

BRAC 2005
Industrial Joint Cross-Service Group (IJCSG)

Meeting Minutes of December 21, 2004

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

The Chairman opened the Industrial JCSG meeting. He thanked everyone for attending. "We're at crunch time!" stated the Chairman who also stated that he is looking for input from each subgroup. Specific recognition of the efforts from the Munitions & Armament and the Ship Repair and Overhaul Subgroups was made by the Chairman.

Mr. Orr briefed the Maintenance status first. A copy of the briefing is at Attachment 2. Mr. Orr stated that he thought there would be only one recommendation from the Maintenance Subgroup and that the heart of the recommendation would come from scenario MX 1.4 with possibly some input from MX 1.3. Mr. Wynne commented that a comparative recommendation may also be needed to look at an alternative universe. A discussion of the status of data ensued as the subgroup is presently waiting for the Services' responses to the data calls. The Chairman requested a status on the data calls that are out. Scenario MX 1.4 was then discussed and statements were made that the data calls were being released between the 21st and the 23rd. A final comment from Mr. Orr requested concurrence to have a "Red Team," below Secretary Wynne's level, look at the Maintenance Subgroup's approach and ask hard questions of the subgroup members to validate the process. The Chairman concurred with this request.

Mr. Motsek briefed the Munitions and Armaments status next. A copy of the briefing is at Attachment 3. Handouts were provided for the first five recommended candidates from a total of seventeen for the scenario. The certified data for the five was expected from OSD on the same day as the meeting, 21 Dec 04. A sixth candidate recommendation was expected to be completed on the 22nd with all seventeen being completed by Thursday, the 23rd of December. The candidate recommendation closing Kansas Army Ammunition Plant was briefed and a provisional acceptance was provided awaiting the receipt of certified data.

RDML Hugel briefed the Ship Overhaul and Repair status last. A copy of the briefing is at Attachment 4. The draft candidate recommendation for scenario number SR-5 was briefed with no issues. A discussion on enabling scenarios ensued with the recommendation from the Chairman and Mr. Potochney that they be pushed through for all reviews up to the ISG level to await input from the Service. A comment was made that the Navy BRAC office is already doing summaries of environmental impacts.

The next Industrial JCSG meeting is scheduled for 8 Jan 05.

Approved: _____



Mr. Michael Wynne
Chairman, Industrial Joint Cross-Service Group

Attachments:

1. List of attendees
2. Maintenance Subgroup briefing
3. Munitions and Armament Subgroup briefing
4. Ship Overhaul and Repair Subgroup briefing

**Industrial JCSG Meeting
December 21, 2004**

Attendees

Members:

- Michael Wynne, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics
- RADM Klemm
- Gray Motsek, Deputy G3, Support Operations, Army Material Command
- Maj Gen Mary Saunders, Defense Logistics Agency
- Mr. Ron Orr, Air Force
- BGen Willie Williams, Director Logistics Plans and Policies, HQMC
- RDML Mark Hugel, OPNAV
- Mr. Allen Beckett, US Air Force

Others:

- Pete Potochney, OSD BRAC Office
- Alex Yellin, OSD BRAC Office
- Jay Berry, OSD Maintenance Policy, Programs and Resources
- George Kingsley, Defense Logistics Agency
- Steve Krum, NAVSEA
- COL Sarah Smith, OSD Maintenance Policy, Programs and Resources
- Catherine Schneiter, DoDIG
- Maj. S. DuBois, HQMC
- Willie Smith, HQ AFSC
- CAPT William Porter, AT&L MA
- Mark VanGilst, HQ USAF/ILMM
- Mr. Dave Pauling, ADUSD (MR&MP)

Attachment 1



Industrial Joint Cross Service Group

December 21, 2004



Maintenance Subgroup



IJCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Scenarios

- **MX-1.0 Minimize Sites**

- Scenarios (4)

- MX-1.1 Min Site using Workload - Total Capacity at 1.5 (60 hr week)
 - MX-1.2 Min Site using Workload – Max Capacity at 1.0 (40 hr week)
 - MX-1.3 Min Site using Workload - Max Capacity at 1.5 (60 hr week)
 - Min Site assessing Core - Max Capacity at 1.5 (60 hr week)
 - MX 1.4 Implement Fleet Readiness Center and min site
 - Implementation - Establish Joint Depot(s) (Based on results from Scenarios)

