksonville, FL.

4. A small metal shed and two small concrete block buildings totaling 328 square feet located off Heckscher Drive, Jacksonville, FL housing machinery for Company B, 4th Assault Amphibious Battalion USMCR. Fire Protection is provided by a mutual aid fire fighting assistance agreement with the City of Jacksonville, FL.

NAS Jacksonville does not have an agreement with the local community for hazardous materials incidents.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Source of Data (3.d. Fire/Hazmat): Written mutual aid fire fighting assistance agreement with the City of Jacksonville, FL and a verbal fire fighting agreement with the Town of Orange Park, FL.

e. **Police Protection.**

1) What is the level of legislative jurisdiction held by the installation?

NAS Jacksonville has exclusive jurisdiction. Request to become concurrent pending at SECNAV level.

2) If there is more than one level of legislative jurisdiction for installation property, provide a brief narrative description of the areas covered by each level of legislative jurisdiction and whether there are separate agreements for local law enforcement protection.

This does not apply to NAS Jacksonville.

3) Does the activity have a specific written agreement with local law enforcement concerning the provision of local police protection?

There is no specific written agreement with local law enforcement concerning the provision of local police protection.

4) If agreements exist with more than one local law enforcement entity, provide a brief narrative description of whom the agreement is with and what services are covered.

An agreement exists between the Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville and the Clay County Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff of Clay County has agreed to provide criminal justice information from the Florida Department of Law Enforcement - Florida Crime Information Center (FCIC) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation - National Crime Information Centers (NCIC) Criminal Justice Automated Computer System. The Sheriff of Clay County agrees to provide:

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

-Drivers License Information
-Stolen Vehicle/Property Information
-Vehicle Registration Information
-Wanted Persons Information
-Criminal History Information

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

5) If military law enforcement officials are routinely augmented by officials of other federal agencies (BLM, Forest Service, etc.), identify any written agreements covering such services and briefly describe the level of support received.

The Coast Guard is considering a proposal to remove an existing security zone for the St. Johns River, Jacksonville, Florida, and to establish a security zone for the waters surrounding Naval Air Station Jacksonville. The proposed change will delete an existing security zone for the north bank of the St. Johns River at the junction of Brills Cut Range and Broward Point Turn, locally known as Dunn Creek Terminal. The proposal is also to establish a security zone around NAS Jacksonville to safeguard sensitive military assets on the facility. Entry into this zone will be prohibited, unless authorized by the Captain of the Port. This proposal will enhance the ability of the Navy to increase security for the facility during heightened threat conditions.

Source of Data (3.e. 1) - 5) - Police): Letter of Agreement between the Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville and the Clay County Sheriff's Office. Federal Register/Vol 59. No 96/ May 19, 1994

f. **Utilities.**

1) Does the activity have an agreement with the local community for water, refuse disposal, power or any other utility requirements? Explain the nature of the agreement and identify the provider of the service.

Electric power is supplied by the Jacksonville Electric Authority for all three Navy bases. Water and Sewage is supplied to off-base activities at Mayport Naval Station by the City of Atlantic Beach. Natural Gas is supplied to NAS Cecil Field and NAS Jacksonville by Peoples Gas. Pickup of refuse is accomplished by contractor and deposited to the City of Jacksonville landfill.

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

2) Has the activity been subject to water rationing or interruption of delivery during the last five years? If so, identify time period during which rationing existed and the restrictions imposed. Were activity operations affected by these situations? If so, explain extent of impact.

Minor water rationing has occurred requiring washing of cars and yard irrigation on certain days of the week. Water is supplied by Navy owned plants so no interruption of service has occurred. No activity operations have been impacted.

3) Has the activity been subject to any other significant disruptions in utility service, e.g., electrical "brown outs", "rolling black outs", etc., during the last five years? If so, identify time period(s) covered and extent/nature of restrictions/disruption. Were activity operations affected by these situations? If so, explain extent of impact.

Reduced availability of natural gas occurs 2-5 times per year requiring steam plants to use backup fuel. Periods range from one to two days and do not impact activity operations. No significant interruption of power has occurred in the last five years.

Source of Data (3.f. 1) - 3) Utilities): Public Works, NAS Jacksonville, Fl.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

4. **Business Profile.** List the top ten employers in the geographic area defined by your response to question 1.b. (page 3), taken in the aggregate, (include your activity, if appropriate):

Employer	Product/Service	No. of Employees
1. NAS Jacksonville	Military	20,461
2. NS Mayport	Military	15,003
3. Duval County Public Schools	Education	11,035
4. State of Florida	Government	9,733
5. NAS Cecil Field	Military	8,555
6. Winn Dixie Stores	Supermarket	8,000
7. City of Jacksonville	Government	7,427
8. AT&T American Transtech	Telemarketing	5,300
9. Publix Supermarkets	Supermarket	5,018
10. Blue Cross/Blue Shield	Insurance	4,890

Source of Data (4. Business Profile): Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce, 1994

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

5. **Other Socio-Economic Impacts.** For each of the following areas, describe other recent (past 5 years), on-going or projected economic impacts (both positive and negative) on the geographic region defined by your response to question 1.b. (page 3), in the aggregate:

a. Loss of Major Employers:

NAS Cecil Field, military,	8555 jobs lost
Sears, distribution,	1000 jobs lost
P.I.E., trucking,	500 jobs lost
Southeast Bank, financial services,	350 jobs lost
Delta Airlines, reservation center,	300 jobs lost
Gulf Life, insurance,	250 jobs lost
Pace Inc., distribution,	150 jobs lost
Cheseborough Ponds, distribution,	100 jobs lost
American Tourister, distribution and mfg.,	100 jobs lost

b. Introduction of New Businesses/Technologies:

Coach, distribution,	700 jobs
Harris Specialty Chemicals, chemical company h.q.,	300 jobs
Adesa Corp., automotive auction ,	250 jobs
Vector Aeromotive Corp., sports car production,	250 jobs
Swisher International, cigar manufacturing,	200 jobs
Parisian, retail,	200 jobs

c. Natural Disasters:

NONE

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

d. Overall Economic Trends:

The Jacksonville Business Index measures eight indicators of economic activity in the Jacksonville metropolitan area. As indicated below, all eight indicators improved in 1993 as compared to 1992.

Building permits (number)	increased by 7%
Building permits (dollar value)	increased by 15.9%
Unemployment	decreased by 15%
Employment	increased by 2.6%
Help wanted Advertising	increased by 17.4%
Retail sales	increased by 4.8%
Airline travelers	increased by 2.4%
Electric accounts	increased by 1.4%

Source of Data (5. Other Socio/Econ): Jacksonville Business Index, Florida Times Union, 1994

6. Other. Identify any contributions of your activity to the local community not discussed elsewhere in this response.

Advent Lutheran Church Youth Group
American Red Cross, NE FL
Athletic Association of Orange Park
Boy Scouts of America
Bass Tournament
Big Brothers/Big Sisters
Big Orange Barbershop Chorus
Boys & girls Club of NE Florida
Career Shadowing
Channel 7 WJCT
Chimney Lakes Elementary
Clay County Department Public Safety
Clay County Sheriff Vol.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Clay County Soccer Club
Clay County Soccer Referees
Community Church in Keystone
Down Syndrome Association
Ed White Senior High School
Evangel Temple Assembly of God
Faith Wesleyan Church
Fleming Island Baptist Church
Florida-Georgia Blood Alliance
Gateway Girl Scout Council
Gateway Rehab Center
Gloryfound
Green Cove Springs Athletic Assoc
Guardian Adlitem
HRS
Habitat for Humanity
Island View Baptist Church
James Weldon Johnson Middle School
Jax Insight
Jax Pathfinders of SDA Church
Lake Shore Middle School
Lakeside Elementary School
Mandarin Presbyterian Church
March of Dimes
Mayor's Disability Council
Middleburgh High School
Mission Air
Mormon Church
NADEP Outreach
New Life Christian Fellowship
Orange Park High School Baseball Booster
Orange Park High School Soccer Booster
Orange Park Little League
Ortega Stockton Soccer Association
Outreach Committee
Pacesetter Booster Club

