DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
1000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20350-1000
DCN:5451

MN-0265
IAT/JAN
18 November 2004

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 4 NOVEMBER 2004

Encl: (1) 4 November 2004 IEG Meeting Agenda
(2) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on 4 November 2004

1. The forty-sixth meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 1034 on 4 November 2004 in room 4E415 at the Pentagon. The following members of the IEG were present: Ms. Anne R. Davis, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy for all matters associated with BRAC 2005 (Special Assistant for BRAC), Co-Chair; Gen William L. Nyland, USMC, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps (ACMC), Co-Chair; ADM John B. Nathman, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations (VCNO), Co-Chair; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, Director Fleet Training (N7A), U.S. Fleet Forces Command, serving as alternate for VADM Kevin J. Cosgriff, USN, Deputy and Chief of Staff, U.S. Fleet Forces Command, Member; Ms. Ariane Whittemore, Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4B), serving as alternate for VADM Justin D. McCarthy, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4), Member; Ms. Carla Liberatore, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, serving as alternate for LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), Member; Mr. Michael F. Jaggard, Chief of Staff, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition (ASN(RD&A)), serving as alternate for Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research Development Test & Evaluation (DASN(RDT&E)), Member; Ms. Debra Edmond, Director, Office of Civilian Human Resources, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower & Reserve Affairs (M&RA), serving as alternate for Mr. Robert T. Cali, Assistant General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower & Reserve Affairs (M&RA), Member; Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service (NAVAUDSVC), Representative; Mr. David W. LaCroix, Senior Counsel, Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis; CDR Robert E. Vincent II,

JAGC, USN, Recorder; LCDR Vincent J. Moore, JAGC, USNR; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC, Recorder. LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Aviation (AVN), Member was absent.

2. The following members of the DON Analysis Group (DAG) were present: MajGen Emerson N. Gardner Jr., USMC, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Programs and Resources and Deputy Commandant for PP&O; Mr. Paul Hubbell, Deputy Assistant Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (Facilities) Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; and CAPT Thomas Mangold, USN, alternate for RDML(sel) Charles Martoglio, USN.

3. The following members or representatives of the Functional Advisory Board (FAB) were present: VADM Gerald L. Hoewing, USN, Chief of Naval Personnel and Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Manpower and Personnel; RADM Kathleen L. Martin, NC, USN, Deputy Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery; RADM(sel) Alan S. Thompson, SC, USN, Director, Supply, Ordnance and Logistics Operations Division, N41, OPNAV; Mr. Michael Rhodes, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (M&RA), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; Ms. Karin Dolan, Assistant Director of Intelligence for Support, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; Ms. Shanna Poole, Deputy, Logistics Chain Management Center, Installations and Logistics (I&L), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; Ms. Susan Kinney, Deputy Director, Logistics Plans, Policies and Strategic Mobility Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; RDML Jan C. Gaudio, USN, Commandant, Naval District Washington; RDML Mark Hugel, USN, Deputy Director, Fleet Readiness Division, N43B, OPNAV; Col Michael J. Massoth, USMC; CAPT Albert J. Shimkus, NC, USN; CAPT Nancy Hight, MSC, USN; and, Mr. Thomas B. Grewe.

4. The following members of the IAT were also present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff; CAPT Jason A. Leaver, USN; CAPT Christopher T. Nichols, USN; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, II, USN; and, LCDR Paul V. Neuzil, USN. All attendees were provided enclosure (1). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 28 October 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

5. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the DAG is reviewing the comments made by major claimants during the 28 October 2004 IEG meeting to address them appropriately. She stated that the BRAC 2005 status brief was provided to SECNAV, the Under, and the ASN's to inform them on the progress of the DON BRAC 2005 process. Ms. Davis noted that no significant concerns were raised but that the DON leadership observed that there appear to be opportunities for consolidation and emphasized that

communication and coordination is essential between the Services and the JCSGs. She discussed the proposed agenda for the Infrastructure Executive Council meeting scheduled for 5 November 2004. Ms. Davis stated that the Infrastructure Steering Group meeting on 5 November 2004 would discuss the release of scenario data calls and additional items to consider for BRAC 2005, e.g., homeland security.