- **MX-2.0 Consolidate Intermediate Maintenance functions with same commodities**

- Navy Enabling Scenarios IM –E -001 through IM-E005

(56 Scenario Data Calls have been released as of 3 Dec 2004)

(5 Scenario Data Calls have been released as of 20 Dec 2004)

(9 Scenario Data Calls to be released as of 21 Dec 2004)



IJCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Scenarios MX 1.1

Scenario ID #	IND JCSG Tracking #	Stakeholder (Service)	SDC To Services	DATA RECEIVED BY JCSG				DATA Problems	(Screen 9) COMMENTS (By SERVICE)
				ARMY	AIR FORCE	NAVY	DLA		
IND-0063	MX 1.1 A	AF, ARMY, NAVY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04			N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions - included costs not captured
IND-0064	MX 1.1 B	ARMY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A	N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Recertified data shows no maintenance workload
IND-0065	MX 1.1 C	ARMY, DLA	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Recertified data shows no maintenance workload
IND-0066	MX 1.1 D	AF, ARMY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Nothing >\$1M; AF- No comment
IND-0067	MX 1.1 E	AF, ARMY, NAVY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04			N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Nothing >\$1M
IND-0068	MX 1.1 F	AF, ARMY, NAVY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04			N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Nothing >\$1M
IND-0069	MX 1.1 G	AF, NAVY	3-Dec-04	N/A	20-Dec-04		N/A	AF - Put contractor personnel numbers in Screen 3& 6 rather than Screen 9	AF- No comment

Army – Corrections due for 7 data calls

Air Force – Corrections for 1 data call; 3 data calls open

Navy – 4 data calls open

DLA – 1 data call open



IJCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Scenarios MX 1.2

Scenario ID #	IND JCSG Tracking #	Stakeholder (Service)	SDC To Services	DATA RECEIVED BY JCSG				DATA Problems	(Screen 9) COMMENTS (By SERVICE)
				ARMY	AIR FORCE	NAVY	DLA		
IND-0073	MX 1.2 A	AF, ARMY, NAVY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04			N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions - included costs not captured
IND-0074	MX 1.2 B	ARMY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A	N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Recertified data shows no maintenance workload
IND-0075	MX 1.2 C	ARMY, DLA	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Recertified data shows no maintenance workload
IND-0076	MX 1.2 D	AF, ARMY	3-Dec-04	Not Recvd	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		AF- No comment
IND-0078	MX 1.2 F	NAVY	3-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		N/A		
IND-0079	MX 1.2 G	AF, NAVY	3-Dec-04	N/A	20-Dec-04		N/A	AF - Put contractor personnel numbers in Screen 3& 6 rather than Screen 9	AF- No comment

Army – Corrections due for 3 data calls; 1 data call open
 Air Force – Corrections for 1 data call; 1 data calls open
 Navy – 3 data calls open
 DLA – 1 data call open



IJCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Scenarios MX 1.3

Scenario ID #	IND JCSG Tracking #	Stakeholder (Service)	SDC To Services	DATA RECEIVED BY JCSG				DATA Problems	(Screen 9) COMMENTS (By SERVICE)
				ARMY	AIR FORCE	NAVY	DLA		
IND-0083	MX 1.3 A	AF, ARMY, NAVY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04			N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions - included costs not captured
IND-0084	MX 1.3 B	ARMY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A	N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Recertified data shows no maintenance workload
IND-0085	MX 1.3 C	ARMY, DLA	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Recertified data shows no maintenance workload
IND-0086	MX 1.3 D	AF, ARMY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Nothing >\$1M; AF- No comment
IND-0087	MX 1.3 E	AF, ARMY, NAVY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04			N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Nothing >\$1M
IND-0088	MX 1.3 F	AF, ARMY, NAVY	3-Dec-04	20-Dec-04			N/A	ARMY -(1) Screens" 3-6 Losing" worksheets missing; (2) Screen 5 worksheets (One-Time Losing and Gaining" had data but not inputted into Master Worksheet; (3) MILCON info nto broken down by Action #	ARMY - MILDEP Assumptions -Nothing >\$1M
IND-0089	MX 1.3 G	AF	3-Dec-04	N/A	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A	AF - Put contractor personnel numbers in Screen 3& 6 rather than Screen 9	AF- No comment
IND-0090	MX 1.3 H	NAVY	3-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		N/A		
MX 1.3+ CORE REQ									
IND-0083	MX 1.3 Sup1	AF, ARMY, NAVY	20-Dec-04				N/A		
IND-0083	MX 1.3 Sup2	ARMY	20-Dec-04		N/A	N/A	N/A		
IND-0090	MX 1.3H Sup1	NAVY	20-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		N/A		