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Ridgeview Jr. High
Riverside/Avondale Preservation
Southside Church of God in Christ
Springfield Preservation
St. Catherine Catholic Church
St. Catherine Nursing Home
St. Joseph's Church
St. John's River City Band
The Players Championship
Theater Jacksonville, Inc.
WJCT Jazz Fest
WJCT Radio
City Council Presentation
Marc Little, Navy League
Jacksonville Civic Round Table
Chamber of Commerce, Mil Issues Steering Council
Jax Community Adams Environmental Award
Presidential Award for Quality Examiners
International Brotherhood of Teamsters Union Reps (Local 512)
N. E. Chapter FL Planning & Zoning Assoc
Society of American Military Engineers
Downtown Chapter of Sertoma
S. E. Regional Maintenance Consolidation Group

Participation in special events and observances to include:

Depot Float/Veteran's Day Parade
FY94 Food Drive
FY94 CFC
Career Shadow/Bradford HS
Toys for Tots Collection
Salvation Army Bell Ringers
Cmty/Outreach Children's Christmas Party
Cmty/CCAR Christmas Party
Blood Drive
Special Olympics/Booster Club

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Judge Sheetmetal Contest/Westside Skill Center
Savings Bond Drive
National Volunteer Week
Depot Environmental Exhibit
March of Dimes Walk
Cmty Tours/Take Daughters to Work Day
Depot Exhibit/Blacks in Gov't
Depot Exhibit/Heritage Days
Scout World
Summer Youth Program

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

The Pacesetters of the Naval Aviation Depot (NADEP), Jacksonville, are deeply involved in the Jacksonville community, both collectively and individually. They contribute their time, (17,000 hours) money, and interest to every aspect of the community ranging from employment, environment, and public safety, to cultural, civic, and neighborhood associations.

NADEP has initiated a number of community outreach programs such as providing employment to approximately 50 employees who are under contract with the Clay County Association for the Retarded and career shadow opportunities to students from various shcools throughout the city. This also includes an active visitor program that provides tours to community organizations, city representatives, and schools.

NADEP employees participate in over 60 volunteer activities such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Food Bank, Hospice, Hot Line Crisis, American Red Cross, Learn-to-Read, Special Olympics, and fire, police, and rescue squads. In addition, the NADEP Outreach Committee conducts fund raisers during the year and sponsors a variety of activities for the needs and for underpriviledged children, such as an annual Christmas party and donations of playground and athletic equipment.

For the past three years, Depot employees have participated in an annual food drive which benefits the hungry in the greater Jacksonville area with an all time high this past year of over 2 tons of food.

Source of Data (6. Other):NADEP PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE /SUBMITTED BY KATRINA DUGAN

~~46~~ 49 KC 8/1/94 . AIR-0983

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAVNOTE 11000 of 08 December 1993

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

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

CAPT. A. W. ROSSITER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Commanding Officer
Title

18 July 1994
Date

Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 65

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT L. JORDAN, CAPT, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER
FOR AVIATION DEPOTS
Title

8/1/94
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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

WILLIAM J. TINSTON, JR., RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR
LOGISTICS AND FLEET SUPPORT
Title

8/1/94
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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

DONALD V. BOECKER, RADM USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

COMMANDER,
NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title (ACTING)

2 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)

Signature

Title

8/10/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 65

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

JUL 25 1994
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES

Activity Information:

Activity Name:	NADEP Jacksonville
UIC:	N65886
Host Activity Name (if response is for a tenant activity):	Naval Air Station Jacksonville
Host Activity UIC:	N00207

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

DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES

lines to the table (following line 2j., as necessary, to identify any additional cost elements not currently shown). **Leave shaded areas of table blank.**

Table 1A - Base Operating Support Costs (Other Than DBOF Overhead)			
Activity Name: NADEP Jacksonville		**UIC:** N65886	
Category	**FY 1996 BOS Costs ($000)**		
	Non-Labor	**Labor**	**Total**
1. Real Property Maintenance Costs:			
1a. Maintenance and Repair	N/A	N/A	N/A
1b. Minor Construction	N/A	N/A	N/A
1c. Sub-total 1a. and 1b.	N/A	N/A	N/A
2. Other Base Operating Support Costs:			
2a. Utilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
2b. Transportation	N/A	N/A	N/A
2c. Environmental	N/A	N/A	N/A
2d. Facility Leases	N/A	N/A	N/A
2e. Morale, Welfare & Recreation	N/A	N/A	N/A
2f. Bachelor Quarters	N/A	N/A	N/A
2g. Child Care Centers	N/A	N/A	N/A
2h. Family Service Centers	N/A	N/A	N/A
2i. Administration	N/A	N/A	N/A
2j. Other (Specify)	N/A	N/A	N/A
2k. Sub-total 2a. through 2j:	N/A	N/A	N/A
3. Grand Total (sum of 1c. and 2k.):	N/A	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

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)
Not Applicable	

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 under utilized plant capacity costs as a DBOF overhead "BOS expense" on Table 1B..

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES

Table 1B - Base Operating Support Costs (DBOF Overhead)			
Activity Name: NADEP Jacksonville		UIC: N65886	
Category	FY 1996 Net Cost From UC/FUND-4 ($000)		
	Non-Labor	Labor	Total
1. Real Property Maintenance Costs:			
1a. Real Property Maintenance (>$15K)	730		730
1b. Real Property Maintenance (<$15K)	277	39	316
1c. Minor Construction (Expensed)	8	1	9
1d. Minor Construction (Capital Budget)	1,910	0	1,910
1c. Sub-total 1a. through 1d.	2,925	40	2,965
2. Other Base Operating Support Costs:			
2a. Command Office	21	1,695	1,716
2b. ADP Support	3,941	2,507	6,448
2c. Equipment Maintenance	1,292	1,335	2,627
2d. Civilian Personnel Services	2,260	185	2,445
2e. Accounting/Finance	1,194	1,204	2,398
2f. Utilities	742	0	742
2g. Environmental Compliance	628	683	1,311
2h. Police and Fire	1,515	104	1,619
2i. Safety	99	0	99
2j. Supply and Storage Operations	69	4,571	4,640
2k. Major Range Test Facility Base Costs	0	0	0

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES

Table 1B - Base Operating Support Costs (DBOF Overhead)			
Activity Name: NADEP Jacksonville		UIC: N65886	
Category	FY 1996 Net Cost From UC/FUND-4 ($000)		
	Non-Labor	Labor	Total
21. Other (Specify)	14,950	28,011	42,961
Military Personnel	894	0	894
Printing & Duplication	491	0	491
Travel and Training	1,189	604	1,793
FECA	2,264	0	2,264
Janitorial	153	0	153
Audiovisual	285	425	710
Headquarters	4,959	0	4,959
Awards	0	1,349	1,349
Logistic Support	785	285	1,070
Equip Design & Engineering	0	1,947	1,947
Ops Analysis & Stands Dev	112	1,958	2,070
Equipment & Tools	2,125	1,026	3,151
Administration	265	5,238	5,503
Communications	998	0	998
Quality Analysis Verification	0	2,957	2,957

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 66
INSTALLATION RESOURCES

Table 1B - Base Operating Support Costs (DBOF Overhead)			
Activity Name: NADEP Jacksonville		UIC: N65886	
Category	FY 1996 Net Cost From UC/FUND-4 ($000)		
	Non-Labor	Labor	Total
Production Control	239	4,479	4,718
Workload Planning	0	5,110	5,110
Miscellaneous Other	191	2,633	2,824
2m. Sub-total 2a. through 2l:	26,711	40,295	67,006
3. Depreciation	5,060	0	5,060
4. Grand Total (sum of 1c., 2m., and 3.) :	34,696	40,335	75,031

