

JEFF MILLER
1ST DISTRICT, FLORIDA

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM,
UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS, AND CAPABILITIES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISABILITY ASSISTANCE
AND MEMORIAL AFFAIRS
CHAIRMAN

DCN 7156
Executive Correspondence

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
324 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-4136

DISTRICT OFFICES:
4300 BAYOU BOULEVARD
SUITE 12
PENSACOLA, FL 32503
(850) 479-1183

348 S.W. MIRACLE STRIP PARKWAY
UNIT 24
FORT WALTON BEACH, FL 32548
(850) 664-1266

BRAC Commission

<http://jeffmiller.house.gov>

August 5, 2005

APR 11 2005

Received

The Honorable Anthony Principi
Chairman, 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 S. Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Chairman Principi:

As the Commission starts to vote on finalizing the BRAC recommendations, the Pensacola community wants to communicate with you one last time to shed new light on recently uncovered information regarding the Department of Defense BRAC recommendation to consolidate Officer Training Command (OTC) Pensacola with OTC Newport. This information will complement our entire analysis of the OTC consolidation recommendation, which was submitted for the record at the BRAC Commission regional hearing in New Orleans on July 22, 2005.

It is unfortunate that we were not able to provide the information regarding OTC Pensacola before the BRAC Commission hearing on July 18, which dealt with additions to the DOD BRAC recommendation list. We believe that if we had been able to present this information prior to the July 18th BRAC Commission hearing, the case for consolidating OTC Newport with OTC Pensacola at NAS Pensacola would have been considered.

The Navy still maintains that costs will be significantly reduced by creation of the Center for Officer Training at Newport, RI. A thorough analysis of military value, COBRA data and inconsistent and often incorrect data provided by the Navy has proved beyond any doubt that at the very least OTC Pensacola should remain where it is. The best recommendation, however, would be for OTC Newport to be consolidated with OTC Pensacola at NAS Pensacola.

We wanted to present a few additional pieces of information that clearly illustrate that incorrect data was used and that there will be no cost savings from moving OTC Pensacola to OTC Newport. The first is in the environmental questions of the military value analysis of OTC Newport.

According to the Navy the answers to the environmental questions asked in the military value data call were provided by the base, not by OTC. In the final certified data provided for OTC Newport, the scores received on Military Value questions ENV-2a-c and ENV-7a were 5.20 and 3.50, respectively. However, on a different comparison

DCN 7156
Executive Correspondence

Military Value chart for Newport (N-RP-0190 Report of DAG Deliberations of 1 September 2004, Tab 7 titled DON PME Military Value scoring) those same questions, ENV-2a-c and ENV-7a, had different and lower scores of 2.6 and 1.75, respectively. This is a deviation of 4.35 points. The difference in Military Value between OTC Pensacola and OTC Newport is 2.22 points in favor of Newport. If the base supplied the answers to those questions then the value should be consistent for NAVSTA Newport on every Military Value chart, but they are not the same. This is a serious inconsistency that needs to be looked at very closely.

A second additional inconsistency in the data was in the surge capacity analysis. The Navy decided to use the peak month for Average on Board (AOB) for Newport and Pensacola and combine the two to define the surge capacity of OTC. The peak month for Newport was June with 434 AOB. The peak month for Pensacola was January with 524 AOB. The combined total is 958 and this number is used as the Navy's surge capacity requirement. However, there is never a time when 958 many students are on board OTC Newport and OTC Pensacola at the same time. In fact, the highest combined AOB for Newport and Pensacola at the same time was 752 in June of 2003. June is incidentally the only month when there are more AOB at OTC Newport. In every other month of the year OTC Pensacola has more AOB than OTC Newport by at least 100 and in one case over 300. Why did the Navy use a surge capacity analysis that, based on their own data, was clearly flawed? This is another serious additional inconsistency.

Finally, the certified COBRA analysis of OTC Pensacola stated that there would be 28 officers and 28 enlisted personnel heading to OTC Newport. Even with these numbers of enlisted and officers the BAH cost difference between OTC Pensacola and OTC Newport would have been \$11,208,960 cheaper in favor of Pensacola over twenty years. However, in a certified data call on August 16, 2004 signed by Ms. Anne R. Davis, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy for BRAC, it is stated that the number of military personnel moving to OTC Newport from OTC Pensacola is in fact 56 officers and zero enlisted.

Using this certified number the twenty year savings in BAH costs alone are actually \$13,529,640, or \$2,320,640 cheaper at OTC Pensacola than the final certified COBRA data stated. What accounts for this inconsistency? Why did the final COBRA analysis misstate the number of officers and enlisted personnel that would be transferred from OTC Pensacola to OTC Newport? This is a serious error and a further example of the inconsistency of the DOD BRAC recommendation to consolidate OTC Pensacola at OTC Newport.

OTC Pensacola has more than enough capacity, both classroom and otherwise, to accommodate OTC Newport. In addition, the cost savings for moving OTC Newport to OTC Pensacola would be at least \$13.5 million over twenty years and most likely much higher than that. Even factoring in that a new fire and rescue training facility would need to be built at a cost of \$1.14 million, the extra \$2.3 million in savings from BAH of 56 officers staying at OTC Pensacola over twenty years would more than offset that cost, cutting the Return on Investment (ROI) time down to ten years instead of never as

DCN 7156
Executive Correspondence

originally suggested by scenario DON-0087 (OTC Newport consolidated at OTC Pensacola).

We believe that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the BRAC Criteria in the areas of capacity analysis, cost of operations, and potential costs and savings as stated above and in my testimony for the record, which we submitted to the Commission on July 22 in New Orleans.

The information we have provided here and in New Orleans clearly illustrates that the Navy made consistent errors throughout the BRAC process with regards to OTC Pensacola and OTC Newport. We believe, based on Navy data, that there is no justification for moving OTC Pensacola to OTC Newport and that the reverse should be considered. It is our understanding that such a move would be considered as an addition to the BRAC recommendations and therefore is no longer possible based on the BRAC Commission timeline. We would argue, however, that the BRAC Commission hearing on additions took place on July 18th before Florida had a chance to present a case for the consolidation of OTC Newport with OTC Pensacola at NAS Pensacola on July 22nd. Therefore, we would ask that if the Commission agrees that there is a case for such a move that it be allowed as an addition to the final BRAC recommendations.

We believe that the case presented to the Commission proves, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the original DOD BRAC recommendation to move OTC Pensacola to OTC Newport was inconsistent, incorrect and irreparably flawed. At the very least we ask that the Commission vote to leave OTC Pensacola at NAS Pensacola.

On behalf of the Pensacola community,

With warm personal regards I am,

Sincerely,


Jeff Miller
Member of Congress

