



ACQUISITION
TECHNOLOGY
AND LOGISTICS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
3000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3000

ACTION MEMO

FOR: ACTING UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (AT&L)

FROM: Mr. Jay Berry, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Maintenance Policy, Programs and Resources

SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes of the Industrial Joint Cross-Service Group (IJCSG)

- The IJCSG met on October 7, 2004 to consider scenarios proposed by the IJCSG subgroups.
- The General Accounting Office and Commission have statutory obligations to review the Department's BRAC process. Keeping meeting minutes helps ensure they can meet these obligations without participating directly in our deliberative process.
- We recommend that you, as the IJCSG Chairman, approve and sign the minutes of this meeting provided at TAB A.

COORDINATION: OSD BRAC Office

RECOMMENDATION: That you sign the meeting minutes at TAB A

Attachments:

As stated



Industrial Joint Cross-Service Group (IJCSG)

Meeting Minutes of October 7, 2004

Mr. Michael Wynne, Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, chaired the meeting. The list of attendees is at Attachment 1.

The Chairman opened this sixteenth IJCSG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to consider scenarios proposed by the IJCSG subgroups.

Mr. Wynne said that the IJCSG must be aggressive in developing scenarios. The group must also consider how we want to do business in the future and force consideration of new ideas as the group progresses through the BRAC analysis.

Pete Potochny discussed the Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG)-approved timeline. By 1 November, most scenarios should be identified and loaded in the scenario tracking tool; by 8 November, scenario deconfliction should be complete enough to allow release of scenario data calls to field activities shortly thereafter; by 20 December, the JCSG candidate recommendations should go to the ISG for review.

RADM Klemm gave the Ship Overhaul and Repair Subgroup scenario presentation (attachment 2). The subgroup is getting input from the Navy about potential ship movements to help in scenario development. He also discussed the exclusion from analysis of bases that do not perform traditional ship maintenance work. RADM Klemm said that capacity data problems should be resolved next week.

Gary Motsek gave the Munitions and Armaments Subgroup scenario presentation (attachment 3). The subgroup's scenarios focus on storage functions and not production. He said that the subgroup's capacity analysis data issues were complete and military value data issues were close to completion. He also discussed military judgment rules that would be used during military value analysis.

Ron Orr presented the Maintenance Subgroup scenario presentation (attachment 4). Mr. Wynne suggested that the subgroup review at least three doctrines constraining scenario development and test them by developing scenarios using size-to-core, maximum capacity, and 1 ½ shifts. Mr. Wynne believes that the IJCSG should develop scenarios that force the MilDeps to consider whether some of their constraining doctrines are still required. Mr. Orr said that core would be used in scenario development because it is consistently applied and reported across the MilDeps.

Mr. Orr said that capacity data issues were being resolved and that bases that are not true depots were being eliminated from the analysis. The Air Force had most of its capacity data issues resolved. The Navy depot capacity data was complete, and, with the exception of some core data, the Army was complete.

All principals agreed that the proposals presented during this meeting should be analyzed further as scenarios.

Approved:



Mr. Michael Wynne

Chairman, Industrial Joint Cross-Service Group

Attachments:

1. List of attendees
2. Ship Overhaul and Repair Subgroup scenario presentation
3. Munitions and Armaments Subgroup scenario presentation
4. Maintenance Subgroup scenario presentation

**Industrial JCSG Meeting
Oct 7, 2004**

Attendees

Members:

- Michael Wynne, Acting Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics
- RADM Bill Klemm, Deputy Commander, Naval Sea Systems Command
- Ron Orr, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Installations, Environment & Logistics)
- Gary Motsek, Deputy G3, Support Operations, Army Material Command
- BGen Willie Williams, Director Logistics Plans and Policies, HQMC

Alternates:

- None

Others:

- RDML Mark Hugel, OPNAV
- Peter Potochny, Director OSD BRAC Office
- Jay Berry, OSD Maintenance Policy, Programs and Resources
- Shanna Poole, USMC
- Frank O'Rourke, Defense Logistics Agency
- Allan Beckett, HQ USAF
- Mark VanGilst, HQ USAF/ILMM
- Steve Krum, NAVSEA
- David Pauling, OSD (MPP&R)
- COL Sarah Smith, OSD (MPP&R)
- LTC Linwood Clark, OSD (MPP&R)
- Catherine Schneiter, DoDIG
- Maj. S. DuBois, HQMC
- Brian Shanley, HQMC
- LtCol Walt Eady, JCS/J4
- Willie Smith, HQ AFSC
- Tanya Robinson, IJCSG Staff
- John Desiderio, OSD BRAC Office
- Alex Yellin, OSD BRAC Office
- Sal Culosi, OSD (MPP&R)
- Stu Paul, OSD (MPP&R)
- Capt Bill Porter, USD(AT&L) Military Assistant