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

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 UC/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 UC/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: NADEP Jacksonville	UIC: N65886
Cost Category	**FY 1996 Projected Costs ($000)**
Travel:	6,263
Material and Supplies (including equipment):	221,311
Industrial Fund Purchases (other DBOF purchases):	23,608
Transportation:	180
Other Purchases (Contract support, etc.):	43,457
Total:	294,819

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

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: NADEP Jacksonville	**UIC: N65886**
Contract Type	**FY 1996 Estimated Number of Workyears On-Base**
Construction:	1
Facilities Support:	129
Mission Support:	122
Procurement:	0
Other:*	0
Total Workyears:	252

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

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

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)):

0

2) Estimated number of workyears which would be eliminated:

252

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

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

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.)
119	Engineering Support, Technical Support, Logistics

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

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 66

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT L. JORDAN, CAPT, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR AVIATION DEPOTS
Title

7/22/94
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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

WILLIAM J. TINSTON, JR. RADM, USN
NAME(Please type or print)

Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR LOGISTICS AND FLEET SUPPORT
Title

7/22/94
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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

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

Signature

COMMANDER,
NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title

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)

Signature

Title

8/10/94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
Data Call # 66

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

JUL 21 1994
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

NADEP, JACKSONVILLE
DATA CALL #66

Reference: SECNAVNOTE 11000 of 08 December 1993

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

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

CAPT A. W. ROSSITER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Commanding Officer
Title

18 July 1994
Date

Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville
Activity

Document Separator

DATA CALL 63
FAMILY HOUSING DATA

112

Information on Family Housing is required for use in BRAC-95 return on investment calculaitons.

Installation Name:	NADEP JACKSONVILLE
Unit Identification Code (UIC):	N65886
Major Claimant:	COMNAVAIRSYSCOM

Percentage Of Military Families Living on-Base:	6.6
Number of Vacant Officer Housing Units:	0
Number of Vacant Enlisted Housing Units:	0
Fy 1996 Family Housing Budget ($000):	$11
Total Number of Officer Housing Units:	1
Total Number of Enlisted Housing Units:	1

NOTE: Closure of this UIC may not result in closure of all housing units.

Note: All data should reflect figures as of the beginning of FY 1996. If major DON installations share a family housing complex, figures should reflect an estimate of the installation's prorated share of the family housing complex.

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

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

J. E. BUFFINGTON, RADM, CEC, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

COMMANDER
Title

7/20/94
Date

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING 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)

Signature

Title

7/25/94
Date

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

J. R. REVER
NAME (Please type of print)

Signature

CAPT. CEC, USN
COMMANDING OFFICER
Title

27 June 1994
Date

SOUTHNAVFACENGCOM
Activity

Enclosure (1)

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

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

YVONNE O. SPRING
NAME (Please type or print)

Yvonne O. Spring
Signature

Housing Management Specialist
Title

27 June 1994
Date

Housing Division
Division

Facilities Management Dept.
Department

SOUTHNAVFACENCON
Activity

Enclosure (1)

Document Separator

BRAC - 95

DATA CALL # 1

Naval Aviation Depot

JACKSONVILLE

ORIGINAL

4 February 1994

UIC: N65886

DATA CALL 1: GENERAL INSTALLATION INFORMATION

1. ACTIVITY: Follow example as provided in the table below (*delete the examples when providing your input*). If any of the questions have multiple responses, please provide all. If any of the information requested is subject to change between now and the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 1995 due to known redesignations, realignments/closures or other action, provide current and projected data and so annotate.

- **Name**

Official name	***Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville, FL***
Acronym(s) used in correspondence	NAVAVNDEPOT, NADEP JAX
Commonly accepted short title(s)	NADEP JAX

- **Complete Mailing Address**
  Commanding Officer
  Naval Aviation Depot
  Naval Air Station
  Jacksonville, FL 32212-0016

- **PLAD**
  NAVAVNDEPOT JACKSONVILLE FL //06//

- **PRIMARY UIC:** N65886 (Plant Account UIC for Plant Account Holders)
  Enter this number as the Activity identifier at the top of each Data Call response page.

- **ALL OTHER UIC(s):** N/A PURPOSE: _____

2. PLANT ACCOUNT HOLDER:

- Yes X No _____ (check one)

3. ACTIVITY TYPE: Choose most appropriate type that describes your activity and completely answer all questions.

• **HOST COMMAND:** A host command is an activity that provides facilities for its own functions and the functions of other (tenant) activities. A host has accountability for Class 1 (land), and/or Class 2 (buildings, structures, and utilities) property, regardless of occupancy. It can also be a tenant at other host activities.

• Yes ____ No _X_ (check one)

• **TENANT COMMAND:** A tenant command is an activity or unit that occupies facilities for which another activity (i.e., the host) has accountability. A tenant may have several hosts, although one is usually designated its primary host. If answer is "Yes," provide best known information for your primary host only.

• Yes _X_ No ____ (check one)

• Primary Host (current) UIC: 00207

• Primary Host (as of 01 Oct 1995) UIC: 00207

• Primary Host (as of 01 Oct 2001) UIC: 00207

• **INDEPENDENT ACTIVITY:** For the purposes of this Data Call, this is the "catch-all" designator, and is defined as any activity not previously identified as a host or a tenant. The activity may occupy owned or leased space. Government Owned/Contractor Operated facilities should be included in this designation if not covered elsewhere.

• Yes ____ No _X_ (check one)

4. SPECIAL AREAS: List all Special Areas. Special Areas are defined as Class 1/Class 2 property for which your command has responsibility that is not located on or contiguous to main complex.

Name	Location	UIC
N/A		

5. DETACHMENTS: If your activity has detachments at other locations, please list them in the table below.

Name N/A	UIC	Location	Host name	Host UIC
NADEP Emergency Repair Team	N65886	NAS Cecil Field, FL - Hgr-67	CLAW-1	N09103
NADEP Emergency Repair Team	N65886	MCAS Beaufort, SC - Hgr-594	MALS-31	N09131
NADEP VRT Team	N65886	N.S. Mayport, FL - Bldg-1470-71	N.S. Mayport	N60201

6. BRAC IMPACT: Were you affected by previous Base Closure and Realignment decisions (BRAC-88, -91, and/or -93)? If so, please provide a brief narrative.

Following actions initiated by BRAC 93:

EA-6B and F-14 aircraft programs from NADEP NORVA.

EA-6B program from NADEP NOVA:		F-14 program from NADEP NORVA:	
Start:	Jul 93	Start:	Jan 94
lst Induction:	Apr 94	SDLM Induction:	May 94
Establish Capability	Oct 95	TCR:	Jun 94
		Bulkhead Induction:	Jul 94
		Wing Bearing Induction:	Oct 95
		Establish Capability	Sep 94

EA-6B, EP-3E Aries II aircraft and TF34 engine program from NADEP Alameda to JAX.

EP-3E Aries II aircraft program from NADEP ALA to JAX:

Start:	Apr 93
#5 Induction:	Mar 94
#6 Induction:	Jun 94
#7 Induction:	Sep 94

Component repair program for newly assigned aircraft and engine work.

Transition over 180 man-years of manufacturing workload:

Navy Stock Fund (NSF):	Start:	Aug 94	End:	Mar 96
Navy Indust. Fund (NSF):	Start:	Aug 94	End:	Mar 96
Other Manufacturing:	Start:	Aug 94	End:	Mar 96

Increase PSD manning for above programs from 500 to over 1000 personnel.

CFA/PSD:				
F-14:	Start:	Jan 94	End:	Sep 94
A-6:		Mar 94		Oct 95
P-3:		Mar 94		Dec 95
TF34 :		Oct 94		Oct 95
T56:		Oct 94		Oct 95

Relocate following CFA's to NADEP JAX: P-3, A-6E, EA-6B, F-14, TF34, T56, F110, TF30, ARS, J85, Common Avionics.

