MISCELLANEOUS FUNCTIONS DCN: 5839
SUPPORT

Excerpt from OFFICIAL SNAVFAC DIRECTORY

EAP EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
Toll Free: 800-869-0276

Employee Assistance Program Contract Administrator	**Norman Hook**	**843-820-5800**
Deputy Employee Assistance Program Contract Administrator	**Cathy Parker**	**843-820-5844**

NFESC NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING SERVICES CENTER CHASN
These NFESC associates are physically located at NavHosp Chas - 3600 Rivers Avenue

DeOgburn, Mark	Roofing Consultant	843-743-7575 x5441
Gannon, William	RR & Crane Trackage Consultant	843-743-7116
Murray, Carl	Boiler/UPV Consultant	843-743-7121
Turknett, Reggie	Jet Engine Test Cell Consultant	843 743-7939

NFI NAVAL FACILITIES INSTITUTE
These NFI associates are physically located at NavHosp Chas - 3600 Rivers Avenue

Bartee, Bobbie	Procurement Analyst	843-743-7161
Borden, Candice	PMAP Deputy	843-743-7133
Jolly, Dawn	FacTS Program Manager	843-743-7945
Stohs, Katie	Procurement Analyst	843-743-7153
Warren, Wendy	PMPG Program Manager	843-743-7864

PA PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE

Beltz, Jim	Public Affairs Officer	843-820-5771

SBA SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (ATLANTA)

Miller, Rick	Procurement Center Rep	843-820-5724

Plenty of Space!
NAVFAC SOUTH recently relocated 70-80 associates from the NAVHOSP in late 2004.

Tom Fressilli
Comment of 7/12/05

Table Of Contents

1. Data Call 3: Dept of Navy, SPECIAL, 23 July
DoD1194 Mission Statement
DoD1195 Location mandate
DoD1197 Location Criticality
DoD1198 Special facilities or fixed assets

Section : Mission Statement

DoD1194 Provide a description of your activity's mission
(Text)
Southern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command is an integral part of the Navy's facilities, installation, and contingency engineers. We serve the Navy and Marine Corps combat team, Unified Commanders, Department of Defense and other federal agencies. Southern Division provides a diversity of products and services such as planning, design, real property acquisition and disposal, environmental protection, construction and maintenance of shore facilities and family housing and operation and maintenance of utilities for a 26 state region, as well as for Facilities Engineering Command Midwest and Engineering Field Activity Southeast. We plan and deliver innovative, best value, technology-leveraged solutions and alternatives that enable our clients to accomplish their mission. Southern Division is also the primary provider of support and services for Naval Reserves and Marine Forces Reserve. Specifically, Southern Division is the Facility Services Program Manager for all stand-alone Marine Corps Reserve Centers throughout the United States. Recently, the Chief of Naval Installations has forwarded a letter to NAVFAC requesting that Southern Division be designated as the Facility Services Program Manager for all stand-alone Naval Reserve Forces Centers. Southern Division is the only Center of Excellence for the Navy for Strategic Sourcing Acquisition. Southern Division is the Defense Energy Support Centers designated worldwide execution agent for Federal work. Southern Division is the designated central point of contact and coordinator for overall support of Naval Air Systems Command Government Owned Contractor Operated activities. Additionally, Southern Division is the leader in Navy BRAC Disposal and Early Transfer.

Section : Location mandate

DoD1195 Is your activity's current location mandated by statutory requirement? List and explain the requirement.

Statute Name (Text)	Date of statute (YYYY/MM/DD)	Explain requirement (Text)
None		

Section : Location Criticality

DoD1197 Is your present activity location critical to your mission? Explain.

Location Criticality	Location critical to mission? (Yes/No)	Explanation (Text)
Location Criticality	(X)Yes ( )No	Southern Division covers a 26 state region. Location within 60 minutes of a major airport is critical to our mission. Southern Division associates make approximately 5900 trips per year.

