

Department of the Navy



## INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS TEAM

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

(703)-602-6500

DCN:5376

RP-0436

IAT/JAN

16 February 2005

### MEMORANDUM FOR THE DON ANALYSIS GROUP (DAG)

Subj: REPORT OF DAG DELIBERATIONS OF 18 JANUARY 2005

Encl: (1) 18 January 2005 DAG Agenda  
(2) COBRA Brief of 18 Jan 05 for DON-0036 and DON-0037  
(3) DON Initial Fenceline Assessment (Naval Support Activity, Crane) Brief of 18 Jan 05  
(4) DON Supply and Storage Initial Fenceline Assessments Brief of 18 Jan 05

1. The thirty-sixth deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Analysis Group (DAG) convened at 0808 on 18 January 2005 in the Infrastructure Analysis Team (IAT) conference room located at Crystal Plaza 6, 9<sup>th</sup> floor.

The following members of the DAG were present: Ms. Anne R. Davis, Chair; Ms. Ariane Whittemore, Member; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, Member; Mr. Paul Hubbell, Member; Ms. Debra Edmond, Member; Mr. Michael Jaggard, Member; and, Mr. Michael G. Akin, alternate for RADM Christopher E. Weaver, USN, Member. MajGen Emerson N. Gardner Jr., USMC, Member; BG Martin Post, USMC, Member; and, Ms. Carla Liberatore, Member, did not attend the deliberative session. Additionally, Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service, Representative; Mr. Thomas N. Ledvina, Navy Office of General Counsel, Representative; LtCol Anthony A. Winicki, USMC; and, the following members of the IAT were present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff; Mr. David LaCroix, Senior Counsel; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN, Recorder; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC, Recorder. All attending DAG members were provided enclosures (1) through (4).

2. The DAG began by discussing scenarios that relocate a carrier (CVN) and carrier air wing (CVW) to Hawaii (DON-0036) and Guam (DON-0037), respectively. Ms. Davis noted that these scenarios, currently structured as closure actions, would be revised to realignment actions in light of the IEG's recent decision not to recommend the closure of NAVSTA Everett, WA. See the discussion at paragraphs 32-34 of the Report of IEG Deliberations of 13 January 2005 regarding DON-0005, close NAVSTA Everett and relocate a CVN to NAVSTA Bremerton, WA. The DAG also discussed other realignment possibilities on both

Subj: REPORT OF DAG DELIBERATIONS OF 18 JANUARY 2005

coasts that might satisfy the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS) requirement to forward deploy a CVN and CVW in the U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) area of responsibility.

3. The DAG discussed the possibility of relocating a CVN from either NAS North Island, CA (NASNI) or NAVSTA Norfolk. The DAG noted that changes to strategic force laydown require discussion with cognizant COCOMs to ensure mission capability and a review of the maintenance infrastructure to accommodate the split. The DAG also noted the need to identify losing sites for the CVW if the CVN is relocated from the east coast. The DAG directed the IAT to develop scenario data calls (SDCs) that explore alternate options to satisfy the IGPBS directive. The DAG noted the need to engage the Industrial JCSG for an enabling scenario to ensure that the maintenance infrastructure will accommodate the shift of assets.

4. CDR Brian Miller, USNR, a member of the IAT Operations Team, used enclosure (2) to provide preliminary COBRA results and update the DAG concerning various issues for DON-0036 and DON-0037 previously discussed at the DAG's 20 December 2004 deliberative session. CDR Miller reviewed the quarterback planning assumptions for the relocation of a CVN and CVW to Hawaii or Guam, noting that assumptions associated with the closure of NAVSTA Everett were deleted. See slides 2-6 of enclosure (2). CDR Miller stated that the earliest date for transfer of a CVN, escort ships and CVW is FY 2010 for both scenarios. He noted that escort ships are relocated with DON-0037 but not DON-0036 since NAVSTA Pearl Harbor has sufficient assets.

5. With regard to DON-0036, CDR Miller noted that the IAT is awaiting a response from Commander, US Pacific Fleet (COMPACFLT) concerning the viability of maintaining maritime patrol aircraft (three VP squadrons and one VPU squadron) at MCBH Kaneohe Bay. The DAG directed the IAT to issue a discrepancy data call (DDC) to explore the costs and operational impacts of relocating these assets to NAS Whidbey Island, WA. CDR Miller noted that assumptions regarding the air wing still call for basing the wing's propeller-driven and rotary-wing aircraft at "Enclave Kalealoa", a phrase used to describe the former NAS Barbers Point, under the assumption that the Navy can reacquire the property from the State of Hawaii.

6. With regard to DON-0037, CDR Miller noted the assumption that the DON will terminate the government of Guam's lease of the former Ship Repair Facility (SRF) and resume control of the

Subj: REPORT OF DAG DELIBERATIONS OF 18 JANUARY 2005

property. The DAG questioned the availability and condition of Agana (former NAS Agana), noting that associated costs for re-acquisition of Agana may be understated since rehabilitation is necessary. The COBRA data for DON-0036 indicates one-time costs of \$2.18 billion, that it never provides a Payback, and has 20-year net present value (NPV) costs of \$2.84 billion. DON-0037 has one-time costs of \$3.47 billion, never provides a Payback, and has 20-year NPV costs of \$4.23 billion. The DAG noted that the major difference in terms of cost is the amount of military construction (MILCON) required at NAVSTA Guam (\$3 billion) as compared to the amount required at NAVSTA Pearl Harbor (\$1.7 billion) where existing facilities are more extensive. See slide 7 of enclosure (2).

7. CDR Miller reviewed the disposition of billets and positions for both scenarios, noting that very few billets or positions are eliminated in either scenario (DON-0036 eliminates 44 and DON-0037 eliminates 12). DON-0037 moves approximately 1,300 more personnel than DON-0036 because it relocates three escort ships. See slide 8 of enclosure (2). He then reviewed a summary of one-time costs and savings. See slide 9 of enclosure (2). Ms. Davis noted that MILCON costs include bringing facilities up to current standards. The DAG noted that significant dredging is required at both locations and that procurement of simulators is necessary for both scenarios since splitting the aviation assets will require replicating simulator facilities. The IAT questioned the extensive one-time information technology (IT) costs reported for the stand-up of Agana and tactical aviation at Andersen AFB. CDR Miller reviewed summaries of MILCON, recurring costs and savings, and key elements of net savings for both scenarios and noted that the data is being refined. He noted that while the medical and dental MILCON costs identified will not be included per the approved TRICARE convention for evaluating Medical personnel in COBRA, they appear to be a fair reflection of actual costs. The DAG noted that similar scenario costs could be expected from the relocation of a CVN from the east coast. Additionally, the DAG noted that meeting the BRAC execution window may be difficult for either scenario.