Army – Corrections due for 6 data calls

Air Force – Corrections for 1 data call; 3 data calls open

Navy – 4 data calls open

DLA – 1 data call open



IJCSG – Maintenance Subgroup

Scenarios MX1.4

Scenario ID #	IND JCSG Tracking #	Stakeholder (Service)	SDC To Services	DATA RECEIVED BY JCSG				DATA Problems	(Screen 9) COMMENTS (By SERVICE)
				ARMY	AIR FORCE	NAVY	DLA		
IND-0093	MX 1.4 A	AF, ARMY, NAVY	EST 21-Dec-04				N/A		
IND-0099	MX 1.4 K	NAVY	EST 21-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		N/A		
IND-0100	MX 1.4 L	NAVY	EST 21-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		N/A		
IND-0101	MX 1.4 M	NAVY	EST 21-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		N/A		
IND-0102	MX 1.4 N	NAVY	EST 21-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		N/A		
IND-0103	MX 1.4 O	NAVY	EST 21-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		N/A		
IND-0104	MX 1.4 P	NAVY	EST 21-Dec-04	N/A	N/A		N/A		



MUNITIONS & ARMAMENTS



AGENDA

- DATACALL UPDATE
- CANDIDATE RECOMMENDATIONS



DATACALL UPDATE

- CAPACITY ANALYSIS – COMPLETE
- MILITARY VALUE – COMPLETE
- REQUIREMENTS – COMPLETE
- SCENARIO QUESTIONS – 80% SOLUTION



IJCSG Armaments & Munitions Subgroup

Functions – Sites

Armaments Production - 3

Munitions Storage & Distribution – 18

Munitions Demilitarization – 13

Munitions Maintenance – 8

Munitions Production – 16

Artillery – 8

CAD/PAD – 1

Energetics – 4

Metal Parts – 4

Missiles – 6

Pyro/Demo – 9

Small Caliber – 1

Torpedoes – 1

Bombs – 3

Cluster Bombs – 3

Medium Caliber – 3

Mines – 4

Mortars – 5

Rockets – 4

Tank - 2



CANDIDATE RECOMMENDATIONS

- Close Kansas Army Ammunition Plant
- Close Lone Star Army Ammunition Plant
- Close Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant
- Close Mississippi Army Ammunition Plant
- Close Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant



CANDIDATE # :CLOSE KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

✓ Candidate Recommendation: Realign Sensor Fuzed Weapon/Cluster Bomb to McAlester AAP; Storage to Pine Bluff Arsenal; 155MM ICM Artillery to Milan AAP; 105 and 155MM HE Artillery to Iowa AAP; Missile Warhead production to Iowa AAP and McAlester AAP; 60MM, 81MM, and 120MM Mortar workload to Milan AAP; Detonators/relays/delays workload to Crane AAA and close Kansas AAP.

Justification

✓ Capacity and capability for Artillery, Mortars, Missiles, Pyro/Demo, and Storage exists at numerous munitions sites. There are 8 sites producing Artillery, 5 producing Mortars, 9 producing Pyro/Demo, 15 performing storage, and 9 performing Demil. To reduce redundancy and remove excess from the Industrial Base, the closure allows DoD to create centers of excellence, avoid single point failure, and generate efficiencies.

Military Value

- Average Military Value for all sites performing Demil, Production, and Storage with Kansas in the calculation, the score is .2574.
- With the closure of Kansas, the average military value is .2677.

- ✓ Strategy
- ☐ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- ☐ JCSG Recommended
- ☐ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ☐ COBRA
- ☐ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- ☐ Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- ☐ De-conflicted w/Services



CANDIDATE # :CLOSE KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

Payback

- Payback begins immediately with 1-Time closure cost of \$17.1M and NPV in 2025 of \$203M.