Section : Special facilities or fixed assets

DoD1198 List and describe any of your activity's specially configured facilities or fixed assets which are essential to your mission. Address in your description the ability to collocate or combine your activity with ANY other DoD or DoN facilities with similar functionality. Include any facilities or fixed assets for your reporting detachments.

Facility / Fixed Asset (Text)	Location (Text)	Describe / Explain (Text)
None	None	None

Tom Fressilli
• Comment e-Mailed on 11 July 2005

EFA SOUTHEAST

ESE

U.S. Postal Address:
Commanding Officer
Engineering Field Activity, SouthEast
Naval Air Station
P.O. Box 143, Bldg. 902
Jacksonville, FL 32212-0143

Fed-Ex Address:
EFA SouthEast
Naval Air Station
Building 902
Jacksonville, FL 32212

DSN: 942-xxxx

FAX DSN: 942-8710

Satellite Conf Phone: FTS 904-542-5571 x146
(Bldg. 13 - VTC Room)

ESE00	**COMMANDING OFFICER**		
	Doggett, Judy	Secretary	904-542-5132 x2002
	Walden, Paul CAPT	***CO**	**904-542-5132 x2001**
ESE09	**EXECUTIVE OFFICER**		
	Dobson, Van CDR	***XO**	**904-542-5132 x2009**
	Hatcher, Scott	SADBU Specialist	904-542-8745 x1105
ESE09C	**COUNSEL**		
	Waller, Bill	Counsel	904-542-8745 x1126
ESE09R	**RESOURCE DEPARTMENT**		
	Coleman, Beverly	Management Assistant	904-542-8745 x1109
ESE02	**CONTRACTS DEPARTMENT**		
	Burgess, Barbara	Contract Specialist	904-542-8745 x1121
	Howard, Dana	Contract Specialist	904-542-8745 x1122
	Kohler, Theresa	Procurement Analyst	904-542-8745 x1103
	Life, Crystal	Contract Specialist	904-542-5571 x1115
	O'Connor, Rhonda	Contract Specialist	904-542-3358 x4501
	White, Sandy	***Chief of Contracts**	**904-542-8745 x1119**
	Wilber, Cathy	Supvy Contract Specialist	904-542-8745 x1118
ESE05	**OPERATIONS**		
	Allen, Leslie	Bldg 902	904-8745x108
	Blackburn, Larry	Envir Tech/Safety Specialist (Bldg 902)	904-542-5571 x260
	Helinski, Mary CDR	***Operations Officer**	**904-542-2114 x2030**
	McLane, Shelly	Management Assistant	904-542-8745 x1100
	Noble, Bill	Civil Engineer Intern	904-542-8745 x1113
	O'Connor, Rhonda		
	Surrency, Tommy		904-542-8745x1102
	Wagner, Julie	Civil Engineer Intern	904-542-8745 x1114

ESE05PS **MULTI-INSTALLATION FACILITIES SUPPORT CONTRACTS GROUP**
(Located in Bldg. 103)

Bazemore, Diane	Contract Specialist	904-542-3358 x4502
Feliciano, Alberto	Budget Technician	904-542-3358 x4526
Haymans, Dianne	Contract Specialist	904-542-3358 x4529
Janosick, Frank	Contract Specialist	904-542-3358 x4524
McLaughlin, Chris	Contract Specialist	904-542-3358 x4530
Smith, Pam	***Supvy Contract Specialist**	**904-542-3358 x4500**

ESE05CE **COMBINED ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**
(Located in Bldg. 103)

Haley, Pat	***Engineering Director**	**904-542-3355 x4400**
Jackson, Michele	Civil Engineer	904-542-3355 x4435
Paivandy, Al	Architect	904-542-3355 x4421

ESE05FT **FTSE (CNRSE) SUPPORT DEPARTMENT**

Bovier, Jan	Environmental Engineer	904-542-8745 x1111
Coggeshall, Kathryn	Base Development	904-542-8745 x1112
Destafney, Camille	Environmental Services Team Leader	904-542-8745 x1102
Forsythe, David	***IPT Leader**	**904-542-8745 x1101**
Nolan, Rob	Real Estate Advisor	904-542-8745 x1110
Waltzie, Arenas		904-542-5140 x2126