8. The DAG then discussed the scenario issues for DON-0036 and DON-0037. With regard to DON-0036, the DAG noted the need to determine the viability of re-acquiring Kalaeloa (formerly NAS Barber's Point). The IAT is requesting additional information from COMPACFLT to understand repurchase costs. The facilities at MCBH Kaneohe Bay are highly constrained, and the assumption that air wing assets can be located there without relocating the

Subj: REPORT OF DAG DELIBERATIONS OF 18 JANUARY 2005

Marine assets may be inaccurate. The DAG directed the IAT to explore options in Hawaii with and without Barber's Point by reviewing the availability of Wheeler Army Airfield, HI and Hickam AFB. The DAG noted that Hickam AFB appears to have limited available property for MILCON and that it is class B joint military civilian airspace without apparent adequate training space. Additionally, the DAG directed the IAT to continue to evaluate the availability of training ranges for units in Hawaii. Lastly, the DAG noted the importance of understanding the operational necessity and the nexus for the proximity of the carrier air wing and the carrier.

9. With regard to DON-0037, the DAG noted the need to accurately identify the repurchase costs for the former NAS Agana. The DAG directed the IAT to request additional data from Air Force in order to determine the possibility of siting Navy assets at Anderson AFB. The DAG directed the IAT to continue to evaluate the availability of training ranges for units in Guam. The DAG noted that the ability of the civilian infrastructure to absorb additional forces will need to be evaluated. The DAG noted the need to identify operational and environmental issues associated with these scenarios and discussed the formation of a "Tiger Team" with membership from N41 and Headquarters Marine Corps (I&L) to assist the IAT with these issues.

10. The DAG recessed at 1000 and reconvened at 1015. All members of the DAG present when the DAG recessed were again present except that Mr. Mark Anthony, alternate for Mr. Crabtree, Member replaced Mr. Crabtree. CAPT Thomas Mangold, USN, alternate for RDML (sel) Charles Martoglio, USN, Member entered the deliberative session.

11. Mr. Mark E. Shiffler, a member of the IAT Technical team, used enclosure (3) to discuss an initial fenceline assessment for Naval Support Activity (NSA) Crane, IN. He noted that Navy activities at NSA Crane are comprised of the NSA Crane (315 personnel), the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) Crane (2,978 personnel), the Public Works Center (PWC) (Great Lakes Crane Detachment with 233 personnel), the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS) with 1 person, and the Naval Inventory Control Point (NAVICP) Support (85 personnel) and that the total Navy base population is 3,612 personnel. See slide 2 of enclosure (3). He noted that the Crane Army Ammunition Activity, which occupies 80-90% of the footprint at NSA Crane (640 personnel) is a major tenant activity and that the Army does not intend to relocate this function. Mr. Shiffler noted that there are eight Technical and four Industrial JCSG scenarios impacting NSA

Subj: REPORT OF DAG DELIBERATIONS OF 18 JANUARY 2005

Crane, however, NSWC Crane is the only activity affected by these scenarios. The scenarios would affect approximately 1,930 of the 3,000 employees at NSWC Crane. See slides 3-7 of enclosure (3). There are no JCSG scenarios moving workload into NSA Crane.

12. The DAG discussed possible alternative actions for NSA Crane, including closure (dispose of property or transfer to the Army) or retention of some Navy functions at NSA Crane and transfer of the property to the Army. The DAG noted that the balance of NSWC Crane could relocate to NSWC Dahlgren, VA, and the Army could assume the BOS responsibilities in the event of a fenceline closure. Additionally, the DAG noted that NCIS could relocate to Washington, DC and NAVICP support could relocate as part of a proposed Supply and Storage JCSG scenario. The DAG directed the IAT to continue working with the Technical JCSG to incorporate the remaining workload into existing or new scenarios and to discuss transfer of the property to the Army through the Joint Action Scenario Team (JAST) process.

13. CAPT Eric Myhre, SC, USN used enclosure (4) to discuss initial fenceline assessments arising from Supply and Storage JCSG scenarios affecting NSA Philadelphia, PA, NSA Mechanicsburg, PA, Marine Corps Logistics Base (MCLB) Albany, GA, and MCLB Barstow, CA.

a. NSA Philadelphia, PA. CAPT Myhre noted that the NAVICP Philadelphia (1,229 personnel), Fleet Industrial Supply Center (FISC) Norfolk Detachment (six personnel), Defense Supply Center Philadelphia (2,766 personnel) and Defense Contracting Management Command (125 personnel) are the major activities located at NSA Philadelphia and the approximate base population is 4,126 personnel. See slide 2 of enclosure (4). The DAG directed the IAT to verify the reported personnel at the FISC Norfolk Detachment. CAPT Myhre stated that four Supply and Storage and two HSA JSCG scenarios affect NSA Philadelphia. Of note S&S-0010 would realign NAVICP Philadelphia with NAVICP Mechanicsburg, thereby resulting in a single NAVICP. See slide 3 of enclosure (4). CAPT Myhre informed the DAG that these six newly developed scenarios were subject to revision.

b. NSA Mechanicsburg, PA. CAPT Myhre noted that the NAVICP Mechanicsburg (1,366 personnel), Commander Naval Supply Systems Command (85 personnel), Naval Sea Logistics Center (106 personnel), Naval Operational Logistics Support Center (101 personnel) and Defense Depot (an annex of Defense Depot Susquehanna with 372 personnel) are the major activities located

Subj: REPORT OF DAG DELIBERATIONS OF 18 JANUARY 2005

at NSA Mechanicsburg and the approximate base population is 2,000 personnel. He stated that three Supply and Storage JSCG scenarios affect NSA Philadelphia. Of note, S&S-0041, an alternative of S&S-0010, realigns NAVICP Mechanicsburg with NAVICP Philadelphia. See slide 5 of enclosure (4). The DAG discussed the benefit of relocating remaining DON activities if the JCSG approves S&S-0041 as a candidate recommendation. CAPT Myhre noted that while the scenarios remove DON activities, since no scenario diminishes Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) footprint, a fenceline closure may not be viable. Additionally, Ms. Davis noted that the synergies between the NAVICP and other activities at NSA Mechanicsburg suggest that a fenceline closure of NSA Philadelphia would be a more viable option.

c. MCLB Barstow, CA. CAPT Myhre noted that MCLB Barstow (1,570 personnel), Defense Distribution Center West (Stockton, CA with eight civilian and 217 contractors), and the Defense Re-utilization Marketing Office (14 personnel) are the major activities located at MCLB Barstow and the approximate base population is 1,584 personnel. The industrial function at MCLB Barstow accounts for approximately 800 personnel while the base operating support (BOS) function accounts for approximately 500 personnel. CAPT Myhre stated that no Supply and Storage scenario decreases Marine Corps footprint and S&S-0030 transfers assets to the Defense Distribution Center. CAPT Myhre stated that four Industrial JCSG scenarios affect MCLB Barstow. See slide 7 of enclosure (4). He noted that two of the four Industrial JCSG scenarios are probable candidate recommendations and would remove all industrial functions from MCLB Barstow, leaving only the BOS personnel.

d. MCLB Albany, GA. CAPT Myhre noted that the MCLB Albany (Marine Corps ICP with 836 personnel), Marine Corps Logistics Command (1,628 personnel), Marine Corps Systems Command (detachment from MCB Quantico with 126 personnel) and the Defense Contract Management Agency (four personnel) are the major activities located at MCLB Albany and the approximate base population is 2,759 personnel. He stated that no Supply and Storage JCSG activities affect MCLB Albany and four Industrial JCSG scenarios would increase the footprint at the base.