Attachment 1

Ship Overhaul and Repair

October 7, 2004





IJCSSG - Ship Overhaul & Repair

Scenario SR-3

Scenario

- Realign Depot and Intermediate Ship Maintenance as a result of a Carrier Strike Group Assignment in Hawaii:
 - Pearl Harbor NSY&IMF maintains the Carrier Strike Group
 - Realign Pearl Harbor NSY&IMF as a Partnership with a Nuclear Carrier Qualified Workforce
 - Realign some Long-term SSN Depot Work from Pearl Harbor to Puget Sound, Portsmouth and Norfolk NSY's to Compensate for Carrier Workload
 - Realign Maintenance of Army Watercraft Stationed in Hawaii to Pearl Harbor NSY&IMF.

Drivers/Assumptions

- DON Operational Force basing scenarios could realign homeports, resulting in shifts in maintenance requirements:
 - Assumes a DON Scenario which moves a CVN Strike Group from Norfolk to Hawaii.
 - Assumes the Replacement Carrier for USS KITTY HAWK (CV 63) upon her decommissioning comes from the East Coast.
 - Requires coordination with DON.

Potential Conflicts

- Accommodating the Carrier Air Wing in Hawaii .
- Reduces ship overhaul and repair depot-level excess capacity.
- Realigns ship maintenance in response to forward deploying a second Carrier Strike Group and the associated home port changes.

DCN: 11287

IJCSG - Ship Overhaul & Repair

Exclusions



The following Navy Activities responded to the Ship Overhaul & Repair Capacity and Military Value Data Call Questions; however, these activities do not perform traditional ship maintenance work.

It is recommended that these activities be excluded from IJCSG analysis:

- COMREGSUPPGRU MAYPORT FL
- NAVNUPWRTRAU BALLSTON SPA NY
- NAVNUPWRTRAU CHARLESTON SC
- USNA ANNAPOLIS MD

IJCSG - Ship Overhaul & Repair

Data Problems Status



Navy Activities

- Capacity Data Problems:
 - 13 Total (10 over 30 days)
 - 10 Missing Data
 - 1 Incorrect Units of Measure
 - 2 Inconsistent Data
- Military Value Data Problems:
 - 15 Total (all less than 30 days old)
- Prognosis:
 - All Capacity Resolved by 12 October
 - All Military Value Resolved by 18 October

DRAFT



IJCSCG MUNITIONS & ARMAMENTS

Mr. Gary Motsek

STORAGE & DISTRIBUTION ANALYSIS



Goal: The best support to the warfighter

✓ PHASE I:

➤ Analysis of “Wholesale” Storage sites

- ❖ Has explosive sited magazines and igloos
- ❖ Stores and distributes munitions to all Services
- ❖ Does not affect operational readiness of that Military Department

✓ PHASE II:

➤ Distribution/Deployment Network Analysis

- ❖ Have we positioned “Wholesale” distribution sites in the right places
- ❖ Can we make better use of “Operational” sites in support of distribution and deployment

Munitions & Armaments



| Proposal | Drivers/Assumptions |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Preserve and optimize <u>Storage & Distribution</u> capability while minimizing excess capacity. ✓ Retain storage/distribution capability at munitions sites retained for production: Crane, Iowa, Lake City, McAlester, Milan, Pine Bluff, and Radford, plus Blue Grass, and Tooele. ✓ Close Anniston Munitions Center, Kansas, Letterkenny Munitions Center, Louisiana, Red River Munitions Center, Hawthorne, Lone Star, and Sierra | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Transformational Option: Establish a multi-service distribution and deployment network that enhances the strategic responsiveness of the Joint Team ✓ Transformational Option: Maintain a multi-service distribution and deployment network consolidating on regional joint nodes |
| Justification/Impact | Potential Conflicts |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Retain Joint storage and distribution capability for all Services ✓ Support return of WRSA-K retrograde ✓ Retain capacity to support deployment needs for force structure of 2025 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ IJCSG Maintenance Subgroup ✓ Supply and Storage JCSG |