TF-34:	
Start:	Jan 94
100 Induction:	Jul 94
400 Induction:	Jul 94

ARS (Aerial Refueling Stores) from NADEP Alameda.

Start:	Aug 94
End:	Oct 97

VRT (Voyage Repair Team) for NOS Norfolk.

Start:	Apr 94
End:	Jul 94

DET Whidbey Island (EA-6B) from NADEP Alameda.

Info not known at this time.

Cal Lab functions from NADEP Pensacola.

Pensacola Components:	
Start:	Oct 94
Bldg 631:	Apr 94

Bldg 3220:	Apr 94
Bldg 3450:	Nov 95
Calibration:	Nov 95

Relocate PMA (F) from NADEP's Alameda (P-3, TF34)/Pensacola T-2).
PMA (F) 222 BRAC Impact

Facilities/Space for the transfer of eight billets from Alameda, CA to Jacksonville, FL scheduled for 1 June 94.

7. MISSION: Do not simply report the standard mission statement. Instead, describe important functions in a bulletized format. Include anticipated mission changes and brief narrative explanation of change; also indicate if any current/projected mission changes are a result of previous BRAC-88, -91,-93 action(s).

Current Missions

- Provider of CORE depot maintenance comprised of the minimum facilities, equipment, and skilled personnel necessary to ensure a ready and controlled source of required technical competence to our DoD customers world wide

- Depot Maintenance Center providing world wide:

  - Aviation Maintenance
  - Logistics Management
  - Engineering Support

- The following product lines are supported:

  - Aircraft periodic maintenance, modification and emergency repair (crash/battle damage)
  - Engine major/minor repair, overhaul and modification
  - Component repair and modification
  - Basic design engineering includes weapon system design and analysis
  - Material engineering develops and monitors processes utilizing chemical and structural analysis
  - Maintenance engineering develops concepts, criteria and technical requirements
  - Calibration Lab (Type III)
  - Manufacturing

- Customer Service includes depot level service, emergency check, test, repair and manufacture of parts to relieve supply and work stoppage conditions
- Field Service includes engineering investigations, onsite inspections and evaluation
- Voyage Repair Teams (VRT) for catapult and arresting gear systems
- Aviation Support Equipment installation, calibration and repair
- Automatic Test Equipment (ATE)
- In-service repair includes modification and emergency repair
- Navy personnel technical training
- Electro-Optics/Electronic Warfare (EO/EW) maintenance and modification
- Anti Submarine Warfare (ASW) maintenance and modification
- Aerial Refueling Stores (ARS) and drop tank maintenance and modification
- Bomb racks and launchers maintenance and modification
- Plating Facility

- Developer, user, and provider of emergent technologies such as:

  - Test Program Set development which consists of test programs, interconnection devices, test program instructions and supplemental data
  - Composite repair

Projected Missions for FY 2001

- East Coast TACAIR Depot Maintenance Center providing world wide:

  - Aviation Maintenance
  - Logistics Management
  - Engineering Support

- Continuation of the current mission with the following adjustments for implementation of the outcomes of BRAC 93.

  - Addition of EA-6B aircraft
    - Production (aircraft and components)
    - Manufacturing
    - Engineering and logistics support (CFA)

  - Addition of F-14 aircraft
    - Production (aircraft and components)

- Manufacturing
- Engineering and logistics support (CFA)
- Calibration Van Complexes

- TF34 Engine major/minor repair overhaul & modification

- Increased use of current capacity due to BRAC 93 workload transition decisions for the following products and services:
  - EA-6B aircraft production
  - F-14 aircraft production
  - Avionics
  - A/C Components
  - VRT
  - Calibration
  - Manufacturing
  - CFA

8. UNIQUE MISSIONS: Describe any missions which are unique or relatively unique to the activity. Include information on projected changes. Indicate if your command has any National Command Authority or classified mission responsibilities.

Current Unique Missions

- Periodic maintenance, modification and emergency repairs for P-3 and T-2 aircraft

- Automatic Test Equipment repair, calibration and installation for USM-392B, Consolidated Automated Support System (CASS) EO Tester, USM-458C, etc.

- Engine major/minor repair, overhaul and modification of J52, F404, and TF41

- Classified mission responsibilities

- EO/EW systems maintenance and modification

- ASW maintenance and modification

- ARS and drop tank maintenance and modification

Projected Unique Missions for FY 2001

- Continuation of the current unique missions with a designation as East Coast TACAIR Depot and product transitions driven by BRAC 93.

- Transitioned products and services include:
  - F-14 and EA-6B aircraft, components, manufacturing, engineering and logistic support
  - Aircraft Depot Level inspection for non-assigned East Coast Aircraft - Avionics Systems
  - Manufacturing
  - Calibration
  - Test Integration Facility

9. IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR IN COMMAND (ISIC): Identify your ISIC. If your ISIC is not your funding source, please identify that source in addition to the operational ISIC.

- Operational name — UIC

Naval Air Systems Command — N00019

- Funding Source

Appropriation	Major Customer	UIC
O&MN	CMDR US Atlantic Fleet	V00060
	Naval Telecomm Com Hdq	N00063
	Naval Sea Systems Command	N00024
	Naval Air Systems Command	N00019
O&MNR	Naval Air Systems Command	N00019
	CMDR US Atlantic Fleet	
APN	Naval Air Systems Command	N00019
OPN	Naval Air Systems Command	N00019
RDT&E	Naval Air Systems Command	N00019
	Space & Naval Warfare Systems Command	N00039
FMS	Naval Air Systems Command	N00019
	Naval Aviation Supply Office	N00383
Army	Tripler Army Medical Center	
DBOF	Tinker Air Force Base	FD2039

	Robins Air Force Base	FD2060
	Kelly Air Force Base	FD2059
	NADEP Norfolk	N65887
	Aviation Supply Office	N00383
	NADEP Alameda	N65885
	Fleet Industrial Supply Center	N68836
	NADEP Pensacola	N65889
	NADEP Cherry Point	N65923
	NADEP North Island	N65888
	Philadelphia Naval Shipyard	N00151
	Defense Construction Supply Center	
	NAWC, Indianapolis, IN	N00163
	NAWC, Point Mugu, CA	N63126
	NAWC, Patuxent River, MD	N00421
	PWC, Jacksonville, FL	N68931
	NAWC, Trenton, NJ	N62376
	NCTS, Washington, DC	N63165
	NSWC, Bethesda, MD	N00167
Misc Other	USCG, ARSC, Elizabeth City, NC	Z50100
	US Customs Service	
	Florida Air National Guard	
	Disease Vector Ecology & Control Center	N62873
	NASA Ames-Dryden Flight Research	
	Defense General Supply Center	

10. PERSONNEL NUMBERS: Host activities are responsible for totalling the personnel numbers for all of their tenant commands, even if the tenant command has been asked to separately report the data. The tenant totals here should match the total tally for the tenant listing provided subsequently in this Data Call (see Tenant Activity list). (Civilian count shall include Appropriated Fund personnel only.)

On Board Count as of 01 January 1994

	Officers	Enlisted	Civilian (Appropriated)
• Reporting Command	14	14	2,777
• Tenants (total)			

UIC: N65886

Authorized Positions as of 30 September 1994

	Officers	Enlisted	Civilian (Appropriated)
• Reporting Command	14	14	2,693*
• Tenants (total)			

* **This is FY94 end strength full-time equivalent as shown in the Congressional Budget.**

11. KEY POINTS OF CONTACT (POC): Provide the work, FAX, and home telephone numbers for the Commanding Officer or OIC, and the Duty Officer. Include area code(s). You may provide other key POCs if so desired in addition to those above.