Impacts

- No known economic or environmental impacts

✓ Strategy

Capacity Analysis / Data Verification

JCSG Recommended

De-conflicted w/JCSGs

COBRA

Military Value Analysis / Data Verification

Criteria 6-8 Analysis

De-conflicted w/Services



CANDIDATE # :CLOSE LONE STAR ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

✓ **Candidate Recommendation: Realign Storage and Demil to McAlester; 105MM and 155MM ICM Artillery, MLRS Artillery, Hand Grenades, 60MM and 81MM Mortars to Milan; Mines to Iowa; Detonators/relays/delays to Pine Bluff; Demolition Charges to Crane; and close Lone Star.**

Justification

✓ Capacity and capability for Artillery, Mortars, Missiles, Pyro/Demo, and Storage exists at numerous munitions sites. There are 8 sites producing Artillery, 5 producing Mortars, 9 producing Pyro/Demo, 15 performing storage, and 9 performing Demil. To reduce redundancy and remove excess from the Industrial Base, the closure allows DoD to create centers of excellence, avoid single point failure, and generate efficiencies.

Military Value

- Average Military Value for all sites performing Demil, Production , and Storage with Lone Star in is .2574.
- With the closure of Lone Star .2623.

Payback

- Payback begins immediately with 1-Time closure cost is \$32.3M with NPV in 2025 of \$314.9M.

Impacts

- No known economic or environmental impacts.

✓ Strategy

Capacity Analysis / Data Verification

JCSG Recommended

De-conflicted w/JCSGs

COBRA

Military Value Analysis / Data Verification

Criteria 6-8 Analysis

De-conflicted w/Services



CANDIDATE # :CLOSE LOUISIANA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

✓ **Candidate Recommendation: Realign Storage to Pine Bluff Arsenal and 155MM ICM Artillery Metal Parts workload to Scranton and close Louisiana.**

Justification

- ✓ There are 4 sites within the Industrial Base producing Metal Parts. To remove excess from the Industrial Base, the closure allows DoD to generate efficiencies and nurture partnership with multiple sources in the private sector.

Military Value

- Average Military Value for all sites performing Storage and Metal Pats workload with Louisiana in the calculation, is .2451.
- With the closure of Louisiana, the average military value is .2515.

Payback

- Payback begins immediately with 1-Time closure cost of \$1.8M and NPV in 2025 of \$229.0M.

Impacts

- No known economic or environmental impacts

✓ Strategy

Capacity Analysis / Data Verification

JCSG Recommended

De-conflicted w/JCSGs

COBRA

Military Value Analysis / Data Verification

Criteria 6-8 Analysis

De-conflicted w/Services



CANDIDATE # :CLOSE MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

✓ **Candidate Recommendation: Realign 155MM ICM Artillery Metal Parts workload to Scranton and close Mississippi.**

Justification

- ✓ There are 4 sites within the Industrial Base producing Metal Parts. To remove excess from the Industrial Base, the closure allows DoD to generate efficiencies and nurture partnership with multiple sources in the private sector.

Military Value

- Average Military Value for all sites performing Storage and Metal Pats workload with Mississippi in the calculation, is .3026.
- With the closure of Mississippi the average military value is .3177.

Payback

- Payback begins immediately with 1-Time closure cost of \$70.0M and NPV in 2025 of \$49.0M.

Impacts

- No known economic or environmental impacts

✓ Strategy

Capacity Analysis / Data Verification

JCSG Recommended

De-conflicted w/JCSGs

COBRA

Military Value Analysis / Data Verification

Criteria 6-8 Analysis

De-conflicted w/Services



CANDIDATE # :CLOSE RIVERBANK ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

✓ **Candidate Recommendation: Realign Artillery, Mortar, and Tank Metal Parts workload to Scranton AAP and close Riverbank.**

Justification

- ✓ There are 4 sites within the Industrial Base producing Metal Parts. To remove excess from the Industrial Base, the closure allows DoD to generate efficiencies and nurture partnership with multiple sources in the private sector.

Military Value

- Average Military Value for all sites performing Storage and Metal Pats workload with Riverbank in the calculation, is .3026.
- With the closure of Riverbank, the average military value is .3156.