The DAG decided to issue a scenario data call for a fenceline closure of MCLB Barstow, CA and provide e-mail notification to the IEG. The DAG noted that no other fenceline closure opportunities appeared viable at this time.

Subj: REPORT OF DAG DELIBERATIONS OF 18 JANUARY 2005

14. The deliberative session adjourned at 1139.

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

**TAB 1**



# DON Analysis Group

**18 January 2005  
0800-1200  
Crystal Plaza 6, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor**

---

**Meeting called by:** Chairman      **Recorder:**      **Capt Noel**

## ----- Agenda Topics -----

Deliberative Session:

- Operational (COBRA):
  - CVN to Pacific      Mr. Jack Leather & CDR Brian Miller      DON-0036/0037
- Initial Fenceline Closure Assessments
  - Supply & Storage/Industrial(4)      CAPT Eric Myhre & Mr. Andy DeMott
  - Technical/Industrial(1)      Col Walt Hamm & Mr. Andy Demott
- Next meeting 21 January, 0800-1200

---

## Other Information

Read ahead for deliberative discussions.

---

## **TAB 2**

**DON-0036 & DON-0037**  
**Relocate CVN and CVW to Hawaii**  
**Relocate CVN and CVW to Guam**  
**Criterion 5 - COBRA**

| 8 20 January 2005  
CDR Brian Miller



# QB Planning Assumptions

## CVN to Pearl Harbor

- Earliest date for transfer of carrier, escort ships, and the air wing is FY 2010.
- Data shall reflect an FY 2010 movement of the carrier, air wing, and escort ships.
- CSG and CAG staff will relocate with the carrier. Relocate CSG staff to NS Pearl Harbor. CAG will transfer from NAS Lemoore to MCBH Kaneohe Bay.
- CSG will operate per FDNF Model. Assume one 120-day maintenance availability per year. Plan this annual maintenance within the 2nd and 3rd quarters of the FY (Feb-May timeframe).
- CVN docking maintenance availability will continue to be performed at Puget Sound NSY Bremerton WA. Modifications or upgrades to Pearl Harbor NSY's Drydock #4 is therefore not required.
- EOH availability for homeported Pearl Harbor submarines will be conducted at Pearl Harbor unless reassigned or rescheduled on a case basis due to carrier maintenance workload.
- T-AOE maintenance work will be performed by the private sector. Workload shall not be included in Pearl Harbor NSY's workload data.
- T-AOE will berth at Pearl Harbor West Loch. Input should include impact and mitigation (if required) to other ordnance operations.
- CVW TACAIR AIMD capability is primarily on ship, existing facilities at MCBH Kaneohe Bay has adequate space to support.



# QB Planning Assumptions

## CVW to Pearl Harbor

- CVW TACAIR to Hickam AFB – 20 Hornets [Joint Base; Navy for JSF beyond 2010]
  - 2 VFA SQD (20 FA-18C)
  - Other Support: 1 FA-18C/D simulator
- CVW TACAIR to MCBH Kaneohe Bay - 29 Super Hornets
  - 2 VFA SQD (12 FA-18E; 12 FA-18F) and 1 VAQ SQD 5 EA-18G
  - Other Support: 1 FA-18E/F simulator, 1 EA-18G simulator
- CVW Prop Acft to Enclave Kaleaoa - 4 Hawkeye + 2 Greyhound
  - 1 VAW SQD (4 E-2Cs) and 1 VRC DET (2 C-2As)
  - Other Support: 1 E-2C simulator
- CVW+EXP Rotary Wing to Enclave Kaleaoa - 29 Seahawks
  - 1 HSM SQD (12 MH-60Rs), 1 HSC SQD (8 MH-60S), and 1 HSL SQD (9 SH-60Bs)
  - Other Support: 1 MH-60R simulator and 1 MH-60S simulator
- EXEC/LOG ACFT and to Hickam AFB – 3 Gulfstreams [Exec Acft Joint Basing]
  - 1 ETD (1 C-37) and 1 VR SQD (2 C-20G)
- Note: MPA to remain at MCBH Kaneohe Bay: 3 VP SQD (24 P-3Cs) and 1 VPU SQD (3 P3Cs)



# QB Planning Assumptions

## CVN to Guam

- Surface ships to Guam: 1 FLT IIA DDG from Everett; 1 FLT I DDG from San Diego; 1 CG from San Diego.
- Relocate DESRON 9 to Guam.
- Earliest date for transfer of carrier, surface ships, and the air wing is FY 2010. Data shall reflect an FY 2010 movement of the carrier, air wing, and escort ships.
- CSG STAFF will relocate to NSA Guam; CAG staff will relocate to AAFB. (Personnel numbers should not specifically be modeled after FDNF staffs in Atsugi. Consider appropriate level of manning assuming minimum overseas coordination requirements and loss of shared CONUS billets for CSG operations.)
- CSG will operate per FDNF Model. Assume one 120-day maintenance availability per year. Plan this annual maintenance within the 2nd and 3rd quarters of the FY (Feb-May timeframe).
- CVN docking maintenance availability will continue to be performed at Puget Sound NSY Bremerton WA.
- All CVN primary and secondary plant maintenance to be accomplished by personnel from a nuclear capable shipyard. All other work on the CVN and Surface Ships will be accomplished by Naval Shipyard and/or private Shipyard personnel.



## **QB Planning Assumptions CVN to Guam**

- Navy will terminate Gov Guam lease of former SRF and resume control of property.
- CVN to be berthed at Northern edge of SRF property which will require the construction of a wharf to meet berthing requirements; i.e. depth (50 ft), 4160v power, steam, CHT discharge, heavy weather mooring, etc. CSG Escort Surface Ships to be berthed at or near former SRF.
- Depot Maintenance Facility (DMF), similar to the DMF at North Island, [including a Radiological Repair Facility (CIF), a Ship Maintenance Facility, and a Maintenance Support Facility] is required to support CVN propulsion plant and other critical work. This DMF will be located within a single Controlled Industrial Area (CIA) adjacent to new CVN Berth.