	Title/Name	Office	Fax	Home
•	CO/OIC			
	CAPT A. W. Rossiter	(904) 772-2611	(904) 772-3626	(904) 772-3277
•	Duty Officer	(904) 772-3277	(904) 772-3626	[N/A]
•	Executive Officer			
	CAPT D. S. Rice	(904) 772-2612	(904) 772-3626	(904) 282-3880
•	Dir Of Business Operations			
	Dennis A. Wood	(904) 772-4170	(904) 772-2712	(904) 260-9101

12. TENANT ACTIVITY LIST: This list must be all-inclusive. Tenant activities are to ensure that their host is aware of their existence and any "subleasing" of space. This list should include the name and UIC(s) of all organizations, shore commands and homeported units, active or reserve, DOD or non-DOD (include commercial entities). The tenant listing should be reported in the format provide below, listed in numerical order by UIC, separated into the categories listed below. Host activities are responsible for including authorized personnel numbers, on board as of **30 September 1994**, for all tenants, even if those tenants have also been asked to provide this information on a separate Data Call. (Civilian count shall include Appropriated Fund personnel only.)

UIC: N65886

TO BE ANSWERED BY NAS JACKSONVILLE

- Tenants residing on main complex (shore commands) N/A

Tenant Command Name	UIC	Officer	Enlisted	Civilian

- Tenants residing on main complex (homeported units.)

Tenant Command Name	UIC	Officer	Enlisted	Civilian

- Tenants residing in Special Areas (Special Areas are defined as real estate owned by host command not contiguous with main complex; e.g. outlying fields).

Tenant Command Name	UIC	Location	Officer	Enlisted	Civilian

- Tenants (Other than those identified previously)

Tenant Command Name	UIC	Location	Officer	Enlisted	Civilian

13. REGIONAL SUPPORT: Identify your relationship with other activities, not reported as a host/tenant, for which you provide support. Again, this list should be all-inclusive. The intent of this question is capture the full breadth of the mission of your command and your customer/supplier relationships. Include in your answer any Government Owned/Contractor Operated facilities for which you provide administrative oversight and control.

SERVICES PROVIDED

Activity name	Location	Support function (include mechanism such as ISSA, MOU, etc.)
Warner Robins, ALC	Warner Robins AFB, GA	Avionics, TPS and support equipment - (DMISA)
Oklahoma City ALC	Tinker AFB, OK	Aircraft instruments/Oil coolers - (DMISA)
Ogden ALC	Hill AFB, UT	A-7 Landing gear - (DMISA)
San Antonio ALC	Kelly AFB, TX	A-7 Support equipment/borescopes - (DMISA)
CECOM USA	Ft. Mammouth, NJ	Avionics systems repairs - (DMISA)
AR & SC USCG	Elizabeth City, NC	Misc aircraft components - (DMISA)
COMNAVAIRSYSCOM	Washington, DC	Engineering, logistics, FMS and program management support for P-3, T-2, A-7, F/A-18, F404, J52 and TF41-FMS (MISSION RELATED)
CINCLANTFLT	NAS Norfolk, VA	Aircraft, engine, component, support equipment, calibration, ship board systems, field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)

SERVICES PROVIDED

Activity name	Location	Support function (include mechanism such as ISSA, MOU, etc.)
CINCPACFLT	*NAS Pearl Harbor, HI*	*Aircraft, engine, component, support equipment, calibration, ship board systems, field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Carrier Airwing One	*USS America*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Carrier Airwing Two	*USS Constellation*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Carrier Airwing Three	*USS John F. Kennedy*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Carrier Airwing Seven	*USS George Washington*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Carrier Airwing Eight	*USS Theodore Roosevelt*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Carrier Airwing Seventeen	*USS Saratoga*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
CNATRA	*NAS, Corpus Christi, TX*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
COM CVWR Twenty	*NAS Cecil Field, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
COMFAIRMED	*Nerra, Naples, Italy*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*

SERVICES PROVIDED

Activity name	Location	Support function (include mechanism such as ISSA, MOU, etc.)
HS Wing One	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
COMHSLWINGSLANT	*NS Mayport, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
COMPATWINGFIVE	*NAS Brunswick, MA*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Commander Sea Strike Wing One	*NAS Cecil Field, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
COMRESPATWINGLANT	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
COMRESPATWINGPAC	*NAS Barbers Point, HI*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
COMVAQWINGSPAC	*PAC NAS Whidbey Island, WA*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Fighter Wing One	*NAS Oceana, VA*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
COMSTRKFITWINGLANT	*NAS Cecil Field, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Naval Air Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet	*NAS Norfolk, VA*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Naval Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet	*NAS North Island, CA*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*

SERVICES PROVIDED

Activity name	Location	Support function (include mechanism such as ISSA, MOU, etc.)
Naval Air Reserve Force	*New Orleans, LA*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Patrol Wing Eleven	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
MAG-31	*NAS Beaufort, SC*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
MAG-42	*NAS Cecil Field, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
MAG-41	*NAS Cecil Field, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Defense General Supply Center	*Richmond, VA*	*Manufacturing-(MISSION RELATED)*
Aviation Supply Center	*Philadelphia, PA*	*Component repair, modification and manufacturing-(MISSION RELATED)*
Carrier Airwing Twenty	*NAS Cecil Field, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED/MOU)*
Carrier Airwing Thirty	*NAS Lemoore, CA*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED/MOU)*
FAIRECONRON	*NAS Cecil Field, FL*	*Aircraft field team, engineering and logistics support-(MISSION RELATED)*
Royal Australia Air Force	*Australia*	*P-3 Aircraft and components and FA-18 components, avionics, TPS, support equipment and engineering support-MR*

SERVICES PROVIDED

Activity name	Location	Support function (include mechanism such as ISSA, MOU, etc.)
Canadian Forces	*Canada*	*F/A-18 Component repairs-(FMS)*
Finnish Air Force	*Finland*	*F/A-18 Logistics and component repairs-(FMS)*
Hellinic Air Force	*Greece*	*A-7 Aircraft, components, avionics, TPS, support equipment and engineering support-(FMS)*
Indonesian Air Force	*Indonesia*	*J52 engines and component repairs-(FMS)*
Israeli Air Force	*Israel*	*J52, LES CFA support-(FMS)*
Italian Navy	*Italy*	*AV-8 Component repairs-(FMS)*
Kuwait Air Force	*Kuwait*	*F/A-18, A-4 components, avionics, TPS, SE and engineering support-(FMS)*
Royal Netherlands Navy	*Netherlands*	*P-3 Component repairs-(FMS)*
Royal New Zealand Air Force	*New Zealand*	*P-3, A-4 component repairs-(FMS)*
Royal Norwegian Air Force	*Norway*	*P-3 Aircraft and component repairs-(FMS)*
Portuguese Air Force	*Portugal*	*A-7 (FMS) repairs and CFA support-(FMS)*
Spanish Air Force	*Spain*	*P-3, F/A-18, AV-8B components, avionics, TPS, support equipment, EW and engineering support-(FMS)*
Switzerland Air Force	*Switzerland*	*F/A-18 Logistic support-(FMS)*
Royal Air Force	*United Kingdom*	*APN-194 System support-(FMS)*

SERVICES PROVIDED

Activity name	Location	Support function (include mechanism such as ISSA, MOU, etc.)
Royal Thai Navy	*Thailand*	*P-3 Aircraft and component repairs-(FMS)*
Force Air Venezuela	*Venezuela*	*T-2 Training and CFA support-(FMS)*
Malaysian Air Force	*Malaysia*	*LAU-7 Power supply repairs-(FMS)*
German Air Force	*Germany*	*Borescope repairs-(FMS)*
Saudia Arabian Air Force	*Saudia Arabia*	*Borescope repairs-(FMS)*
Singapore Air Force	*Singapore*	*LAU-7 Power supply repairs-(FMS)*
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	*Edwards AFB CA*	*F/A-18 Repair and modification-(MISSION RELATED/MOU)*
U. S. Customs	*Corpus Christi, TX*	*P-3 Depot repair and modification-(MISSION RELATED)*
National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration	*McDill AFB, FL*	*WP-3D Depot repair and modification-(MISSION RELATED)*
Naval Hospital	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*NADEP Calibration service to Naval Hospital-(ISSA)*