CAPACITY ANALYSIS



✓ Capacity data is good
➤ 13 outstanding questions

❖ Storage /Dist:

- 29 Army "Pretenders"
- 18 Navy "Pretenders"
- 1 Army "Decimal Point Problem"

❖ Armaments:

- 4 Army "Pretenders"
- ❖ Demilitarization
 - 1 Army "Missing Data"

✓ "Pretender" Memo out to Military Departments
for authority to remove from the analysis

Expect Total
Resolution by
6 Oct



ARMY PRETENDERS CAPACITY & MILITARY VALUE

Sites do not meet the criteria for “Wholesale” Storage and Distribution:

- Storage and distribution of munitions for all Military Departments
- Does not exist solely to support its Military Department
- Does not affect the Military Department's operational readiness

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| ✓ | Aberdeen Proving Ground | ✓ | Fort Lee |
| ✓ | Fort A P Hill | ✓ | Fort Leonard Wood |
| ✓ | Fort Belvoir | ✓ | Fort Lewis |
| ✓ | Fort Benning | ✓ | Fort Myer |
| ✓ | Fort Bragg | ✓ | Fort Polk |
| ✓ | Fort Buchanan | ✓ | Fort Riley |
| ✓ | Fort Campbell | ✓ | Fort Rucker |
| ✓ | Fort Dix | ✓ | Fort Sill |
| ✓ | Fort Drum | ✓ | Fort Stewart |
| ✓ | Fort Gillem | ✓ | Picatinny Arsenal |
| ✓ | Fort Gordon | ✓ | Redstone Arsenal |
| ✓ | Fort Huachuca | ✓ | Schofield Barracks |
| ✓ | Fort Jackson | ✓ | West Point Mil Reservation |
| ✓ | Fort Knox | ✓ | White Sands Missile Range |
| ✓ | Fort Leavenworth | ✓ | Yuma Proving Ground |

ARMY PRETENDERS CAPACITY & MILITARY VALUE



Sites do not meet the criteria for Armaments Manufacturing/Production if they do not:

- Take raw material and produce a product
- Perform full-scale Armaments Manufacturing/Production

- ✓ Anniston Army Depot
- ✓ Fort Bliss
- ✓ Fort Lewis
- ✓ Lake City Army Ammunition Plant
- ✓ Letterkenny Army Depot
- ✓ Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant
- ✓ Pine Bluff Arsenal
- ✓ Radford Army Ammunition Plant
- ✓ Red River Army Depot

NAVY PRETENDERS CAPACITY & MILITARY VALUE



Sites do not meet the criteria for “Wholesale” Storage and Distribution:

- Storage and distribution of munitions for all Military Departments
- Does not exist solely to support its Military Department
- Does not affect the Military Department's operational readiness

- ✓ COMNAVMARIANAS_GU
- ✓ LANTORDCOM_YORKTOWN_VA
- ✓ NAS_ATLANTA_GA
- ✓ NAS_KEY_WEST_FL
- ✓ NAVSTA_MAYPORT_FL
- ✓ NAVSTA_NEWPORT_RI
- ✓ NAVSTA_NORFOLK_VA
- ✓ NAVSTA_SAN-DIEGO_CA
- ✓ NAVSUBSUPPFAC_NEW_LONDON_CT
- ✓ NAVSUPPACT_PANAMA_CITY_FL
- ✓ NAVSURFWARCENDIV_INDIAN_HEAD_MD
- ✓ NAVUNSEAWARCCENDIV_KEYPORT_WA
- ✓ NAVWPNSTA_SEAL_BEACH_CA_DET_SAN_DIEGO
- ✓ PACMISRANFAC_HAWAREA_BARKING_SANDS_HI
- ✓ SUBTORPFFAC_YORKTOWN_VA

NAVY PRETENDERS CAPACITY & MILITARY VALUE



Sites do not meet the criteria for Armaments Manufacturing/Production if they do not:

- Take raw material and produce a product
- Perform full-scale Armaments Manufacturing/Production

- ✓ Charleston
- ✓ Willow Grove

MARINE CORPS PRETENDERS CAPACITY & MILITARY VALUE



Sites do not meet the criteria for “Wholesale” Storage and Distribution:

- Storage and distribution of munitions for all Military Departments
- Does not exist solely to support its Military Department
- Does not affect the Military Department's operational readiness