6. The IEG moved into deliberative session at 1037. See enclosure (2). The meeting adjourned at 1203.

Anne R Davis

Anne Rathmell Davis
Co-Chair, IEG

TAB 1

Infrastructure Evaluation Group

4 November 2004
1030-1200
Pentagon, Room 4E415

Meeting called by: Chairs Recorder: Capt Noel

----- Agenda Topics -----

Review and approve minutes of IEG Meeting of 28 Oct 04	Ms. Davis
Status Update : • Major Command follow-up • SECNAV/USN/ASNs Status Brief • IEC Meeting	Ms. Davis

Deliberative Session :
• DAG Update & Scenario Brief
  o DON-specific E&T
  o Surface/Subsurface
  o Aviation
	Ms. Davis

Administrative • Next meeting 18 Nov 04, 1030-1200, 4D447	

Other Information

Draft minutes of 28 Oct 04 IEG meeting provided [To IEG members only]
Report of 28 Oct 04 IEG deliberative session provided [To IEG members only]
Other Read Aheads [To all attendees]

TAB 2

Department of the Navy
IAT

INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS TEAM
ODASN (IS&A), 2221 South Clark Street, Suite 900, Arlington, VA 22202

(703)-602-6500

RP-0266
IAT/JAN
18 Nov 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 4 NOVEMBER 2004

Encl: (1) DON Analysis Group Brief to IEG of 4 November 2004

1. The thirtieth deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 1037 on 4 November 2004 in room 4E415 at the Pentagon. The following members of the IEG were present: Ms. Anne R. Davis, Co-Chair; Gen William L. Nyland, USMC, Co-Chair; ADM John B. Nathman, USN, Co-Chair; Ms. Ariane Whittemore, alternate for VADM Justin D. McCarthy, USN, Member; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, alternate for VADM Kevin J. Cosgriff, USN, Member; Ms. Carla Liberatore, alternate for LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member; Mr. Michael F. Jaggard, alternate for Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Member; Ms. Debra Edmond, alternate for Mr. Robert T. Cali, Member; and, Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service, Representative. The following members of the DON Analysis Group (DAG) were present: MajGen Emerson N. Gardner, USMC; Mr. Paul Hubbell; CAPT Thomas Mangold, USN, alternate for RDML(sel) Charles Martoglio, USN. The following members or representatives of the Functional Advisory Board (FAB) were present: VADM Gerald L. Hoewing, USN; RADM Kathleen L. Martin, NC, USN; RADM William R. Klemm, USN; RADM(sel) Alan S. Thompson, SC, USN; Mr. Michael Rhodes; RDML Jan C. Gaudio, USN; RDML Mark Hugel, USN; Ms. Karin Dolan; Ms. Susan C. Kinney; Ms. Shanna Poole; Col Michael J. Massoth, USMC; CAPT Albert J. Shimkus, NC, USN; CAPT Nancy Hight, MSC, USN; and Mr. Thomas B. Grewe. The following members of the IAT were also present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff; Mr. Dave LaCroix, Senior Counsel; CAPT Jason A. Leaver, USN; CAPT Christopher T. Nichols, USN; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, II, USN; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; LCDR Paul V. Neuzil, USN; LCDR Vincent J. Moore, JAGC, USNR; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC. All attendees were provided enclosure (1).

2. Ms. Davis used slide 5 of enclosure (1) to update the IEG on the status of scenario development for the E&T DON Specific Officer Accession Training Function. She recapped that during its 21 October 2004 deliberative session, the IEG approved

scenarios to consolidate Officer Training Commands (OTCs) at NAVSTA Newport and to close NAVSTA Newport and relocate OTCs and the Naval Academy Preparatory School (NAPS) to NAS Pensacola. Ms. Davis stated that during its 1 November 2004 deliberative session, the DAG received a brief from the Naval Education and Training Command (NETC) in which NETC concurred that officer accession training is appropriate for consolidation and suggested adding NAVSTA Great Lakes, IL, as an alternative receiving site. The DAG determined that siting the officer accession and recruit training functions at a common location would add synergy and offer the potential for dual use of training facilities (e.g., Battle Stations 21 Trainer Complex). Accordingly, the DAG directed the IAT to develop a scenario proposal to consolidate OTC Pensacola, OTC Newport and NAPS to NAVSTA Great Lakes. Additionally, the IAT developed a scenario to realign OTC Newport and NAPS to NAS Pensacola. This scenario was necessary to assess consolidation of officer accession training at NAS Pensacola independent of the potential closure of NAVSTA Newport. The DAG reviewed and decided to recommend these additional scenarios to the IEG at its 2 November 2004 deliberative session. After reviewing the quad charts and scenario alignment assessment results for the additional scenarios, the IEG approved posting the following scenarios to the OSD scenario tracking tool subject to further refinement:

a. Realign OTC Pensacola, OTC Newport, and NAPS to NAVSTA Great Lakes, IL.

b. Realign OTC Newport and NAPS to NAS Pensacola.