Payback

- Payback begins immediately with 1-Time closure cost of \$12.4M and NPV in 2025 of \$121.9M.

Impacts

- No known economic or environmental impacts

✓ Strategy

Capacity Analysis / Data Verification

JCSG Recommended

De-conflicted w/JCSGs

COBRA

Military Value Analysis / Data Verification

Criteria 6-8 Analysis

De-conflicted w/Services



MILESTONES

- Scenario datacall questions
 - 21 Dec
- Candidate Recommendations
 - 12 additional recommendations
 - 23 Dec



Ship Overhaul and Repair



IJCSG - Ship Overhaul & Repair Scenario and Scenario Data Call Summary

- 15 Scenarios Accepted by IJCSG (and 23 derivative scenarios)
- Of these 38 Scenarios:
 - 6 “Robust” Scenarios Receive Data from the Others
 - 7 Scenarios Were Deleted via Deconfliction with Navy (IND-0013, 0017, 0018, 0021, 0023, 0025, and 0036)
- 25 Scenario Data Calls Provided to Navy for Issue
 - 10 Data Call Responses Received, Including COBRA Data for Scenarios SR-2, SR-5 and SR-8
 - SR-2 and SR-8 are being Analyzed
 - SR-5 is a Draft Candidate Recommendation (Next Chart)



IJCSG - Ship Overhaul & Repair Scenario and Scenario Data Call Summary

Scenario Number	Date Delivered to Service	Date Returned to IJCSG	Analysis Complete
IND-0014	26 Nov 04	Est. 22 Dec 04	Est. 05 Jan 05
IND-0015	26 Nov 04	02 Dec 04	Est. 05 Jan 05
IND-0016	26 Nov 04	02 Dec 04	Est. 05 Jan 05
IND-0019	26 Nov 04	09 Dec 04	Est. 05 Jan 05
IND-0020	26 Nov 04	16 Dec 04	Est. 05 Jan 05
IND-0022	26 Nov 04	Est. 22 Dec 04	Est. 05 Jan 05
IND-0024	03 Dec 04	09 Dec 04	Est. 23 Dec 04
IND-0026	26 Nov 04	09 Dec 04	Est. 23 Dec 04
IND-0027	26 Nov 04	09 Dec 04	Est. 23 Dec 04
IND-0029	26 Nov 04	02 Dec 04	20 Dec 04
IND-0030	26 Nov 04	16 Dec 04	20 Dec 04
IND-0031	26 Nov 04	09 Dec 04	20 Dec 04
IND-0033	26 Nov 04	Est. 23 Dec 04	Est. 29 Dec 04
IND-0034	07 Dec 04	Est. 23 Dec 04	Est. 29 Dec 04
IND-0035	26 Nov 04	16 Dec 04	Est. 23 Dec 04
IND-0037	03 Dec 04	21 Dec 04	Est. 27 Dec 04
IND-0038	03 Dec 04	21 Dec 04	Est. 27 Dec 04
IND-0054	07 Dec 04	Est. 23 Dec 04	Est. 08 Jan 05
IND-0055	07 Dec 04	Est. 23 Dec 04	Est. 08 Jan 05
IND-0056	07 Dec 04	Est. 23 Dec 04	Est. 08 Jan 05
IND-0057	07 Dec 04	Est. 23 Dec 04	Est. 08 Jan 05
IND-0095	17 Dec 04	Est. 29 Dec 04	Est. 05 Jan 05
IND-0096	17 Dec 04	Est. 29 Dec 04	Est. 05 Jan 05
IND-0097	17 Dec 04	Est. 29 Dec 04	Est. 05 Jan 05
IND-0098	17 Dec 04	Est. 29 Dec 04	Est. 05 Jan 05