- ✓ CG_MCB_HAWAII
- ✓ MCAS_YUMA_AZ



MILITARY VALUE ANALYSIS

| MVA DATA PROBLEMS | DATE SENT TO SERVICES | DATE RESOLVED | EXPECTED CORRECTION |
|---|------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| | 9/22 | | |
| Consistent Units | 0 | | |
| Unanswered Questions/ Incomplete Answers | 3 | | |
| Missing Activities | 0 | | |
| Unexpected Responses | 0 | | |
| Data Compatibility Across Questions | 3 | | |
| Data Errors | 0 | | |

1. Total outstanding responses due: 6 (Army 6, Air Force 0, and Navy 0)
2. Numerous pretenders are still outstanding from all services

- ✓ Memo is in to TABS to remove Army pretenders
- ✓ Memo is in to Department of the Navy to remove Navy pretenders
- ✓ Air Force BRAC Office is removing pretenders from database
- Draft Deliberative Document – For Discussion Purpose Only- Do Not Release Under FOIA

MILITARY JUDGEMENT RULES



- ✓ Exclude all nuclear and bio-chemical munitions from analysis
- ✓ If a site did not respond to the capacity Analysis data call, exclude that site from the Military Value analysis
- ✓ If any site other than the Army responds to Munitions Demil, remove them from the analysis (Army is DoD's Munitions Demil Agent)

CLOSE HOLD



IJCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Draft Deliberative Document – For Discussion Purpose Only
Do Not Release Under FOIA

Maintenance Subgroup Ideas/Proposal/Scenarios



- Reviewed all the ideas and proposals for scenario development
- The following are the 10 proposed scenarios which will be pursued for further consideration.



(Already-Presented)

IJCSCG – Maintenance Subgroup

Minimize the number of joint sites consistent with doctrine & readiness

| Scenario MX-1 | Drivers/Assumptions |
|--|--|
| <p>Realignments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Aviation Workload (NADEP-CP/NI/JAX, ALC-OC/OO/WR) to 2 or 3 sites for each area: Fighter Attack, Other Aircraft, Cargo/Tanker■ Rotary Workload (CCAD, NADEP-CP) to 1 site■ Ground Workload (Vehicles: Tracked, Wheeled, Amphibious) 7 locations (ANAD, RRAD, TYAD, RIA, LEAD, MCLBA, MCLBB) to 2 or 3 sites■ Components- Commodities (e.g. landing gear, electronics, etc) at 35 various locations to 2 or 3 sites per commodity | <p>Boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments; Army National Maintenance Program; USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit wherever possible, if not, move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD. <p>Potential Conflicts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ USC Title 10 Sec 2466 requirement - 50/50■ Other JCSG potential impacts – Supply and Storage <p>Justification/Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increase Joint use through minimizing sites■ Environmental impacts not known at this time- workload moves■ Cost/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Post BRAC recurring costs/savings |



Maintenance Subgroup

Boundaries/Considerations

- Service Doctrinal:
 - Navy – Intermediate Maintenance Concepts (IMC) Detachments/Field Sites
 - Army - National Maintenance Program
 - Marines - Turnaround Response Requirement
 - Air Force/Marines - Alignment of the Logistics Chains
 - Ensure workload to sustain Core capabilities
 - Ensure adequate redundancy within the DoD industrial base
 - Maintain adequate reserve capacity (goal 15%)
 - Consider reducing/tailoring capacity by eliminating/transferring facilities



IJCSCG – Maintenance Subgroup

Minimize the number of joint sites consistent with doctrine & readiness

| Scenario MX-1 (Derivative 1) | Drivers/Assumptions | Potential Conflicts |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Realignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Aviation Workload (NADEP-CP/NI/JAX, ALC-OC/OOMR) to 2 or 3 sites for each area: Fighter Attack, Other Aircraft, Cargo/Tanker■ Rotary Workload (CCAD, NADEP-CP) to 1 site■ Ground Workload (Vehicles: Tracked, Wheeled, Amphibious) 7 locations (ANAD, RRAD, TYAD, RIA, LEAD, MCLBA, MCLBB) to 2 or 3 sites■ Components- Commodities (e.g. landing gear, electronics, etc) at 35 various locations to 2 or 3 sites per commodity■ Using current workload, commodity approach, consider joint Service solutions | <p>Boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments; Army National Maintenance Program; USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit wherever possible, if not, move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD.■ Based on Total Capacity on 1.5 shift/60 hour work week per workstation | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ USC Title 10 Sec 2466 requirement - 50/50■ Other JCSCG potential impacts – Supply and Storage |
| | <p>Justification/Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increase Joint use through minimizing sites■ Environmental impacts not known at this time-workload moves■ Cost/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Post BRAC recurring costs/savings | |