SERVICES RECEIVED

Activity name	Location	Support function (include mechanism such as ISSA, MOU, etc.)
Naval Computer & Telecommunication Station (NCTS)	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*ADP Support to NADEP - (ISSA)*
Fleet Industrial Supply Center (FISC)	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*Transportation, preservation, packing service to NADEP - (ISSA)*
Naval Station Mayport	*NS Mayport, FL*	*Support service to VRT NADEP - (ISSA)*
Naval Air Station JAX	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*Support service to NADEP - (ISSA)*
Defense Accounting Service and Defense Accounting Office	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*DBOF Accounting Service to NADEP - (ISSA)*
Naval Air Station Cecil Field	*NAS Cecil Field, FL*	*Support service to NADEP ISR Team - (ISSA)*
Human Resources Office (HRO)	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*Personnel support service to NADEP - (ISSA)*
Clay Association for the Retarded Inc.	*Green Cove Springs, FL*	*Janitorial/ground services NADEP-(CONTRACT)*
CCI Co.	*Orange Park, FL*	*Warehouse support for FMS/NADEP-(CONTRACT)*
DGS Contract Services	*South Carolina*	*Security services for NADEP-(CONTRACT)*
NAS Jacksonville	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*Cafeteria support by Division of Blind Services for NADEP-(CONTRACT)*

SERVICES RECEIVED

Activity name	Location	Support function (include mechanism such as ISSA, MOU, etc.)
Naval Hospital	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*Part time nurse services for NADEP-(MISSION RELATED)*
NPPSO	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*Duplicating services for NADEP-(MISSION RELATED)*
Public Work Center	*NAS Jacksonville, FL*	*Facility support for NADEP-(MISSION RELATED)*
Southern Division Naval Facility Engineering Command	*Charleston, SC*	*Facility engineering and environmental support for NADEP-(MISSION RELATED)*
National Technologies Associates Inc.	*Arlington, VA*	*Logistics services-(CONTRACT)*
tg Bauer Associates, Inc	*Falls Church, VA*	*ATE, ISE and production engineering support-(CONTRACT)*
The M&T Co.	*King of Prussia, PA*	*CASS support-(CONTRACT)*
Support Systems Associates, Inc	*Hauppauge, NY*	*Engineering and technical support-(CONTRACT)*
DMAC	*Winter Park, FL*	*Contract support-(CONTRACT)*
Southeastern Laboratories Inc	*Orange Park, FL*	*Hazardous waste sample testing for NADEP-(CONTRACT)*
Department of Regulatory and Environmental Services	*Jacksonville, FL*	*Issue air permit-(MISSION RELATED)*
Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center	*Port Hueneme, CA*	*Air pollution sampling-(CONTRACT)*

14. FACILITY MAPS: This is a primary responsibility of the plant account holders/host commands. Tenant activities are not required to comply with submission if it is known that your host activity has complied with the request. Maps and photos should not be dated earlier than 01 January 1991, unless annotated that no changes have taken place. Any recent changes should be annotated on the appropriate map or photo. Date and label all copies.

- **Local Area Map.** This map should encompass, at a minimum, a 50 mile radius of your activity. Indicate the name and location of all DoD activities within this area, whether or not you support that activity. Map should also provide the geographical relationship to the major civilian communities within this radius. (Provide 12 copies.)

- **Installation Map / Activity Map / Base Map / General Development Map / Site Map.** Provide the most current map of your activity, clearly showing all the land under ownership/control of your activity, whether owned or leased. Include all outlying areas, special areas, and housing. Indicate date of last update. Map should show all structures (numbered with a legend, if available) and all significant restrictive use areas/zones that encumber further development such as HERO, HERP, HERF, ESQD arcs, agricultural/forestry programs, environmental restrictions (e.g., endangered species). (Provide in two sizes: 36"x 42" (2 copies, if available); and 11"x 17" (12 copies).)

- **Aerial photo(s).** Aerial shots should show all base use areas (both land and water) as well as any local encroachment sites/issues. You should ensure that these photos provide a good look at the areas identified on your Base Map as areas of concern/interest - remember, a picture tells a thousand words. Again, date and label all copies. (Provide 12 copies of each, 8½"x 11".)

- **Air Installations Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Map.** (Provide 12 copies.)

TO BE PROVIDED BY NAS JACKSONVILLE N/A Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ) Map. (Provide 12 copies.)

ACRONYM LISTING

-A-

ADP	Automated Data Processing
AE	Age Exploration
AFC	Air Frame Change
APML	Assistant Program Manager, Logistics
APU	Auxiliary Power Unit
ARS	Aerial Refueling Stores
ASO	Aviation Supply Office
ASSY	Assembly
ASW	Anti-Submarine Warfare
ATE	Automatic Test Equipment

-B-

BDE	Basic Design Engineering
BIT	BRAC Implementation Team
BOSS	Buy Our Spares Smartly
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure. The actual terminology according to Base Closure Act II is "Base Closure and Realignment".

-C-

CAAS	Contracted Assisted Advisory Services
CAGE	Commercial And Government Entity Code
CALS	Computer-Aided Acquisition And Logistics Support
CAPCOM	Capital Assets Planning Committee
CASS	Consolidated Automated Support System
CETS	Contractor Engineering Technical Support
CFA	Cognizant Field Activity
CM	Configuration Management
CO	Commanding Officer
CSE	Common Support Equipment
CSS	Contractor Support Services

-D-

DBOF	Defense Budget Operating Fund
DLA	Defense Logistics Agency
DMISA	Depot Maintenance Interservice Support Agreement
DMML	Depot Maintenance Manager, Logistics
DOP	Designated Overhaul Point
DRMO	Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office
DRP	Designated Repair Point
DSN	Defense Switched Network

-E-

ECP	Engineering Change Proposal
EI	Engineering Investigation
EMA	Equipment Material Report
EO	Electro Optic
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EW	Electronic Warfare

-F-

FCIM	Flexible Computer Integrated Manufacturing
FEA	Finite Element Analysis
FIC	Family Identification Code
FMECA	Failure Mode Effects & Criticality Analysis
FMS	Foreign Military Sales
FOIA	Freedom of Information Act
FRAG	Fleet Readiness Action Group

-G-

GSE	Ground Support Equipment
GTC	Gas Turbine Compressor

-H-

HMR	Hazardous Material Report
HRO	Human Resource Office
HQ	Headquarters

-I-

IFF	Identification Friend Foe
IIC	Item Identification Code
IMRL	Individual Material Readiness List
IPE	Industrial Plant Equipment
ISEB	Information Systems Executive Board
ILS	Integrated Logistics Support
ISSA	Interservice Supply Support Agreement

-L-

LEM	Logistics Element Manager
LES	Local Engineering Specification
LM	Logistics Manager
LPS	Local Process Specification
LSA	Logistics Support Analysis

-M-

2-M	Miniature/Microminiature Repair
MAM	Maintenance Assist Module
MCRC	Master Component Rework Control
MDR	Master Data Record
MFG	Manufacture
MILCON	Military Construction
MMEB	Material Management Executive Board
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MP	Maintenance Plan
MRIL	Master Repairable Item List

-N-

NADEP	Naval Aviation Depot
NADOC	Naval Aviation Depot Operations Center
NAMO	Naval Aviation Maintenance Office
NAS	Naval Air Station
NATSF	Naval Aviation Technical Support Facility
NAVAIR	Naval Air Systems Command (also NAVAIRSYSCOM)
NAVAVNDEPOT	Naval Aviation Depot
NAVFAC	Naval Facilities Command (also NAVFACCOM)
NAWC	Naval Aviation Warfare Center
NC	Numerical Control
NDCB	NAVAIR Depot Corporate Board
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NIFMs	Naval Industrial Financial Management System
NIIN	National Item Identification Number
NSN	National Stock Number