# QB Planning Assumptions

## CVW to Guam

- CVW TACAIR to Andersen - 20 Hornets and 29 Super Hornets
  - 2 VFA SQD (20 FA-18C), 2 VFA SQD (12 FA-18E; 12 FA-18F) and 1 VAQ SQD (5 EA-18G)
  - Other Support: 1 FA-18C/D simulator, 1 FA-18E/F simulator, and 1 EA-18G simulator
- CVW Prop Acft to Enclave Agana - 4 Hawkeye + 2 Greyhound
  - 1 VAW SQD (4 E-2C) and 1 VRC DET (2 C-2A)
  - Other Support: 1 E-2C simulator
- CVW+EXP Rotary Wing to Enclave Agana - 23 Seahawks/Knighthawks
  - 1 HSM SQD (12 MH-60R), 1 HSC SQD (8 MH-60S), and 1 HSC SQD (3 MH-60S)
  - Other Support: 1 MH-60R simulator and 1 MH-60S simulator



*Department of the Navy*  
*Infrastructure Analysis Group*

## ROI Summary

Scenario	One-Time Costs	Steady-State Savings	ROI Years	20 Year NPV
<b>DON-0036</b> (CVN to Pearl Harbor)	2,180	+75	Never	+2,843
<b>DON-0037</b> (CVN to Guam)	3,471	+93	Never	+4,228

All Dollars shown in Millions

**Notes:**

**Realignment Only**



## **Disposition of Billets/Positions**

Scenario	OFF	ENL	CIV	STU	TOT
DON-0036 (CVN to Pearl Harbor)	Eliminate	1	10	33	44
	Move	530	5,045	15	
DON-0037 (CVN to Guam)	Eliminate	1	10	1	12
	Move	646	6,288	13	
					6,947

### **Notes:**

**Billets eliminated at NAVIMFAC Everett and PSNS (0036).**  
**Three additional escorts ship move in DON-0037.**



# Department of the Navy One-Time Costs/Savings Summary

## Infrastructure Analysis Group

One-Time Costs/Savings FY 06 - FY 11						
Scenario	Const	Pers	Ovhd	Move	Other	Total Costs
DON-0036 CVN to PHBR	1,750.91	0.80	12.85	24.95	390.81	2,180.32
DON-0037 CVN to Guam	3,013.96	0.06	17.52	67.98	371.99	3,471.52
						11.76
						3,459.76

All Dollars Shown in Millions

### Notes:

Significant Dredging at either location.

Procurement of Simulators at either location.

Extensive One-Time IT costs reported at Guam for stand-up of Agana and TACAIR at Andersen



*Department of the Navy*  
*Infrastructure Analysis Group*

## MILCON Summary

CVN to PHBR			
	UM	New	Rehab
All Construction			1,750.90
CVN to Guam			
	UM	New	Rehab
All Construction			3,013.96

Notes:

Note: All Dollars Shown in Millions



# PHBR

## MILCON Summary

Scenario: DON-0036	Location	Issues	Cost
PMRF			33.6
NAVSTA Pearl Harbor CVN (\$659.0) SHIPYARD (\$86.7M) T-AOE (\$57.9)			803.6
MCBH – Kaneohe Bay (2 VFA, 1 VAQ)	No Buildable Acres Displace Current Forces?		162.7
Hickam AFB – (2 VFA)	No USAF Input (any facilities available) Displace USAF Assets Joint Use Airfield (with commercial)		164.0
Kalaeloa – Old NAS BP (Relocate HC-5 from Hickam, C-2, HS)	Need Buy-Back Encroachment		587.0
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>1,750.9</b>

All Dollars Shown in Millions



**PHBR**  
**MILCON Summary**

Scenario: DON-0036		PMRF		
Construction FAC Description	UM	New	Rehab	Cost
Taxiway	SY	116,600		26.7
Arresting Gear	EA	1		3.3
Airfield Pavement Lighting	LF	14,000		3.3
Other				0.2
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>33.6</b>

All Dollars Shown in Millions

**Notes:**  
To support CVW Training

*Department of the Navy*  
*Infrastructure Analysis Group*



**PHBR**  
**MILCON Summary**

Scenario: DON-0036	MCBH – Kaneohe Bay			Rehab	Cost
Construction FAC Description	UM	New			
<b>Hangars (3)</b>	<b>SF</b>	<b>41,100</b>		<b>34.85</b>	<b>37.9</b>
<b>Buildings (7)</b>	<b>SF</b>	<b>49,900</b>		<b>9,040</b>	<b>45.6</b>
<b>Shops(6)</b>	<b>SF</b>	<b>109,410</b>		<b>12,330</b>	<b>31.6</b>
<b>Test Facilities(3)</b>	<b>EA</b>	<b>3</b>			<b>13.6</b>
<b>Apron(2)</b>	<b>SY</b>	<b>46,800</b>		<b>17,910</b>	<b>12.6</b>
<b>Taxiway</b>	<b>SY</b>	<b>12,000</b>			<b>2.7</b>
<b>Fuel STWG</b>	<b>GA</b>	<b>15,000</b>			<b>2.2</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>162.7</b>

All Dollars Shown in Millions

**Notes:**

**Facilities for 2 of the 4 VFA Squadrons and VAQ Squadron**

**Buildings include: Admin, Ops, Missile Maint/Assy, Air Ops, Simulators**

**Shops include: Maint, Instrument, Test Building**

**Not shown, small ticket items, <1.0M**

*Department of the Navy*  
*Infrastructure Analysis Group*



**PHBR**  
**MILCON Summary**

Scenario: DON-0036		Hickam AFB		
Construction FAC Description	UM	New	Rehab	Cost
<b>Hangars (3)</b>	SF	71,110		38.7
<b>Buildings (11)</b>	SF	77,570		35.43
<b>Shops (9)</b>	SF	75,230		37.8
<b>Test Facilities</b>	EA	2		8.6
<b>Aprons</b>	SY	108,620		24.0
<b>Ammunition Stwg</b>	SF	11,950		4.2
<b>Flight Sim Facility</b>	SF	6,000		2.5
<b>Liq. Fuel Facility</b>	OL	600		7.1
<b>Arresting Gear</b>	EA	1		1.4
<b>TOTAL</b>				163.96

All Dollars Shown in Millions

**Notes:**

**Facilities for 2 of the 4 VFA Squadrons**  
**Buildings include: Admin, Ops, Missile Maint/Assy, Air Ops, Simulators**  
**Shops include: Maint, Instrument, Test Building**  
**Not shown, small ticket items, <1.0M**



*Department of the Navy*  
*Infrastructure Analysis Group*

# PHBR MILCON Summary

## Notes:

**Hangers includes acquisition of Pacific Aeronautical Training Center Hanger  
Covered stwg includes DRMO relocation from MCBH, CVW stowage facilities**