IND-0028; SR-5 Draft Candidate Recommendation

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



IJCSG – Ship Overhaul & Repair Scenario SR-5

<p>Scenario</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Close: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •NAVIMFAC PACNORWEST EVERETT WA •SIMA NRMF INGLESIDE TX •NSY AND IMF PUGET SOUND DET PT LOMA CA ■ Realign CVN I-level workload from NAVIMFAC EVERETT to NSY AND IMF PUGET SOUND DET SAN DIEGO CA. ■ Realign all DD/DDG I-level workload from NAVIMFAC EVERETT to SIMA SAN DIEGO CA. ■ Realign all MCM/MHC I-level workload from SIMA INGLESIDE to SIMA SAN DIEGO. ■ Realign all SSN I-level workload from PUGET SOUND DET PT LOMA to SIMA SAN DIEGO. 	<p>Drivers/Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Supports DON operational scenarios DON-0007, DON-00032, and DON-0035 ■ Closes unrequired I-level maintenance capacity when fleet units depart closing homeport.
<p>Justification/Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Aligns intermediate maintenance capacity to possible shifts in Fleet Force basing (which moves the source of the maintenance requirements) 	<p>Potential Conflicts</p>

- ✓ Strategy Capacity Analysis / Data Verification JCSG Recommended De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- COBRA Military Value Analysis / Data Verification Criteria 6-8 Analysis De-conflicted w/Services

1

Changes to Scenario as briefed:

- None



Draft Potential Candidate # IND-0028

Candidate Recommendation

This Potential Candidate recommendation assumes a DON recommendation to close NAVSTA EVERETT. The CVN intermediate ship maintenance function is consolidated from NAVIMFAC PACNORWEST EVERETT WA to NSY AND IMF PUGET SOUND DET SAN DIEGO CA. All CRUDES intermediate ship maintenance function is consolidated from NAVIMFAC PACNORWEST EVERETT WA to SIMA SAN DIEGO CA.

Also assumes a DON recommendation to close NAVSTA INGLESIDE TX. 10 MCM/12 MHC are relocated to NAVSTA SAN DIEGO CA. All intermediate ship maintenance function is consolidated from SIMA NRMF INGLESIDE to SIMA SAN DIEGO.

Also assumes a DON recommendation to close NAVSUBASE POINT LOMA CA. 7 SSN are relocated to NAVSTA SAN DIEGO CA. All SSN intermediate ship maintenance function is relocated from NSY AND IMF PUGET SOUND DET PT LOMA CA to SIMA NORFOLK.

Justification

- Mission elimination
- Reduce excess capacity

Military Value

- Overall effect on Military Value: Increase from .347339 to .3823004
- Relative military value against its peers:
 - NAVIMFAC PACNORWEST EVERETT WA 10 of 13 Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activities
 - SIMA NRMF INGLESIDE TX 7 of 13 Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activities
 - NSY AND IMF PUGET SOUND DET PT LOMA CA 12 of 13 Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activities
- Military judgment: Removes excess capacity when Fleet units (maintenance requirement) are removed and provides more efficient use of remaining capacity.

Payback

The total estimated one-time cost to the Department of Defense to implement this recommendation is \$10,377K. The net of all costs and savings to the Department during implementation period is a cost of \$-137,368K. Annual recurring savings to the Department after implementation are \$43,090K with payback expected Immediate. The net present value of the costs and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of \$526,435K.

Impacts

- Criteria 6:
 - NAVIMFAC PACNORWEST EVERETT WA and NAVSHIPYD PUGET SOUND WA: Economic Impact on Communities: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 408 jobs (254 direct jobs and 154 indirect jobs) over the 2006-2011 period in the Seattle-Bellevue-Everett, WA MD economic area, which is .02 percent of economic area employment.
 - SIMA NRMF INGLESIDE TX: Assuming no economic recovery, this recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 842 jobs (395 direct jobs and 447 indirect jobs) over 2006-2011 period in Corpus Christi, TX MSA economic area, which is .38 percent of economic area employment.



Draft Potential Candidate # IND-0028

- Impacts (continued)
 - Criteria 7: No impact on receiving communities. Losing activity personnel from SIMA NRMF INGLESIDE TX will see an approximately 7 times greater housing cost at SIMA SAN DIEGO CA.
 - Criteria 8:
 - If this candidate is selected then IJCSG must send to DON for complete environmental review.
 - Potential issues:
 - NSY AND IMF PUGET SOUND DET SAN DIEGO CA: Host, NAS NORTH ISLAND CA, currently has a Biological Opinion which places restrictions on operations. Water Resources potentially increased groundwater contamination.
 - SIMA SAN DIEGO CA: Water Resources potentially increased groundwater contamination.