-O-

OCPM	Office of Civilian Personnel Management
OIC	Officer In Charge
O&M,N	Operations and Maintenance, Navy
OPM	Office of Personnel Management
OSHA	Office of Safety and Health Administration

-P-

PAG	Process Advisory Group
PAPML	Prospective Assistant Program Manager, Logistics
PCFA	Prospective Cognizant Field Activity
PEO	Program Executive Officer
PMA	Program Manager, Air
POA&M	Plan Of Action And Milestone
POC	Point of Contact
PPB	Provision Parts Breakdown
PPEB	Posture Planning Executive Board
PPP	Priority Placement Program
PSD	Product Support Directorate
PSE	Peculiar Support Equipment
PWCs	Public Works Center

-Q-

QDR	Quality Deficiency Report

-R-

RAMEC	Rapid Action Minor Engineering Change
RCM	Reliability Centered Maintenance
RFI	Ready For Issue
RPV	Remotely Piloted Vehicle

-S-

SDLM	Scheduled Depot Level Maintenance
SERD	Support Equipment Requirements Document
SM&R	Source Maintenance And Recoverability
SRA	Shop Replaceable Assembly
SRC	Scheduled Removal Card
STARS	Standard Accounting and Reporting System
SSP	System Support Package
SSRA	Sub-Shop Replaceable Assembly

-T-

TACAIR	Tactical Aircraft
TMCFA	Technical Manual Cognizant Field Activity
TPDR	Technical Publication Deficiency Report

-U-

UAV	Unmanned Air Vehicle
UIC	Unit Identification Code

-V-

VAL	Validation
VER	Verification
VSTOL	Vertical Short Take-Off Landing

-W-

WBS	Work Breakdown Structure
WLS	Workload Standard
WRA	Weapon Replaceable Assembly
WSS	Weapon System Support
WUC	Work Unit Code

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
DATA CALL # ONE

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

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

ROBERT L. JORDAN, CAPT, USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMANDER
FOR AVIATION DEPOTS
Title

2/4/94
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.

NEXT ECHELON LEVEL (If applicable)

WAYNE SMITH, RADM(S), USN
NAME (Please type or print)

Wayne Smith
Signature

ASSISTANT COMMANDER FOR
LOGISTICS AND FLEET SUPPORT
Title

4 Feb 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.

MAJOR CLAIMANT LEVEL

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

Signature

COMMANDER,
NAVAL AIR SYSTEMS COMMAND
Title

10 Feb 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)

Signature

ACTING
Title

16 FEB 94
Date

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAVNOTE 11000 of 08 December 1993

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

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

CAPT A. W. ROSSITER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Commanding Officer
Title

2-1-94
Date

Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Jacksonville
DATA CALL # ONE

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

FEB 04 1994
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Activity Identification: Please complete the following table, identifying the activity for which this response is being submitted.

Activity Name:	NAVAL AVIATION DEPOT JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA
UIC:	N65886
Major Claimant:	COMNAVAIRSYSCOM

General Instructions/Background:

Information requested in this data call is required for use by the Base Structure Evaluation Committee (BSEC), in concert with information from other data calls, to analyze both the impact that potential closure or realignment actions would have on a local community and the impact that relocations of personnel would have on communities surrounding receiving activities. In addition to Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) analyses which incorporate standard Department of the Navy (DON) average cost factors, the BSEC will also be conducting more sophisticated economic and community infrastructure analyses requiring more precise, activity-specific data. For example, activity-specific salary rates are required to reflect differences in salary costs for activities with large concentrations of scientists and engineers and to address geographic differences in wage grade salary rates. Questions relating to "Community Infrastructure" are required to assist the BSEC in evaluating the ability of a community to absorb additional employees and functions as the result of relocation from a closing or realigning DON activity.

Due to the varied nature of potential sources which could be used to respond to the questions contained in this data call, a block appears after each question, requesting the identification of the source of data used to respond to the question. To complete this block, identify the source of the data provided, including the appropriate references for source documents, names and organizational titles of individuals providing information, etc. Completion of this "Source of Data" block is critical since some of the information requested may be available from a non-DoD source such as a published document from the local chamber of commerce, school board, etc. Certification of data obtained from a non-DoD source is then limited to certifying that the information contained in the data call response is an accurate and complete representation of the information obtained from the source. Records must be retained by the certifying official to clearly document the source of any non-DoD information submitted for this data call.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

General Instructions/Background (Continued):

The following notes are provided to further define terms and methodologies used in this data call. Please ensure that responses consistently follow this guidance:

Note 1: Throughout this data call, the term **"activity"** is used to refer to the DON installation that is the addressee for the data call.

Note 2: Periodically throughout this data call, questions will include the statement that the response should refer to the **"area defined in response to question 1.b., (page 3)"**. Recognizing that in some large metropolitan areas employee residences may be scattered among many counties or states, **the scope of the "area defined" may be limited to the sum of:**

- **those counties that contain government (DoD) housing units (as identified in 1.b.2)), and,**
- **those counties closest to the activity which, in the aggregate, include the residences of 80% or more of the activity's employees.**

Note 3: Responses to questions referring to **"civilians"** in this data call should reflect **federal civil service appropriated fund employees.**

1. Workforce Data

a. Average Federal Civilian Salary Rate. Provide the projected FY 1996 average gross annual appropriated fund civil service salary rate for the activity identified as the addressee in this data call. This rate should include all cash payments to employees, and exclude non-cash personnel benefits such as employer retirement contributions, payments to former employees, etc.

Average Appropriated Fund Civilian Salary Rate:	$39,189/annum

Source of Data (1.a. Salary Rate): FY96/97 NAVCOMPT Budget Submit Manpower CP-2/submitted by Linda Welsh

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

b. Location of Residence. Complete the following table to identify where employees live. Data should reflect current workforce.

1) **Residency Table.** Identify residency data, by county, for both military and civilian (civil service) employees working at the installation (including, for example, operational units that are homeported or stationed at the installation). For each county listed, also provide the estimated average distance from the activity, in miles, of employee residences and the estimated average length of time to commute one-way to work. For the purposes of displaying data in the table, any county(s) in which 1% or fewer of the activity's employees reside may be consolidated as a single line entry in the table, titled "Other".

County of Residence	State	No. of Employees Residing in County		Percentage of Total Employees	Average Distance From Base (Miles)	Average Duration of Commute (Minutes)
		Military	Civilian			
DUVAL	FL	7	2,315	.51	11.0	20.5
CLAY	FL	20	1,675	.37	13.5	26.8
ST. JOHNS	FL		139	.03	31.2	42.0
NASSAU	FL		33	.007	37	49.5
OTHER FL COUNTIES	FL		232	.05		
OTHER STATES	GA		35	.007		
INFO NOT AVAILABLE			124	.027		
TOTALS		27	4,553	100		

As discussed in Note 2 on Page 2, subsequent questions in the data call refer to the "area defined in response to question 1.b., (page 3)". In responding to these questions, the scope of the "area defined" may be limited to the sum of: a) those counties that contain government (DoD) housing units (as identified below), and, b) those counties closest to the activity which, in the aggregate, include the residences of 80% or more of the activity's employees.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

2) **Location of Government (DoD) Housing.** If some employees of the base live in government housing, identify the county(s) where government housing is located:

Government housing is located in Duval County on NAS, Jacksonville, Fl.