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

**Department of the Navy**  
*Infrastructure Analysis Group*



**PHBR**  
**MILCON Summary**

Scenario: DON-0036		NAVSTA Pearl Harbor		
Construction FAC Description	UM	New	Rehab	Cost
<b>SHIP REPAIR FACILITY (8 Projects)</b>	SF	117,000	22,500	87.7
T-AOE Wharf and Service Lines	SY	6000		57.9
CVN Wharf	SY	6000		113.3
Power Distribution	LF	15,000		60.8
Service Lines (Sewer, Water, Comms)	Various			84.8
Trainers (ship in a box & DC/FF)	SF	31,525		30.5
BQ	SF	553,364		205.4
Family Housing	SF	1,462,885		112.9
Parking	SY	77,400		8.4
Vehicle Bridge	SY	667		1.2
Buildings (Ops, Admin, Rec Center)	SF	22,600	3000	7.5
DENTAL CLINIC	SF	10,000		5.5
MEDICAL CLINIC	SF	30,000		16.5
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>803.6</b>

**Notes:**

All Dollars Shown in Millions

*Department of the Navy*  
*Infrastructure Analysis Group*



**Guam**  
**MILCON Summary**

Scenario: DON-0037	Location	Issues	Cost
			2707.1
NAVSUPACT Marianas, GU Agana Enclave ( \$190.9M ) CVN / Support Ships (\$2,193.6M) Ship Repair Facility (\$205.6M) T-AOE (\$117.1M)	Move HC-5 from AAFB + CVW assets Includes common support (BQ, Med, etc) Based on NASNI Facility for CVN		
Anderson AFB	No data from USAF		306.9
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>3014.0</b>

All Dollars Shown in Millions



# Guam

## MILCON Summary

Scenario: DON-0037	Anderson AFB			
Construction FAC Description	UM	New	Rehab	Cost
Taxiway	SY	128,600		29.8
Hangars (5)	SF	125,922	19,968	67.3
Buildings (11)	SF	95,755		41.9
Shops (6)	SF	99,473		39.6
Test Building	SF	24,400		8.7
Aprons (6)	SY	147,153		34.1
Ammunition Stowage	SF	4,800		2.5
Flight Simulator Facility (3)	SF	18,000		8.2
Covered Storage (1) and Hazmat (2) Bldgs	SF	287,238		55.1
POL Pipeline	MI	2		2.9
Bulk Liq Storage (AFFF)	GA	525,000		2.2
Pavement Lighting	LF	30,000		6.8
Arresting Gear	EA	2		3.3
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>306.9</b>

**Notes:**

Facilities for 4 VFA Squadrons and VAQ Squadron

Buildings include: Admin, Ops, Missile Maint/Assy, Air Ops, Ops Support Lab

Shops include: Maint, Instrument, Test Building

Not shown, small ticket items, <1.0M

Electrical Power and other support systems did do not provide sufficient data to determine MILCON cost.

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

All Dollars Shown in Millions



# Guam

## MILCON Summary

Scenario: DON-0037		NAVSUPACT MARIANAS – Agana Enclave		
Construction FAC Description	UM	New	Rehab	Cost
Hangars (2)	SF	118,221		59.1
Buildings (11)	SF	95,755		41.9
Shops (6)	SF	99,473		39.6
Test Building	SF	24,400		8.7
Aprons (6)	SY	30,543	120,236	20,237
Ammunition Stowage	SF	11,100		5.7
Flight Simulator Facility (3)	SF	18,000		8.2
Covered Storage (1) and Hazmat (2) Bldgs	SF	287,238		55.1
POL Pipeline	MI	2		2.9
Bulk Liq Storage (AFFF)	GA	525,000		2.2
Dental Facility	SF	11,000		6.0
Arresting Gear	EA	2		3.3
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>190.9</b>

### Notes:

Facilities for HC-5, HS, VAW, and C-2 squadrons  
Buildings include: Admin, Ops, Missile Maint/Assy, Air Ops, Ops Support Lab

Shops include: Maint, Instrument, Test Building

Not shown, small ticket items, <1.0M

Electrical Power and other support systems did do not provide sufficient data to determine MILCON cost.

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

All Dollars Shown in Millions



# Guam MILCON Summary

Scenario: DON-0037	NAVSUPACT MARIANAS – CVN, Escorts, SRF				
Construction FAC Description	UM	New	Rehab	Cost	
<b>SHIP REPAIR FACILITY (3 Projects)</b>	SF	254,700		205.6	
T-AOE Wharf and Service Lines	SY	6000		75.2	
High Performance Magazine for T-AOE	SF	9,065		41.3	
CVN / Escort Wharfs (3)	SY	6000	11,000	91.2	
<b>Emergency Power Generation(2)</b>	KW	41,000		72.0	
<b>Service Lines (Sewer, Water, Steam, Elec)</b>	LF	669,220		44.6	
<b>Trainers (Ship in a Box &amp; DC/FF)</b>	SF	29,526		40.7	
BQ	SF	971,410		357.7	
<b>Family Housing</b>	SF	5,832,196		1,373.7	
Parking	SY	84,083		9.4	
Road Improvements	SY	82,092		4.5	
<b>Buildings (Ops, Admin)</b>	SF	16,200	23,000	9.1	
<b>Dependent Schools (2- HS and ES/MS)</b>	SF	202,826		71.1	
Dental Clinic	SF	10,000		5.5	
Hospital / Medical Clinic (2) (1 for Agana)	SF	182,355		99.2	
<b>TOTAL (including smaller items not listed)</b>				2,516.2	

**Notes:**

All Dollars Shown in Millions



## Recurring Costs/Savings Summary

Scenario	Recurring Costs/Savings FY 06 - FY 11				
	O&M	Mil Pers	Other	Total Costs	Svgs
DON-0036 CVN to PHBR	156.71	101.43	22.26	280.41	-87.46
DON-0037 CVN to Guam	211.61	50.76	93.90	356.27	-107.11
					249.16

All Dollars Shown in Millions

### Notes:

**O&M – Sustainment, Recap, BOS, Civilian Salary**

**Mil Pers – Housing Allowances, COBRA does not have Guam OHA**



## *Department of the Navy*

### *Infrastructure Analysis Group*

## **Key Elements of Net Savings**

<b>Scenario: DON-0036 &amp; 0037</b>	
<b>Element</b> (* indicates recurring savings will occur to year 2025)	<b>Description</b>
<b>Sustainment/Recap</b>	Based on personnel flows out of Everett
<b>BOS*</b>	Based on personnel flows out of Everett
<b>MIL/CIV Salaries/BAH*</b>	Move/Eliminated Billets (0036) Move/Eliminated Billets (0037)
<b>Misc Recurring*</b>	Reduced TAD for VAW, PSNS Savings



## Scenario Issues CVW Basing at Hawaii

- Can we re-acquire land at Kalaeloa (former NAS Barbers Point)?
  - Current data does not include cost for buy-back
    - Requested additional info from COMPPACFLT
- Is there really any space space at MCB Hawaii for additional Navy CVW assets, either through MILCON or relocating Navy P-3s?
  - Current Data shows significant MILCON, no relocation of P-3s
  - Requested additional justification/info from COMPPACFLT
- Will the Air Force let the Navy move any assets into Hickam AFB? Do we want to?
  - Requested data from Army
- Can we use Wheeler Field?
  - Suitable for Fixed Wing? Might still need Barbers Point
  - Requested data from Army