Tom Knessill
Comment
e-Mailed on
11 July 2005

ATTACHMENT H

DESCRIPTION OF ANALYSIS OF

REGIONAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES

Regional Support Activities are those activities that provide management oversight of activity and personnel support functions. Regional Support Activities were divided into four categories: Installation Management; Large Service Providers; Middle Management Providers and Administrative Service Providers. Within each category, each type of activity was analyzed separately. Their administrative management functions were reviewed for opportunities of alignment and integration. The categories and activities analyzed were:

Installation Management

Navy Region Southwest, San Diego, California
Navy Region Northeast, Groton, Connecticut
Navy Region Southeast, Jacksonville, Florida
~~Navy Region Gulf Coast, Pensacola, Florida~~
Navy Region Hawaii, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii
Navy Region Midwest, Great Lakes, Illinois
Navy Reserve Forces Command (Installation Management Function), New Orleans, Louisiana
Navy Region South, Corpus Christi, Texas
Navy Region Mid-Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia
Navy Region Northwest, Seattle, Washington
Naval District Washington, DC
Navy Region Marianas, Guam

Large Service Providers

Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division Southwest, San Diego, California
Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity West, San Bruno, California
2/34 Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Southeast, Jacksonville, Florida
Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii
Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Midwest, Great Lakes, Illinois
Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northeast, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division South, Charleston, South Carolina
Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia
Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Northwest, Poulsbo, Washington
Naval Facilities Engineering Field Activity Chesapeake, Washington DC
Naval Facilities Officer in Charge of Construction Marianas, Guam
Public Works Center, San Diego, California
Public Works Center, Jacksonville, Florida
Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii
Public Works Center, Great Lakes, Illinois
Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia
Public Works Center, Washington, DC

Public Works Center, Guam
Fleet Industrial Supply Center, San Diego, California*
Fleet Industrial Supply Center, Jacksonville, Florida*
Fleet Industrial Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii*
Fleet Industrial Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia*
Fleet Industrial Supply Center, Puget Sound, Washington*

Middle Management Providers

Naval Reserve Readiness Command Southwest, San Diego, California
Naval Reserve Readiness Command Southeast, Jacksonville, Florida
Naval Reserve Readiness Command Midwest, Great Lakes, Illinois
Naval Reserve Readiness Command Northeast, Newport, Rhode Island
Naval Reserve Readiness Command South, Fort Worth, Texas
Naval Reserve Readiness Command Northwest, Everett, Washington
Naval Reserve Readiness Command Mid-Atlantic, Washington, DC
Naval Legal Service Office Southwest, San Diego, California
Naval Legal Service Office Southeast, Jacksonville, Florida
~~Naval Legal Service Office Central, Pensacola, Florida~~
Naval Legal Service Office Pacific Detachment, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii
Naval Legal Service Office Mid-Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia
Naval Legal Service Office Northwest, Bremerton, Washington
Naval Legal Service Office North Central, Washington, DC
Twelfth Marine Corps District, San Diego California
Eighth Marine Corps District, New Orleans, Louisiana
Ninth Marine Corps District, Kansas City, Missouri
First Marine Corps District, Garden City, Long Island, New York
Fourth Marine Corps District, Cumberland, Pennsylvania
Sixth Marine Corps District, Parris Island, South Carolina
Naval Reserve Recruiting Area Pacific, San Diego, California
Naval Reserve Recruiting Area West, Aurora, Colorado
Naval Reserve Recruiting Area Southeast, Orlando, Florida
Naval Reserve Recruiting Area Central, Great Lakes, Illinois
Naval Reserve Recruiting Area South, Dallas, Texas
Naval Reserve Recruiting Area Northeast, Washington DC
Trial Service Office West, San Diego, California
Trial Service Office Southeast, Mayport, Florida
Trial Service Office Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii
Trial Service Office East, Norfolk, Virginia
Trial Service Office Northeast, Washington, DC
Naval Recruiting Region West, Oakland, California
Naval Recruiting Region South, Macon, Georgia
Naval Recruiting Region Central, Great Lakes, Illinois
Naval Recruiting Region North, Scotia, New York
Marine Corps National Capitol Region Command, Washington, DC