IJCSCG – Maintenance Subgroup

Minimize the number of joint sites consistent with doctrine & readiness

| Scenario MX-1 (Derivative 2) | Drivers/Assumptions |
|--|--|
| <p>Realignments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Aviation Workload (NADEP-CP/NI/JAX, ALC-OC/OOWR) to 2 or 3 sites for each area: Fighter Attack, Other Aircraft, Cargo/Tanker■ Rotary Workload (CCAD, NADEP-CP) to 1 site■ Ground Workload (Vehicles: Tracked, Wheeled, Amphibious) 7 locations (ANAD, RRAD, TYAD, RIA, LEAD, MCLBA, MCLBB) to 2 or 3 sites■ Components- Commodities (e.g. landing gear, electronics, etc) at 35 various locations to 2 or 3 sites per commodity■ Using current workload, commodity approach, consider joint Service solutions | <p>Boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments; Army National Maintenance Program; USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit wherever possible, if not, move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD.■ Based on Maximum Capacity on 1.0 shift/40 hour work week per workstation |
| <p>Justification/Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increase Joint use through minimizing sites■ Environmental impacts not known at this time-workload moves■ Cost/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Post BRAC recurring costs/savings | <p>Potential Conflicts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ USC Title 10 Sec 2466 requirement - 50/50■ Other JCSCG potential impacts – Supply and Storage |



IJCSCG – Maintenance Subgroup

Minimize the number of joint sites consistent with doctrine & readiness

| Scenario MX-1 (Derivative 3) | Drivers/Assumptions | Potential Conflicts |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Realignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Aviation Workload (NADEP-CP/NI/JAX, ALC-OC/OO/WR) to 2 or 3 sites for each area: Fighter Attack, Other Aircraft, Cargo/Tanker■ Rotary Workload (CCAD, NADEP-CP) to 1 site■ Ground Workload (Vehicles: Tracked, Wheeled, Amphibious) 7 locations (ANAD, RRAD, TYAD, RIA, LEAD, MCLBA, MCLBB) to 2 or 3 sites■ Components- Commodities (e.g. landing gear, electronics, etc) at 35 various locations to 2 or 3 sites per commodity■ Using current workload, commodity approach, consider joint Service solutions | <p>Boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments; Army National Maintenance Program; USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit wherever possible, if not, move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD.■ Based on Maximum Capacity on 1.5 shift/60 hour work week per workstation | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ USC Title 10 Sec 2466 requirement - 50/50■ Other JCSCG potential impacts – Supply and Storage |
| <p>Justification/Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increase Joint use through minimizing sites■ Environmental impacts not known at this time- workload moves■ Cost/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Post BRAC recurring costs/savings | | |



JCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Minimize excess (available) depot capacity consistent with doctrine and readiness

| Scenario Proposal 2 | Drivers/Assumptions |
|--|--|
| <p>Realignments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Aviation Workload (NADEP-CP/NI/JAX, ALC-OC/OO/WR) to 2 or 3 sites for each area: Fighter Attack, Other Aircraft, Cargo/Tanker■ Rotary Workload (CCAD, NADEP-CP) to 1 site■ Ground Workload (Vehicles: Tracked, Wheeled, Amphibious) 7 locations (ANAD, RRAD, TYAD, RIA, LEAD, MCLBA, MCLBB) to 2 or 3 sites■ Components- Commodities (e.g, landing gear, electronics, etc) at 35 various locations to 2 or 3 sites per commodity | <p>Boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments, Army National Maintenance Program, USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit where ever possible, if not move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD. |
| <p>Justification/Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increases jointness and reduces industrial footprint■ Environmental impacts not known at this time - workload moves■ Costs/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Post BRAC recurring costs/savings | <p>Potential Conflicts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ USC Title 10 Sec 2466 – 50/50■ Other JCSG potential impacts- Supply and Storage |



JCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Minimize excess (available) depot capacity consistent with doctrine and readiness

| Scenario Proposal 2 (Derivative 1) | Drivers/Assumptions |
|---|--|
| <p>Realignments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Aviation Workload (NADEP-CP/NI/JAX, ALC-OC/OOWR) to 2 or 3 sites for each area: Fighter Attack, Other Aircraft, Cargo/Tanker■ Rotary Workload (CCAD, NADEP-CP) to 1 site■ Ground Workload (Vehicles: Tracked, Wheeled, Amphibious) 7 locations (ANAD, RRAD, TYAD, RIA, LEAD, MCLBA, MCLBB) to 2 or 3 sites■ Components- Commodities (e.g. landing gear, electronics, etc.) at 35 various locations to 2 or 3 sites per commodity■ Using current workload, commodity approach, consider joint Service solutions | <p>Boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments, Army National Maintenance Program, USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit where ever possible, if not move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD.■ Total Capacity based on 1.5 shift/60 hour work week per workstation |
| <p>Justification/Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increases jointness and reduces industrial footprint■ Environmental impacts not known at this time - workload moves■ Costs/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Post BRAC recurring costs/savings | <p>Potential Conflicts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ USC Title 10 Sec 2466 – 50/50■ Other JCSG potential impacts- Supply and Storage |



JCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Minimize excess (available) depot capacity consistent with doctrine and readiness

| Scenario Proposal 2 (Derivative 2) | Drivers/Assumptions |
|--|--|
| <p>Realignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Aviation Workload (NADEP-CP/NI/JAX, ALC-OC/OO/WR) to 2 or 3 sites for each area: Fighter Attack, Other Aircraft, Cargo/Tanker■ Rotary Workload (CCAD, NADEP-CP) to 1 site■ Ground Workload (Vehicles: Tracked, Wheeled, Amphibious) 7 locations (ANAD, RRAD, TYAD, RIA, LEAD, MCLBA, MCLBB) to 2 or 3 sites■ Components- Commodities (e.g. landing gear, electronics, etc) at 35 various locations to 2 or 3 sites per commodity■ Using current workload, commodity approach, consider joint service solutions | <p>Boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments, Army National Maintenance Program, USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit where ever possible, if not move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD.■ Maximum Capacity based on 1.0 shift/40 hour work week per workstation |
| <p>Justification/Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increases jointness and reduces industrial footprint■ Environmental impacts not known at this time - workload moves■ Costs/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Post BRAC recurring costs/savings | <p>Potential Conflicts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ USC Title 10 Sec 2466 – 50/50■ Other JCSG potential impacts- Supply and Storage |



JCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Minimize excess (available) depot capacity consistent with doctrine and readiness

| Scenario Proposal 2 (Derivative 3) | Drivers/Assumptions |
|---|--|
| <p>Realignments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Aviation Workload (NADEP-CP/NI/JAX, ALC-OC/OO/WR) to 2 or 3 sites for each area: Fighter Attack, Other Aircraft, Cargo/Tanker■ Rotary Workload (CCAD, NADEP-CP) to 1 site■ Ground Workload (Vehicles: Tracked, Wheeled, Amphibious) 7 locations (ANAD, RRAD, TYAD, RIA, LEAD, MCLBA, MCLBB) to 2 or 3 sites■ Components- Commodities (e.g. landing gear, electronics, etc) at 35 various locations to 2 or 3 sites per commodity■ Using current workload, commodity approach, consider joint Service solutions | <p>Boundaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments, Army National Maintenance Program, USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit where ever possible, if not move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD.■ Base Maximum Capacity on 1.5 shifts/60 hour work week per workstation |
| <p>Justification/Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increases jointness and reduces industrial footprint■ Environmental impacts not known at this time - workload moves■ Costs/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Post BRAC recurring costs/savings | <p>Potential Conflicts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ USC Title 10 Sec 2466 – 50/50■ Other JCSG potential impacts- Supply and Storage |

IJCSC – Maintenance Subgroup

Move entire depot to another depot



| Scenario Proposal 3 | Drivers/Assumptions | Potential Conflicts |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Close an existing depot maintenance site by moving an entire depot to consolidate with another considering:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Workload comparability■ Common or complimentary commodities■ Available physical space and environmental headroom■ Moving and gaining depot selected based on capacity analysis■ Potential Inter and Intra-Service consolidations may include Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine locations | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments, Army National Maintenance Program, USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Reduced Infrastructure through increased Joint operations■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit where ever possible, if not move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Site selection |
| Justification/Impact | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increased opportunities for Joint Operations■ Environmental impacts not known■ Costs/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Other JCSC potential impacts- Supply and Storage and Munitions | |