# Scenario Issues

## AF Input on Hickam

- Currently, Future Total Force plans to expand the HIANG from 15 PAA to 24 PAA F-15s. In addition, Hickam will beddown 8 C-17 aircraft starting in FY06. This would reduce ramp space and flight line facilities available for F/A-18 beddown (PACAF/XPPF)
- Hickam AFB is a major Pacific theater throughput for all contingency operations. A comprehensive airfield management study needs to be accomplished to assess the transient ramp space requirements to support theater contingency requirements (PACAF/DOX). PACAF/CE also states “Raw” ramp is available, but it would reduce ramp space for transient surges during contingency operations.
- Hickam AFB is within Class B airspace and we would need to assess the impacts of expanding flight operations for high volume local training to maintain readiness.
- The potential beddown at Hickam would require a ramp expansion project to realign the parking configuration to meet all aircraft needs. With future beddowns at Hickam within the next few years, Hickam's real estate has reached capacity in flight line areas. Many of the buildings on the flight line are historic and cannot be replaced. If they were used for support facilities for the F/A-18s, they would require extensive renovation and new facilities would be required for the current occupants. All the current occupants would require new large facilities, which are hard to site elsewhere on base due to size, environmental constraints, land availability and ATFP standards. Dorms, the dining facility, housing and other community support facilities have reached or will reach their current capacity within the next few years with new mission beddowns. Cost to beddown would be in the \$200M plus range (PACAF/CE and 15AW/CE).



# Scenario Issues

## AF Input on Hickam

- **How much remaining operational capacity exists at Hickam?**
  - There is room to park the planes (20 F/A-18s and 3 Gulfstreams), but this will reduce the amount of transient space needed for throughput and may not be near future maintenance/support sites. As noted in the PACAF 7 Jan reply: “A comprehensive airfield management study needs to be accomplished to assess the transient ramp space requirements to support theater contingency requirements.”
- **Is there room to put the requested force structure?**
  - No, not without removing something (e.g., units, facilities, airfield pavement, golf course, etc.) and/or rebuild/reconfigure existing facilities (i.e., remove AOC out of hangar, renovate hangar for fighters, and build new AOC).
- **What about room for any hangar requirement as stated and probable Admin space? If none or only a portion or all that is available (state what you can), what is remaining that needs to be built?**
  - All current hangar and admin facilities are being used by current missions. This mission will need to facilities to support itself.
- **Is there space to build it, and how much would it cost?**
  - There is limited space to build on Hickam AFB, especially around the flight line. Renovation of existing or building new facilities will be required, but something must move (e.g., unit, facilities, airfield pavement, golf course, etc.) and/or rebuild/reconfigure existing facilities (i.e., remove AOC out of hangar, use hangar for fighters, and build new AOC). The ROM estimate would be \$300M to \$400M, not including any relocation costs. We’re unable validate the Navy figures because we do not have enough information on what site they are planning to use. PLEASE NOTE: The Navy estimate does not include any base support facilities (dormitories, dining facilities, and increased loads on other Services facilities such as fitness center,etc.) and relocation costs to move other facilities or units currently located on or near the Hickam flightline to make room for this proposed mission.



# Scenario Issues

## AF Input on Hickam

- Any issues that would prevent establishing this presence?
  - No known showstoppers that resources can't fix--significant investments and/or workarounds will be required.
- Operational issues?
  - There may be an issue with ammunition storage and armed aircraft on parking ramps due to explosive safety concerns. There are several functions near the flight line (e.g., housing, administrative, recreation, etc.) which are incompatible with explosive operations and might require relocation or workarounds. Without site surveys, these issues are not fully known at this time. Additionally, Hickam AFB is within Class B airspace and we would need to assess the impacts of expanding flight operations for high volume local training to maintain readiness.
- Environmental issues?
  - The environmental issues would depend on siting. One broad issue is the historic district encompassing many of the facilities along the flight line. Also, there may be some environmental remediation required depending on the site selected.
- Capacity? If not enough room to make this happen, would removing the tankers and/or other units make it happen?
  - Yes, relocating existing units would open up more room; however, more information would be needed to determine feasibility. Cost of unit relocation is not captured in the ROM estimate.



## **Scenario Issues**

### **CVW Basing at Guam**

---

- **Cost to repurchase former NAS Agana included in data**
  - 80 acres @ \$350K = \$28M
- **Can we move Navy assets into Andersen AFB?**
  - Initial discussions with AF indicate space will be limited
  - Requested additional data
- **Availability of Training Ranges (same at Hawaii)**
- **Ability of Civil Infrastructure to absorb forces**

*Department of the Navy*  
*Infrastructure Analysis Group*



## Scenario Comparison

Scenario:	DAG Reductions	One-Time Cost	ROI Years	Billets Eliminated	Total MILCON
DON-0005 & DON-0035					
DON-0036 Pearl Harbor	TBD	2,180	Never	44	1,750.90
DON-0037 Guam	TBD	3,471	Never	12	3,013.96

Note: All Dollars Shown in Millions

Notes:

*Department of the Navy*  
*Infrastructure Analysis Group*



# Back-Up



## **Scenario Issues**

---

**Excerpts from USD Memorandum for Infrastructure Steering Group Members  
Chairmen, Joint Cross-Service Groups dated 05 Jan 05**

**SUBJECT: Inclusion of the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy )  
IGPBS within the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Process**

- “In a recent report to Congress, the Department provide an update to its global defense posture review. The report indicates that proposed overseas posture changes will directly affect the BRAC process. To that end, the Associate General Counsel for Environment and Installations prepared the attached legal opinion to provide guidance on how the IGPBS results will inform the BRAC process.”
- “To fall within the scope of BRAC, the action contemplated must be a part of, and directly linked to, a final recommendation to close or realign a military installation inside the United States. Furthermore, the action contemplated must be capable of being completed within the six-year time period provided under the law. The risk of a successful challenge increases as this linkage becomes more attenuated, the timing more remote or both.”



## **Scenario Issues**

---

- “...Although not defined by statute, prior BRAC policies have defined a closure to mean “[a]ll missions of the base will cease or be relocated. All personnel (military, civilian and contractor) will either be eliminated or relocated. The entire base will be excessed and the property disposed....A realignment is defined in the Act as including “any action which both reduces and relocates functions and civilian personnel positions but does not include a reduction in force resulting from workload adjustments, reduced personnel or funding levels, or skill imbalances.”