Administrative Service Providers

Human Resources Service Center, San Diego, California*
Human Resources Service Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii*
Human Resources Service Center, Stennis, Mississippi*
Human Resources Service Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania*
Human Resources Service Center, Portsmouth, Virginia*
Human Resources Service Center, Silverdale, Washington*
Healthcare Support Office, San Diego, California
Healthcare Support Office, Jacksonville, Florida
Healthcare Support Office, Norfolk, Virginia
Personnel Support Activity West, San Diego, California
Personnel Support Activity Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia

*These activities were also analyzed by the Headquarters and Support Activities and Supply and Storage Joint Cross-Service Groups and thus were removed from review at the Department of the Navy level after initial evaluation.

Data Call Development

Regionalization of the Navy shore Installation Management commenced after BRAC 1995 in an effort to decrease overhead and infrastructure. BRAC 2005 sought to build upon this effort by analyzing commands, in addition to installation management regions, in an effort to seek common measures of management with an eye towards opportunities for better alignment. There are no commonly accepted benchmarks for the administrative management functions performed by this diverse group of activities. As a result, data call development focused on questions to identify commonalities among these activities. Commander, Navy Installations and the Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps for Installations and Logistics were both consulted for insight and input into the data call development process.

The capacity data call requested information on span of control and workload balance. Because Regional Support Activities are made up of a diverse collection of activities performing multiple missions, there was no common output measure. Instead, a variety of measures were derived from data collected on customers and subordinates served, facilities supported, and distance to customers.

Military value key factors for Regional Support Activities were: operational proximity, criticality of location, scope of responsibility, regional alignment, relative productivity, quality of facilities, and personnel support. These key factors were analyzed within standard attribute groupings: Effectiveness of Operations, Efficiency of Operations, Quality of Facilities, and Personnel Support.

Undoubtedly the Problem!

Capacity Analysis

Span of control and workload balance measures were utilized in the assessment of capacity for the various Regional Support Activities in an effort to find opportunities for better alignment leading to future efficiencies. Such measures included the number of supported customers and distance to customers. Because there were no stated requirements or clear limits on the appropriate span of control for Regional Support Activities, there was no measurement of excess capacity. The capacity measures were used in conjunction with military value to test possible scenarios that stressed current spans of control while strengthening alignment.

Military Value Analysis

Final military value scoring placed heavy emphasis on operational proximity, criticality of location, current scope of responsibility, co-location, regional alignment and relative productivity. Each of the four Regional Support Activities categories shared the same attributes, yet were weighted slightly differently to account for different mission characteristics, including accessibility to customers. Military value was determined by individual activity type within the category.

Effectiveness of Operation and Efficiency of Operation were given the greatest weight across all four categories of Regional Support Activities. With the exception of Administrative Service Providers, Quality of Facilities outweighed Personnel Support. Activities scoring on the high end of the range included Commander, Navy Region Mid-Atlantic, Engineering Field Division Southwest, Public Works Center Norfolk, Naval Legal Service Office Mid-Atlantic, Trial Service Office San Diego, and Naval Reserve Readiness Command Mid-Atlantic. These activities generally are close to customers, have low overhead, and are located at or near the Installation Management regional headquarters. Activities that had low scores were generally in leased space, not located in proximity to operational units, and/or not aligned to the Installation Management regional headquarters. Installation Management had a range of scores from 40.4 to 86.7 with an average military value for this category of 60.9; Large Service Providers, 45.2 to 87.7, with an average of 72.6; Middle Management Providers, 34.4 to 85.4, with an average of 66.0; and Administrative Service Providers, 58.8 to 87.6, with an average of 77.0.