IJCSCG – Maintenance Subgroup

Move entire depot to another depot

| Scenario Proposal 3 (Derivative 1) | Drivers/Assumptions |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Close an existing depot maintenance site by moving an entire depot to consolidate with another considering:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Workload comparability■ Common or complimentary commodities■ Available physical space and environmental headroom■ Moving and gaining depot selected based on capacity analysis■ Potential Inter and Intra-Service consolidations may include Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine locations | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments, Army National Maintenance Program, USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Reduced Infrastructure through increased Joint operations■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit where ever possible, if not move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD.■ Based on Total Capacity on 1.5 shift/60 hour work week per workstation |
| Justification/Impact | Potential Conflicts |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increased opportunities for Joint Operations■ Environmental impacts not known■ Costs/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Other JCSG potential impacts- Supply and Storage and Munitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Site selection |

IJCSC – Maintenance Subgroup

Move entire depot to another depot



| Scenario Proposal 3 (Derivative 2) | Drivers/Assumptions |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Close an existing depot maintenance site by moving an entire depot to consolidate with another considering:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Workload comparability■ Common or complimentary commodities■ Available physical space and environmental headroom■ Moving and gaining depot selected based on capacity analysis■ Potential Inter and Intra-Service consolidations may include Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine locations | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments, Army National Maintenance Program, USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Reduced Infrastructure through increased Joint operations■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit where ever possible, if not move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD.■ Based on Maximum Capacity on 1.0 shift/40 hour work week per workstation |
| Justification/Impact | Potential Conflicts |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increased opportunities for Joint Operations■ Environmental impacts not known■ Costs/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Other JCSC potential impacts- Supply and Storage and Munitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Site selection |

JCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Move entire depot to another depot



| Scenario Proposal 3 (Derivative 3) | Drivers/Assumptions | Justification/Impact | Potential Conflicts |
|---|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Close an existing depot maintenance site by moving an entire depot to consolidate with another considering:<ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Workload comparability■ Common or complimentary commodities■ Available physical space and environmental headroom■ Moving and gaining depot selected based on capacity analysis■ Potential Inter and Intra-Service consolidations may include Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine locations | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Service Doctrinal Compliance: Navy Detachments, Army National Maintenance Program, USMC turnaround response requirement, etc.■ Reduced Infrastructure through increased Joint operations■ Workload moved from closing sites should be moved as a complete unit where ever possible, if not move a portion of the work to the site with the highest available capacity and remaining is TBD.■ Based on Maximum Capacity on 1.5 shift/60 hour work week per workstation | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Increased opportunities for Joint Operations■ Environmental impacts not known■ Costs/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Other JCSG potential impacts- Supply and Storage and Munitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Site selection |



IJCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Regionalization of intermediate capabilities

| Scenario Proposal 4 | Drivers/Assumptions | Potential Conflicts |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Realignments: Aviation & Ground Workload■ Regionalization of CFS/Intermediate capabilities within a 50 mile radius of a CFS/Intermediate or Depot activity by same weapon system | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Boundaries:■ Locations with greater than or equal to 50 personnel■ Move Workload from closing site as a complete unit■ Single customer support should not be considered for consolidation■ Operational level maintenance is excluded | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Services Operational Requirements CFS/Intermediate Maintenance are primarily Lead/Follow type activities.■ Incompatibility of repair philosophies and standard support equipment |
| Justification/Impact | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">■ Environmental impacts not known at this time - workload moves■ Costs/Savings of movements not determined – COBRA■ Other JCSG potential impacts- Supply and Storage | |



Maintenance Subgroup Exclusions

Navy activities proposed to be excluded from analysis

- SWFPAC_BANGOR_WA
- SWFLANT_KINGS_BAY_GA

Justification:

- Provide specific support related to Strategic Weapons (Trident II missiles/related Systems) in direct support of the Trident Fleet Ballistic Missile submarines.
- Facilities will be subject to realignments should the operational employment of these supported systems be changed

Army activities proposed to be excluded from analysis

- Ft Dix
- Ft Rucker
- Ft Sill
- Ft Stewart
- Lone Star AAP

Justification:

- Primary function is not to perform depot level tasks.
- Perform selected depot level tasks only on equipment assigned to that activity for readiness purposes

IJCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Military Value Scoring Rules



Depot Maintenance

- For each Depot Maintenance Responder, do not calculate a Military Value score for each commodity group that does not have a positive response for Total Capacity in DoD Capacity Question 501.

Combat Field Support/Intermediate Level Maintenance

- For each Combat Field Support/Intermediate Level Maintenance Responder, do not calculate a Military Value score that does not have a positive response for Workload in DoD Capacity Question 496.