3. Ms. Davis used slide 10 of enclosure (1) to update the IEG on the status of the Marine Corps Recruit Training scenario to close MCRD San Diego, CA. She noted that one of the final draft OSD Transformational Options directs consideration of consolidation of recruiting sites and recapped that the DAG initially proposed two scenarios to the IEG for this function during its 30 September 2004 deliberative session. The IEG decided to delete a proposed scenario to consolidate all Marine Corps recruit training at Camp Lejeune and approved a scenario to close MCRD San Diego and consolidate all Marine Corps recruit training at MCRD Parris Island subject to further research and refinement.

4. Ms. Davis advised the IEG that initial research did not identify any major impediments. She noted that Marine Corps Recruiting Command indicated an appropriate receiving site for its Western Recruiting Region office would be MCB Camp

Pendleton, CA, to maintain presence within the region. Ms. Davis stated that the military value score for MCRD San Diego is lower than that for MCRD Parris Island and that MCRD Parris Island has apparent excess capacity, i.e., buildable acres to absorb required military construction, although there is some potential concern regarding archeological sites within the buildable acres, and the existence of wetlands in the weapons impact area would need to be considered in any range expansion. Ms. Davis noted that the scenario allows for the total closure of an installation and makes the recruit training site at MCB Camp Pendleton available for other uses. However, single siting Marine Recruit Training on the east coast imposes new travel requirements for western recruits and west coast follow-on training.

5. Ms. Davis noted that while the DAG concluded that the consolidation appears to be viable, there were a number of potential concerns to be considered. First, Marine recruit training and regional recruiting management currently operate effectively and there is some concern that this scenario could negatively impact these important functions. Second, the scenario would reduce excess capacity at MCRD Paris Island, limiting the ability to expand for surge or future growth in end-strength, unless built into expansion at MCRD Parris Island. Third, the scenario would expose Marine Recruit Training to the inherent risks of single site consolidation, i.e., potential single point of mission failure. Finally, the scenario would require infrastructure investment in a hurricane prone geographic area. Following a thorough discussion of these concerns and a review of the quad chart and scenario alignment assessment result, the IEG approved posting the following scenario to the OSD scenario tracking tool subject to further refinement:

Close MCRD San Diego, CA, and relocate all Marine recruit training activities to MCRD Parris Island, SC.

6. Ms. Davis used slide 16 of enclosure (1) to discuss the status of the Surface/Subsurface Operations Function analysis. She stated that scenario descriptions have been refined for all IEG approved scenarios. The IEG discussed the following outstanding issues:

a. NAVSTA Ingleside. During its deliberative session on 14 October 2004, the IEG noted that the scenarios to close NAVSTA Ingleside would create a single site option for MCM/MHC forces on the west coast. Accordingly, the IEG directed the DAG

to develop a comparable scenario to single site the NAVSTA Ingleside and realign NAS Corpus Christi forces to an east coast base. The DAG reviewed options for this possibility and noted a number of concerns. First, since available capacity at NAB Little Creek is required to allow NAB Little Creek to remain viable as the identified east coast base for littoral combat ships (LCS) Flight 1, basing MCM/MHC forces at NAB Little Creek is not compatible with plans for basing LCS assets. Second, CFFC has suggested siting COMINEWARCOM and Mine Warfare Training Center (MWTC) at the Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, San Diego, to create an Undersea Warfare Center of excellence. The efficiency and synergy gained by locating all MCM/MHC forces in San Diego would not be realized by locating all MCM/MHC forces on the east coast. Accordingly, the IEG concurred with the DAG recommendation not to add any additional scenarios to explore the viability of single siting MCM/MHC assets on the east coast.

b. NAVSHIPYD Portsmouth. During its 14 October 2004 deliberative session, the IEG directed the DAG to review the ability of Portsmouth Naval Shipyard to act as a receiver for SSNs from SUBASE New London or NAVSTA Norfolk. The DAG reviewed the updated certified capacity data that indicates available capacity for eleven SSNs at NAVSHIPYD Portsmouth (six of which would be required for industrial upkeep). The DAG noted that the current industrial infrastructure is suited for SSN maintenance rather than SSN homeporting. The DAG further noted that sufficient submarine homeport capacity with required operational infrastructure (including ordnance handling capability) already exists at SUBASE New London and SUBASE Kings Bay. The limited submarine training services currently available at NAVSHIPYD Portsmouth would either require personnel to commute to SUBASE New London for training or military construction to increase the training capacity at NAVSHIPYD Portsmouth. Finally, the berthing capacity at NAVSHIPYD Portsmouth is inside the Controlled Industrial Area (CIA) and the U.S. Coast Guard utilizes the pier outside of the CIA. Based on the foregoing, the IEG concurred with the DAG recommendation not to add a scenario identifying NAVSHIPYD Portsmouth as a receiving site for east coast SSNs.