Configuration Analysis

Configuration analysis was used to develop solutions that progressively reduced the number of installation management regions, while maximizing military value and minimizing distance to installations served. The model's parameters included: (1) military values of each current regional management activity; (2) distances to each Navy installation; (3) plant replacement value and workforce at each Navy installation; and (4) the state in which each Navy installation is located. The model runs include the following rules approved by the Department of the Navy (DON) Analysis Group: (1) maintain Navy District Washington in its current configuration; (2) achieve balance in workload between regions, to the extent practical; and (3) do not split states across multiple regions (except as necessary to maintain Navy District Washington. The configuration analysis produced various alternatives for structuring the regions. Although it was not possible to define a specific measure of excess

capacity in this group of activities, the DON Analysis Group did review alternatives in terms of workload, balance of workload, and geographical distribution relative to installations served.

Scenario Development and Analyses

The DON Analysis Group decided to use the optimization model results to begin scenario development for Installation Management, and then sought to successively align the other groups of activities to various Installation Management options to see if these options could increase efficiency between Regional Support Activities. In addition to alignment, it was felt that collocation could potentially lead to further efficiencies as commands identified other like functions. The DON Analysis Group decision for scenarios to be analyzed was based on balance and alignment of the various configurations; having non-contiguous regions was not viewed as a viable option. Three scenarios resulted, two of which included options for the continental United States region consolidation, and one that consolidated Pacific regions. The continental United States options differed in that Northeast was consolidated in one (leaving five continental United States regions exclusive of Navy District Washington) and left open in another (leaving six continental United States regions). Navy District Washington has a unique mission and therefore the DON Analysis Group determined that it would maintain its current status as a region and would not be considered for consolidation. Once the continental United States region configurations were identified, other Regional Support Activities that did not currently align with the regions or had significant capacity imbalances were reviewed and scenarios developed to assess the impact of alignment with the Installation Management Regions. Efforts were also made to stress the potential for relocation of commands from leased space onto government owned property.

The Pacific Installation Management scenario consolidated Installation Management regions in Hawaii and Guam. This was evaluated but rejected because the DON Analysis Group felt realignment might be counter-productive. The elimination of eight personnel did not outweigh the potential disruption and risk to fleet missions. In addition, both regions are working with other Services to maximize opportunities for consolidation.

The continental United States scenario selected as a recommendation minimized the number of regions while maximizing their span of control by eliminating Commander, Navy Regions South, Gulf Coast, and Northeast, and by eliminating Commander, Naval Reserve Forces Command as a region. While the closure scenario as initially analyzed included all of the region closures, in the course of integrating candidate recommendations per the Office of the Secretary of Defense guidance, the Northeast Region and Naval Reserve Installation Management closures were incorporated into the closures of Submarine Base New London and Naval Support Activity New Orleans, respectively.

Naval Facilities Engineering Command commenced consolidation of its subordinate commands prior to BRAC 2005. The Naval Facilities Engineering Command Transformational Plan addressed consolidation of Engineering Field Activities and Divisions with Public Works Centers and regionally managed public works departments. This plan keyed on alignment with the installation management Regions in an effort to further the Chief of Naval Operations' priority of alignment.

Engineering Field Activity Northeast and Engineering Field Division South were the only naval facilities activities that were not directly addressed by the Naval Facilities Engineering Command Transformational Plan, and did not align to the current existing regions. Multiple scenarios were run simultaneously with the Installation Management regional scenarios to ensure the correct number of Engineering Field Divisions/Engineering Field Activities aligned to the optimized number of regions. Relocating Engineering Field Activity Northeast to Submarine Base New London was removed from consideration after determining that Commander, Navy Region Northeast would be eliminated under the optimized Installation Management regional structure. A scenario closing Engineering Field Activity Northeast and realigning its remaining mission to Engineering Field Division Atlantic showed increased payback. Naval Crane Center was part of the same facility lease as Engineering Field Activity Northeast, and relocation of the Navy Crane Center will allow for closure of this leased facility. The DON Analysis Group determined that savings and other synergies are realized by locating the Crane Center with other like industrial activities in a fleet concentration area. Realignment of Naval Facilities Officer in Charge of Construction Guam and Public Works Center Guam to Hawaii was removed from consideration since the DON Analysis Group decided to discontinue consideration of consolidating Commander, Navy Region Marianas, Guam to Commander, Navy Region Hawaii.