* For clarification, a "0", "Null", "Blank", "N/A", or "NA" answer is not considered a positive response by the Maintenance Subgroup.

Maintenance Subgroup Data Status



Capacity Data Corrections As of October 1, 2004

| | | Army | Navy / Marines | Air Force |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Subgroup | Total Clarifications | Outstanding Clarifications | Outstanding Clarifications | Outstanding Clarifications |
| Maintenance | 258 | 171 (does not include Core data) | 6/16 | 20 |

Military Value Data Corrections As of October 1, 2004

| | | Army | Navy / Marines | Air Force |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Subgroup | Total Clarifications | Outstanding Clarifications | Outstanding Clarifications | Outstanding Clarifications |
| Maintenance | 538 | 252 | 59/15 | 212 |

Backup

Draft Deliberative Document – For Discussion Purpose Only
Do Not Release Under FOIA





Maintenance Subgroup

Service Considerations Aug 27, 2004

Supply, Service, and Maintain:

5. Consider the value of preserving the Army integrated business process for life cycle materiel management of rotary wing aircraft, ground combat and tactical vehicles, individual and platform mounted weapons, the land component of C4ISR, and chemical and biological defense equipment , all of which are integral to the conduct of Joint expeditionary land warfare.
7. Consider the value of preserving inherent Service capabilities where concept of operations differ from other Services (e.g., MALS support to FRSSs, deployable intermediate maintenance support MPS equipment, Navy IMAs, reach back support for sea-based logistics, etc.)
8. Consider the risks presented by creating a single point of failure in logistics operations.
9. Consider the fact that the DON requires a depot maintenance industrial complex that delivers best value cradle-to-grave- results in cost-efficiency (total unit cost), responsiveness (schedule compliance and flexibility), and quality (compliance with specifications).



Transformational Options For Consideration

- Original wording: **Decentralize Depot level maintenance by reclassifying work from depot-level to I-level.**
 - Decentralize selected depot level maintenance performed at the parent major depots to depot level maintenance performed in a collaborative manner at the I-levels when this results in greater "Efficiency and Effectiveness"
- Original wording: **Centralize I-level maintenance and decentralize depot-level maintenance to the existing (or remaining) depots**
 - Centralize I-level maintenance activities with geographically co-located depots when practical.
 - **Regionalize severable and similar work at the intermediate level** when doing so results in better efficiency and maintains required effectiveness.
- **Partnership Expansion.** Under a partnership, have government personnel work in contractor owned/leased facilities and realign or close facilities where personnel are currently working.
- **Co-locate depots.** Two Services use the same facility(s). Separate command structures but shared common operations.
- **Consolidate similar commodities under Centers of Technical Excellence.**



Maintenance Subgroup

Navy Doctrinal Exclusions

Navy activities proposed to be excluded from analysis

- NADEP_JACKSONVILLE_FL_DET_CECIL_FIELD
- NADEP_JACKSONVILLE_FL_DET_JACKSONVILLE
- NADEP_JACKSONVILLE_FL_DET_MAYPORT
- NADEP_JACKSONVILLE_FL_DET_NORFOLK
- NADEP_JACKSONVILLE_FL_DET_OCEANA
- NADEP_NORTH_ISLAND_CA_DET_CAMP_PENDLETON
- NADEP_NORTH_ISLAND_CA_DET_LEMOORE
- NADEP_NORTH_ISLAND_CA_DET_MIRAMAR
- NADEP_NORTH_ISLAND_CA_DET_NORTH_ISLAND
- NAVIRSEFAC_BEAUFORT_SC
- NAVIRSEFAC_CAMP_LEJEUNE_NC
- NAVIRSEFAC_CHERRY_PT_NC
- NAVIRSEFAC_JRB_FORT_WORTH_TX
- NAVIRSEFAC_MAYPORT_FL
- NAVIRSEFAC_NEW_ORLEANS_LA
- NAVIRSEFAC_NEWPORt_NEWS_SHIPYARD_VA
- NAVIRSEFAC_NORTH_ISLAND_CA
- NAVIRSEFAC_SOLOMONS_MD
- NAWCAD_LAKEHURST_DET_MAYPORT_FL
- NAWCAD_LAKEHURST_DET_NORFOLK_VA

Justification:

- Primary function is not to perform depot level tasks except for selected depot level tasks only in direct support of equipment assigned to that activity for readiness purposes.