## **TAB 3**



**DON**

## **Initial Fenceline Assessment**

**Naval Support Activity, Crane**

**18 January, 2005**



**Naval Support Activity, Crane, IN**  
**Lead: Technical**

## Navy Activities

- Naval Support Activity Crane
  - NSWC Crane
  - Public Works Center
    - Great Lakes Crane Detachment
  - Naval Criminal Investigative Service
  - NAVICP Support
- 315 Personnel
  - 2978 Personnel
  - 233 Personnel
  - 1 Person
  - 85 Personnel

**NSWC Crane  
Only Activity  
affected by  
Scenarios**

**Total Navy Personnel - 3612**



**Department of the Navy**  
**DON Analysis Group**

- 8 Technical Scenarios
  - Technical areas impacted
    - Chem- Bio Defense
      - Relocated to Aberdeen Proving Ground – 58 Personnel affected
    - Sensors, Electronics & Electronics Warfare RDAT&E
      - Surface Ship work relocated to NSWC Dahlgren – 470 Personnel affected
      - **Submarine, Air & Land remain at NSWC Crane – 1048 Personnel un-affected**  
{NSWC Crane only}
    - Weapons RDAT&E Technology
      - Relocated to various places – 859 personnel affected
  - 4 Industrial Scenarios
    - Depot Work
      - Relocated work, many locations – 543 Personnel affected (maximum)

**Total Navy personnel  
affected - 1960      Un-affected - 1652**

*Department of the Navy*  
*DON Analysis Group*



# Naval Support Activity Crane IN Lead: Technical

Scenario	# Navy Mil Pers at fenceline	# Navy Civ Pers at fenceline	# Navy Mil Pers relocated/ eliminated	# Navy CIV Pers relocated/ eliminated	# Navy Mil Pers Remaining	# Navy Civ Pers Remaining
TECH-0002	41	3571	0	389	41	3182
TECH-0008	41	3571	8	453	33	3118
TECH-0017	41	3571	0	354	41	3217
TECH-0018 *	41	3571	0	376	41	3195
TECH-0019	41	3571	0	12	41	3559
TECH-0032	41	3571	0	58	41	3513
TECH-0043 *	41	3571	0	12	41	3559
TECH-0044 *	41	3571	0	354	41	3217

\* Variants of previous scenarios

**Department of the Navy**  
**DON Analysis Group**



**Naval Support Activity Crane IN  
 Lead: Technical**

Scenario	# Navy Mil Pers at fenceline	# Navy Civ Pers at fenceline	# Navy Mil Pers relocated/ eliminated	# Navy CIV Pers relocated/ eliminated	# Navy Mil Pers Remaining	# Navy Civ Pers Remaining
IND-0063 **	41	3571	0	520	41	3051
IND-0073 **	41	3571	0	520	41	3051
IND-0083 **	41	3571	0	520	41	3051
IND-0104 ***	41	3571	0	152	41	3419
IND-0127 ***	41	3571	0	391	41	3180

\*\* Personnel affected are identical

\*\*\* IND-0104 and IND-0127 are companion scenarios to relocate the Depot work to FRC's



## Department of the Navy

### DON Analysis Group

# Naval Support Activity Crane IN Lead: Technical

## 8 Technical JCSG Scenarios move functions out of Naval Support Activity Crane:

TECH-0002	Relocate W&A RDAT&E to 3 Primary & 2 specialty with weapons from PAX River & Pt. Mugu to China Lake	Relocate most Weapons and Armaments [W&A] e.g. missiles, energetics, guns, etc. (see definition from previous data calls) Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation (RDAT&E)
TECH-0008	C4ISR Joint Centers	Sensors, Electronics and Electronic Warfare RDAT&E for surface ships relocated to NSWC Dahlgren
TECH-0017	Relocate DoD Guns & Ammunition RD&A to Picatinny	Relocate DoD Guns & Ammunition RD&A (except energetic materials) at Picatinny.
TECH-0018	Cooperative: Relaligns and consolidates Undergrad Pilot and NAV/NFO/CSO training	Relocate W&A RDAT&E to 3 Primary & 2 specialty; retain/relocate energetics materials at Indian Head
TECH-0019	Relocate RD&A Energetic materials capability from Crane, Aberdeen, and Yorktown to Indian Head	Relocate RD&A Energetic materials capability from Crane, Aberdeen, and Yorktown to Indian Head
TECH-0032	Chemical-Biological Defense RD&A consolidation	Relocate Crane and Dahlgren Chem-Bio defense RD&A function to Aberdeen proving grounds
TECH-0043	Relocate W&A RDAT&E to 3 Primary & 4 specialty; retain/relocate energetics at Dahlgren	Relocate energetic materials RDAT&E capabilities from Indian Head, Crane and Yorktown to Dahlgren.
TECH-0044	Relocate DoD Guns & Ammunition RD&A at one location (Dahlgren)	Relocate DoD Guns & Ammunition RD&A (except energetic materials) and selected T&E at Dahlgren. Relocate gun/ammunition research from Aberdeen, Gun/Ammunition/fuze RD&A from Adelphi, gun/ammunition RDAT&E from Crane, Picatinny, Port Hueneme (Louisville Detachment), Quantico, China Lake, Eglin; and gun RD&A from Watervliet (Benet Lab) to Dahlgren.

## *Department of the Navy*

### *DON Analysis Group*

# **Naval Support Activity Crane IN Lead: Technical**



## **4 Industrial JCSG Scenarios move functions out of Naval Support Activity Crane:**

IND-0063	Realign Depot Maintenance (3 parts)	This scenario consolidates depot level maintenance functions into a reduced number of activities based upon workload and capacity for specific commodities.
IND-0073	Realign Depot Level Maintenance (3 parts)	This scenario consolidates depot level maintenance functions into a reduced number of activities based upon workload and capacity for specific commodities.
IND-0083	Realign Depot Maintenance (5 Parts)	This scenario consolidates depot level maintenance functions into a reduced number of activities based upon workload and capacity for specific commodities.
IND-0104 And IND-0127	Fleet Readiness Center Northwest and Tobyhanna	These scenarios contribute to evaluating the potential transformation of the traditional aviation intermediate and depot level maintenance construct into six shore based Fleet Readiness Centers (FRCs) at strategic fleet concentrations. The FRCs and the addition of depot level maintenance capability at their associated detachments are intended to increase effectiveness and efficiency of off-aircraft and equipment maintenance, increase mission readiness, and reduce costs and turnaround time.