c. SUBASE San Diego. The IEG reviewed the history of the development of the close SUBASE San Diego scenario. Phase One analysis focused on activities with the lowest military value, while Phase Two analysis involved a refined look at capacity and military value data and generated additional options. Although SUBASE San Diego's military value score was above average, the

DAG determined that the close SUBASE San Diego scenarios (with NAVSTA Pearl Harbor and NAVSTA San Diego identified as alternate receiver sites) were feasible due to SUBASE San Diego's low capacity (10.5 CGE) and the excess capacity at the proposed receiver sites. Accordingly, the two scenarios were generated by the DAG and approved by the IEG. These west coast submarine scenarios are companion scenarios to the closure of SUBASE New London scenarios and allow for closure of east and west coast submarine sites.

At the 28 October 2004 IEG meeting, COMPACFLT indicated that San Diego is a critical submarine homeport because of the importance of conducting submarine training in San Diego waters and emphasized the criticality of the Ballast Point property for force protection purposes. At its 2 November 2004 deliberative session, the DAG discussed these concerns and re-evaluated the viability of the close SUBASE San Diego scenarios. The DAG noted that SUBASE San Diego has the highest military value score of activities in the current Surface/Subsurface closure scenarios, the area under consideration is surrounded by other federal property that has not, at present, been identified for closure (the Technical JCSG has not indicated the development of a scenario to move the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center) which suggests that the proposed scenarios would only close the waterfront portion of the base; and Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP) considerations and the viability of the property for other uses suggests retention of the property. Therefore, the DAG recommended deleting the close SUBASE San Diego scenarios. The IEG discussed these concerns and geographic importance of Ballast Point and noted that retention of Ballast Point would not eliminate AT/FP concerns. The IEG also concluded that the existence of other activities that utilize the contiguous geography of a base should not be dispositive for closure decisions. Accordingly, the IEG determined that the scenarios to close SUBASE San Diego should continue to be analyzed.

7. Ms. Davis used slide 21 of enclosure (1) to update the IEG on the status of scenario development for the Naval Aviation Operations Function. She recapped that during Phase One analysis the DAG conducted an iterative review of the optimization mode outputs and refined the model parameters. During Phase Two, the optimization model output led the DAG to consider seven reserve aviation sites for closure or realignment. The DAG consulted with COMNAVRESFOR and MARFORRES to better understand the effect of demographics on reserve forces. After conducting additional model runs to optimize

reserve aviation laydown on reserve air stations, which suggested that at least one major reserve air station could close, the DAG developed proposals for closure or realignment of reserve air stations with lower military value and demographically feasible receiving sites. After reviewing the quad charts and scenario alignment assessment results (see slides 23-34 of enclosure (1)), the IEG approved posting of the following scenarios to the OSD scenario tracking tool subject to further refinement:

a. Realign Cambria Airport, Johnstown, PA by relocating HMLA 775 Det A to NAS JRB Willow Grove, PA.

b. Close NAS Atlanta and relocate assets to Dobbins ARB, GA.

c. Close NAS Atlanta, GA by relocating assets to NAS JRB New Orleans, LA, NAS JRB Fort Worth, TX, Warner Robins AFB, GA, Andrews AFB, MD, and Dobbins ARB, GA.

d. Close NAS JRB Fort Worth, TX by relocating assets to NAS Atlanta, GA, Ellington Field, TX, and Andrews AFB, MD.

e. Close NAS JRB Willow Grove, PA, by relocating assets to McGuire AFB, NJ.

f. Close NAF Washington, DC, by relocating the VAQ 209 squadron to NAS Whidbey Island and relocating remaining assets to Andrews AFB, MD.

8. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the DAG will continue to develop Phase Two scenarios for the DON HSA Regional Support Activities and discuss future aviation laydown. She stated that DON Principals from the Intelligence, Medical, and Technical JCSGs will brief the DAG concerning their respective JCSG's scenario development progress on 8 November 2004. DON Principals from the Supply & Storage, Industrial, HSA, and Education & Training JCSGs will brief the DAG concerning their respective JCSG's scenario development progress on 9 November 2004. Ms. Davis stated that the IAT will continue to prepare Scenario Data Calls and that the first set of data calls are scheduled to be released next week. Additionally, she noted that the scenario coordination and deconfliction process is continuing. Lastly, Ms. Davis provided the proposed schedule for future DON Leadership briefings.

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 4 NOVEMBER 2004

9. The deliberative session adjourned at 1203.

JAMES A. NOEL
CAPTAIN, U.S. Marine Corps
Recorder, IAT