Source of Data (1.b. 1) & 2) Residence Data): FY97 A-11 Budget Submission dated 5/10/94

c. **Nearest Metropolitan Area(s).** Identify all major metropolitan area(s) (i.e., population concentrations of 100,000 or more people) which are within 50 miles of the installation. If no major metropolitan area is within 50 miles of the base, then identify the nearest major metropolitan area(s) (100,000 or more people) and its distance(s) from the base.

City	County	Distance from base (miles)
JACKSONVILLE, FL	DUVAL	BASE LOCATED IN DUVAL

Source of Data (1.c. Metro Areas): Florida State Map

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

d. Age of Civilian Workforce. Complete the following table, identifying the age of the activity's civil service workforce.

Age Category	Number of Employees	Percentage of Employees
16 - 19 Years	0	00.0
20 - 24 Years	9	00.3
25 - 34 Years	427	14.4
35 - 44 Years	903	30.5
45 - 54 Years	1,036	35.1
55 - 64 Years	552	18.7
65 or Older	30	1.0
TOTAL	2,957	100 %

Source of Data (1.d.) Age Data):	Defense Personnel Data System retrieved by HRO Jacksonville, Fl.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

e. Education Level of Civilian Workforce

1) Education Level Table. Complete the following table, identifying the education level of the activity's civil service workforce.

Last School Year Completed	Number of Employees	Percentage of Employees
8th Grade or less	7	00.2
9th through 11th Grade	100	03.4
12th Grade or High School Equivalency	1,786	60.4
1-3 Years of College	572	19.4
4 Years of College (Bachelors Degree)	400	13.5
5 or More Years of College (Graduate Work)	92	03.1
TOTAL	2,957	100 %

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

2) Degrees Achieved. Complete the following table for the activity's civil service workforce. Identify the number of employees with each of the following degrees, etc. To avoid double counting, only identify the highest degree obtained by a worker (e.g., if an employee has both a Master's Degree and a Doctorate, only include the employee under the category "Doctorate").

Degree	Number of Civilian Employees
Terminal Occupation Program - Certificate of Completion, Diploma or Equivalent (for areas such as technicians, craftsmen, artisans, skilled operators, etc.)	144
Associate Degree	173
Bachelor Degree	429
Masters Degree	44
Doctorate	4

Source of Data (1.e.1) and 2)) - Education Level Data): Defense Civilian Personnel Data System retrieved by HRO Jacksonville, Fl.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

f. Civilian Employment By Industry. Complete the following table to identify by "industry" the type of work performed by civil service employees at the activity. The intent of this table is to attempt to stratify the activity civilian workforce using the same categories of industries used to identify private sector employment. Employees should be categorized based on their primary duties. Additional information on categorization of private sector employment by industry can be found in the Office of Management and Budget Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Manual. However, you do not need to obtain a copy of this publication to provide the data requested in this table.

Note the following specific guidance regarding the "Industry Type" codes in the first column of the table: Even though categories listed may not perfectly match the type of work performed by civilian employees, please attempt to assign each civilian employee to one of the "Industry Types" identified in the table. However, only use the Category 6, "Public Administration" sub-categories when none of the other categories apply. Retain supporting data used to construct this table at the activity-level, in case questions arise or additional information is required at some future time. **Leave shaded areas blank.**

Industry	SIC Codes	No. of Civilians	% of Civilians
1. **Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing**	01-09	0	0
2. **Construction** (includes facility maintenance and repair)	15-17	19	0.6
3. **Manufacturing** (includes Intermediate and Depot level maintenance)	20-39		
3a. Fabricated Metal Products (include ordnance, ammo, etc.)	34	321	10.9
3b. Aircraft (includes engines and missiles)	3721 et al	1,596	54
3c. Ships	3731	0	0
3d. Other Transportation (includes ground vehicles)	various	11	.4
3e. Other Manufacturing not included in 3a. through 3d.	various	0	0

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Industry	SIC Codes	No. of Civilians	% of Civilians
Sub-Total 3a. through 3e.	20-39	1,928	65.3
4. Transportation/Communications/Utilities	40-49		
4a. Railroad Transportation	40	0	0
4b. Motor Freight Transportation & Warehousing (includes supply services)	42	0	0
4c. Water Transportation (includes organizational level maintenance)	44	0	0
4d. Air Transportation (includes organizational level maintenance)	45	0	0
4e. Other Transportation Services (includes organizational level maintenance)	47	0	0
4f. Communications	48	7	.2
4g. Utilities	49	6	.2
Sub-Total 4a. through 4g.	40-49	13	.4
5. Services	70-89		
5a. Lodging Services	70	0	0
5b. Personal Services (includes laundry and funeral services)	72	0	0
5c. Business Services (includes mail, security guards, pest control, photography, janitorial and ADP services)	73	227	7.7
5d. Automotive Repair and Services	75	18	.6
5e. Other Misc. Repair Services	76	56	1.9
5f. Motion Pictures	78	5	.2
5g. Amusement and Recreation Services	79	0	0

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

Industry	SIC Codes	No. of Civilians	% of Civilians
5h. Health Services	80	10	.3
5i. Legal Services	81	3	.1
5j. Educational Services	82	0	0
5k. Social Services	83	0	0
5l. Museums	84		0
5m. Engineering, Accounting, Research & Related Services (includes RDT&E, ISE, etc.)	87	568	19.2
5n. Other Misc. Services	89	62	2.1
Sub-Total 5a. through 5n.:	70-89	949	32.1
6. Public Administration	91-97		
6a. Executive and General Government, Except Finance	91	0	0
6b. Justice, Public Order & Safety (includes police, fire fighting and emergency management)	92	0	0
6c. Public Finance	93	0	0
6d. Environmental Quality and Housing Programs	95	48	1.6
Sub-Total 6a. through 6d.		48	1.6
TOTAL		2,957	100 %

Source of Data (1.f.) Classification By Industry Data): Anthony Liberti, Industrial Specialist & Wayne Scott, Workload Planning Coordinator - NADEP, Jacksonville, Fl.

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

ACTIVITY: N65886
NADEP JACKSONVILLE

DATA CALL 65
ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE DATA

g. Civilian Employment by Occupation. Complete the following table to identify the types of "occupations" performed by civil service employees at the activity. Employees should be categorized based on their primary duties. Additional information on categorization of employment by occupation can be found in the Department of Labor Occupational Outlook Handbook. However, you do not need to obtain a copy of this publication to provide the data requested in this table.

Note the following specific guidance regarding the "Occupation Type" codes in the first column of the table: Even though categories listed may not perfectly match the type of work performed by civilian employees, please attempt to assign each civilian employee to one of the "Occupation Types" identified in the table. Refer to the descriptions immediately following this table for more information on the various occupational categories. Retain supporting data used to construct this table at the activity-level, in case questions arise or additional information is required at some future time. **Leave shaded areas blank.**

Occupation	Number of Civilian Employees	Percent of Civilian Employees
1. Executive, Administrative and Management	333	11.26
2. Professional Specialty		
2a. Engineers	374	12.65
2b. Architects and Surveyors		
2c. Computer, Mathematical & Operations Research	81	2.74
2d. Life Scientists		
2e. Physical Scientists	7	.24
2f. Lawyers and Judges	1	.03
2g. Social Scientists & Urban Planners		
2h. Social & Recreation Workers		
2i. Religious Workers		
2j. Teachers, Librarians & Counselors		

INFORMATION CONTAINED ON THIS PAGE IS CERTIFIED BY THE NADEP

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION

Reference: SECNAVNOTE 11000 of 08 December 1993

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

ACTIVITY COMMANDER

CAPT. A.W. ROSSITER
NAME (Please type or print)

Signature

Commanding Officer
Title

5/23/94
Date

Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville
Activity

BRAC-95 CERTIFICATION
Cherry Point
Data Call # 8

F. C. TILLACK
NAME (Please type or print)

F C Tillack
Signature

SUPERVISORY PROGRAM ANALYST
Title

6/1/94
Date

Division

BRAC IMPLEMENTATION TEAM
Department

NADOC
Activity