**Naval Support Activity Crane**  
**Lead: Technical**

- Tenants remaining at Naval Support Activity Crane

Tenants	UIC	Possible Action
NSWC Crane (balance of)		Relocate to Dahlgren
Naval Support Activity Crane		Transfer to Army (Base host function)
Public Works		Transfer to Army
Naval Criminal Investigative Service		Relocate to Washington DC
NAVICP Support		Relocate with Supply Scenario



## **BRAC Action Alternatives**

- Close Navy installation – Dispose of property
- Close Navy installation – Transfer property to Army
- Retain Navy TBD functions at site – Transfer property to Army

## **Planned Actions**

- Work with Technical JCSG to incorporate remaining workload into existing or new scenarios
- Discuss property transfer to Army via JAST – for both closure and retain-functions alternatives

**TAB 4**



*Department of the Navy  
Infrastructure Analysis Team*

---

**DON**

***Supply and Storage  
Initial Fenceline Assessments***

**Naval Support Activity Philadelphia**

**Naval Support Activity Mechanicsburg**

**Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA**

**Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA**

**18 Jan 2005**



## **Naval Support Activity Philadelphia**

### **Activities and Tenants:**

- NAVICP Philadelphia (COB: 1,229)
- FISCC Norfolk Detachment (COB: 6)
- Defense Supply Center Philadelphia (COB: 2,766)
- Defense Contracting Management Command (COB: 125)
- Approx. Base Population: 4,126



**Department of the Navy**  
**Infrastructure Analysis Team**

# Naval Support Activity Philadelphia

S&S-0005	Consolidate DSC Philadelphia at DSC Columbus	This scenario consolidates all DLA ICP's in a single location at DSC Columbus.
S&S-0010	Realign NAVICP Philadelphia with NAVICP Mechanicsburg	This scenario disestablishes NAVICP Philadelphia and consolidates all functions at NAVICP Mechanicsburg resulting in a single NAVICP.
S&S-0028	Realign DLR management from NAVICP to Defense Supply Centers in Richmond and Columbus.	This scenario realigns all Service Common DLR management to DLA.
S&S-0035	Relocate NAVICP Philadelphia to DSC Richmond.	This scenario transfers all Service ICP's to DLA for consolidation.
HSA-0031	Realign Human Resources Service Center-Northeast, Philadelphia, to a new regional civilian personnel office at NSA, Mechanicsburg.	This scenario realigns civilian personnel offices in San Diego, Norfolk and Mechanicsburg..
HSA-0029	Consolidate HRO Service Center-Northeast, Philadelphia, with the Civilian Personnel Offices from DLA-New Cumberland, PA; DLA-Columbus, OH; and WHS-Arlington, VA to establish a regional civilian personnel office at NSA Mechanicsburg.	This scenario realigns ten Civilian Personnel Offices into four Regional Civilian Personnel Offices



## **Naval Support Activity Mechanicsburg**

### **Activities and Tenants:**

- NAVICP Mechanicsburg (COB: 1366)
  - Commander Naval Supply Systems Command (COB: 85)
  - Naval Sea Logistics Center (COB: 106)
  - Naval Operational Logistics Support Center (COB: 101)
- Approx Base Population: 2,000**
- Defense Depot (annex of DD Susquehanna) (COB: 372)



**Department of the Navy**  
**Infrastructure Analysis Team**

# Naval Support Activity Mechanicsburg

S&S-0028 (same for Phil)	Realign DLR management from NAVICP Mechanicsburg to Defense Supply Centers in Richmond and Columbus.	This scenario realigns all Service Common DLR management to DLA.
S&S-0035	Relocate NAVICP Mechanicsburg to DSC Columbus.	This scenario transfers all Service ICP's to DLA for consolidation.
S&S-0041 (mirror of S&S-0010)	Relocates and consolidates NAVICP Mechanicsburg with NAVICP Philadelphia	Consolidates NAVICP in a single location (Philadelphia)



## **Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow**

### **Activities and tenants:**

- **MCLB Barstow (COB: 1,570\*)**

\*Industrial function: 803

- **Defense Distribution Center West (Stockton, CA)**
- **Defense Regionalization Marketing Office (COB: 14)**

**Approx. Base Population: 1,584**



**Department of the Navy**  
**Infrastructure Analysis Team**

## **Key Scenarios: Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow**

S&S-005	Transfer project stocks and war reserve items to the Defense Distribution Depot Barstow	Closes Sierra Army Depot (Enabling Scenario for USA Scenario)
IND-0063	Realign Depot Level Maintenance (Actions realign depot maintenance <u>to</u> MCLB Barstow)	Minimizes maintenance sites DoD wide (on basis of 1.5 times Total Capacity)
IND-0073	Realign Depot Level Maintenance (Actions realign depot maintenance <u>from</u> MCLB Barstow)	Minimizes maintenance sites DoD wide (on basis of 1.0 times Total Capacity)
IND-0083	Realign Depot Level Maintenance (Actions realign depot maintenance <u>from</u> MCLB Barstow)	Minimizes maintenance sites DoD wide (on basis of 1.5 times Maximum Capacity)
IND-0127	Realign Depot & Intermediate Level Maintenance (Actions realign depot maintenance <u>from</u> MCLB Barstow)	Establishes six shore-based naval Fleet Readiness Centers (FRCs) at strategic fleet concentration areas.



## **Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany**

### **Activities and Tenants:**

- MCLB Albany (Marine ICP) (COB: 836)
- Marine Corps Logistics Command (COB: 1,628)
- Marine Corps Systems Command (COB: 126)
- Defense Contract Management Agency (COB: 4)

**Approx. Base Population: 2,759**



**Department of the Navy**  
**Infrastructure Analysis Team**

## **Key Scenarios: Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany**

IND-0063	Realign Depot Level Maintenance (Actions realign depot maintenance <u>to</u> MCLB Albany)	Minimizes maintenance sites DoD wide (on basis of 1.5 times Total Capacity)
IND-0073	Realign Depot Level Maintenance (Actions realign depot maintenance <u>to</u> MCLB Albany)	Minimizes maintenance sites DoD wide (on basis of 1.0 time Total Capacity)
IND-0083	Realign Depot Level Maintenance (Actions realign depot maintenance <u>to</u> MCLB Albany)	Minimizes maintenance sites DoD wide (on basis of 1.5 times Maximum Capacity)
IND-0127	Realign Depot & Intermediate Level Maintenance (Actions realign depot maintenance <u>to</u> MCLB Albany)	Establishes six shore-based naval Fleet Readiness Centers (FRCs) at strategic fleet concentration areas.



**Department of the Navy**  
**Infrastructure Analysis Team**

# Back Up



## **Impacts due to Industrial JCSG Scenarios with Actions Realigning from MCLB Barstow**

MCLB BARSTOW FENCELINE - BASELINE DATA					
	ACTIVITY	MIL	CIV	CTR	TOTAL
	MCLB Barstow	188	1271		1459
	Movement Control Ctr, Ft Irwin	17	2		19
	DRMO		14		14
	Branch Medical Clinic	28	9		37
	NAVFAC, SW Div, ROICC	1	9		10
	DeCA		18		18
	US Aviation Company, Nati Training Ctr	10			10
	Other	6	11		17
	<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>1584</b>

SCENARIO IMPACTS (LOSING)*					
	ACTIVITY	MIL	CIV	CTR	TOTAL
SCENARIO					
IND-0073	MCLB Barstow	-7	-795	-24	-826
IND-0083	MCLB Barstow	-7	-797	-24	-828
IND-0127	MCLB Barstow	-7	-796	-24	-827

\* Each scenario is exclusive of the others. No cumulative impacts. Data is net of personnel movements, gains, and eliminations as reported in scenario data call.