Aligning the reserve readiness commands with the Installation Management regions ensures a reserve voice at each region as well as enabling future savings through consolidation of like functions. Reserve readiness commands were fairly well aligned to future regions with three exceptions: Naval Reserve Readiness Commands South, Northeast and Mid-Atlantic. The scenario relocating Naval Reserve Readiness Command South aligned well with the accompanying regional scenario and was immediately approved. The relocation and realignment of Naval Reserve Readiness Command Northeast to the region did not show any savings and was therefore removed from consideration. The scenario in which alignment to the region is achieved by consolidation of Naval Reserve Readiness Command Northeast with Naval Reserve Readiness Command Mid-Atlantic and subsequent relocation to Norfolk was approved. The scenario resulted in six personnel remaining as a detachment to Navy District Washington, therefore ensuring each region a reserve management support structure.

Because Naval Legal Service Office Central was not aligned with a future region, a scenario for relocation was issued. Personnel savings were small, however, and the DON Analysis Group determined that because of the small size of this activity, its realignment to a region did not require a BRAC action.

The DON Analysis Group also attempted to align all the Marine Corps Recruiting Districts within their respective areas of responsibility. Scenarios were analyzed that relocated the Eighth and Fourth Marine Corps Districts. However, with the high costs of relocation, these scenarios could not be justified as stand-alone recommendations although appropriate placement of the Marine Corps Districts was favored. The Eighth Marine Corps

District was subsequently relocated as part of the closure of Naval Support Activity New Orleans.

Conclusion

The Regional Support Activities analysis was a forward-looking comprehensive review to ensure that Navy support infrastructure will be properly sized and aligned to best serve the Fleet and the Services' various shore commands, now and in the future. Since 1996, the Navy has endeavored to reduce infrastructure support costs as a means of funding operational needs. This BRAC 2005 effort continues this effort and makes it more inclusive by broadening the regionalization analysis. By aligning all "regional support" commands, synergies will be found and further savings beyond BRAC may be possible through the consolidation of like functions. These recommendations create the right number of Installation Management and Regional Support Activities to ensure minimum management staffs and overhead while maintaining robust support to mission customers. The closure and realignment recommendations increase the average military value of Installation Management regions from 60.86 to 63.92; of Naval Facilities Engineering Field Division/Activities from 65.74 to 72.61; and of Naval Readiness Reserve Commands from 72.03 to 75.68. The net savings to the Department over 20 years for these recommendations is approximately $208.1 million.

Tom Fressilli Comment 8/12/05

For Immediate Release
July 19, 2000

Contact: Michael Elazier
202-225-3315

Congressional Black Caucus
PRESS RELEASE

BRAC Commission
JUL 27 2005
Received

Congressman Clyburn Secures $10 Million for Naval Base Project

---

(Washington, DC) --- Sixth District Congressman James E. Clyburn announces a $10 million appropriation to the Charleston Naval Complex Redevelopment Authority. The funding will be used to renovate two existing buildings with the intent of locating the Southern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command on the former base. Congressman Clyburn secured the funding in the FY01 Defense Appropriations Act Conference Report, which is expected to receive final approval by the House and Senate today.

"I expect that if Southern Division relocates to the former naval complex, it will help to ensure its continued presence in the Charleston area for many years to come. That is good news for the 550 people it employs and good news for Charleston," Congressman Clyburn said. "This renovation project will also serve as a catalyst for the redevelopment of the commercial office area of the Charleston Naval Complex."

The $10 million allocation will be used to renovate Buildings 4 and 8 at the former naval base with the intent of housing Southern Division's headquarters. Building 4 is a four-story 80,000 square foot concrete and brick structure constructed in 1917. Building 8 is a two-story 40,000 square foot brick masonry structure constructed in 1903.

Return to the Homepage