DCN 8558

INDUSTRIAL JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP

August 2, 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR R. GARY DINSICK, ARMY TEAM LEADER

Subject: Lima Tank Plant , OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker C0684

The following is in response to your e-mail inquiry of July 2, 2005, where you asked the following:

1. *Confirm that no personnel are impacted by this recommendation.*
   - There are no personnel impacted by this recommendation

2. *How was the determination made that the DoD only requires the capability for the Army Future Combat System (FCS), Marine Corps Expeditionary Force Vehicle (EFV) chassis, and the M1 Tank?*
   - The IJCSG collected data to identify requirement out through 2025. The only requirements identified were for M1Tank recap for foreign military sales. During deliberations, the Army and the Marine Corps identified a need for future requirements. Final site retention was based on military judgment.

3. *Based on the latest POM/PRESBUD position, what is the workload for each of these systems through the POM? How much is funded?*
   - M1 Recap requirements are foreign military sales and there is no budget for this
   - POM/PRESBUD shows no requirements for FCS
   - POM/PRESBUD shows Low Rate Initial Production requirements for EFV in FY 2008 and 2009. Funding for 34 units.

4. *Although not specifically noted in the recommendation, does this action disestablish any capabilities? If so, what specific capabilities does this recommendation disestablish?*
   - No it does not disestablish any capability. Workload just does not exist/requirements do not exist.

5. *Reference Clearing House tasker #C0605 buildings that will no longer be required, for what are they currently utilized? Who is using them?*
   - During the BRAC analysis, Lima was recommended for closure because there was no workload. At that time, Lima was operational because they were pulling forward workload from FY 2006 and 2007. Space was available and utilized, without a need to synchronize for synergy. During the BRAC process and the identification of future workload from the Army and the Marine Corps allows Lima to *more fully utilize some buildings and closedown those that are not in use.*

These buildings were not used or used for functions that can be relocated to building #147 for future workload on the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicles (EFV) and Future Combat System (FCS)(i.e. bldg #266 was used for final test and acceptance/planned for Expeditionary Fighting Vehicles (EFV), bldg #261 is planned for EFV preparation for shipment, etc)

- General Dynamics is the contractor on site.

6. *Reference Clearing House tasker #C0605 the question was asked regarding the methodology for determining excess square footage at Lima, however, the response fails to answer that question. Please specifically address how 432K square feet of excess was determined/calculated. Was it just a calculation of utilized space as a percentage of available space? Why was some of this "excess" not left to manage any potential surge? If workload has changed, should this increase not be taken into consideration?*
   - 432KSF was a calculation of the delta between the total facility square footage identified in COBRA and the certified usable square footage numbers identified by LIMA in their Military Value questions.
   - The ability to surge, especially with a tank manufacturing plant, is determined more on the ability to surge labor resources not facilities resources.
   - The recommendation does take into consideration the future requirements.

7. *If the intent is to divest the Army of excess property, why does this need to be accomplished through BRAC?*
   - It is critical that this recommendation go forward under the BRAC umbrella. The only reason that Lima remains open is because military judgment through deliberative sessions identified a need for its presence based on future DoD needs. Because this decision was made primarily through military judgment, it falls into the realm of BRAC and the planned acquisition strategy needs to become a part of public law.

8. *Provide the current 2005 percentage of facility utilization.*
   - 94.9%

Should additional information be required, feel free to contact me at 703-560-4317 or e-mail jberry@gallows.vacoxmail.com

Jay Berry
Executive Secretary