

AD-A264 209



Department of the Navy

①



DTIC
ELECTE
MAY 05 1993
S E D

FY 1994

BUDGET ESTIMATES

**DOD BASE REALIGNMENT &
CLOSURE PROGRAM II**

(1988 Commission)

111

93-08635



176pdt

93 4 21 082

**JUSTIFICATION DATA
SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS
APRIL 1993**

STRATEGIC STATEMENT
Approved for public release
Distribution Unlimited

PAGES _____
ARE
MISSING
IN
ORIGINAL
DOCUMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Financial Summary	1
2. Base Closure and Realignment Detail by Package:	
a. Naval Air Station, Chase Field, Texas	3
(1) DD Form 1391:	
P-240S, Operational Trainer Facility Addition, NAS Kingsville, TX	9
b. Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, Rhode Island	11
c. Naval Complex, Long Beach, California	17
(1) DD Form 1391:	
P-332S, Dredging, NS San Diego, CA	27
P-338S, Dredging, NS San Diego, CA	29
P-227S, Administrative Offices Alterations, NS Long Beach, CA	31
P-998S, Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, NH Twentynine Palms, CA.	33
d. Naval Air Facility, Midway Island	35
e. Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California.	39
(1) DD Forms 1391's:	
P-261S, Aviation Training Facility, NAS Barbers Point, HI.	45
P-207S, Applied Instruction Building, NAS Jacksonville, FL	47
P-209S, Parking Apron, NAS Jacksonville, FL.	49
P-210S, Maintenance Hangar and Applied Instruction Facility, NAS Jacksonville, FL	51
P-320S, Hangar Modifications, NAS Alameda, CA.	53
H-206, Family Housing, NPWC San Francisco, CA.	55
H-208, Family Housing, NAS Barbers Point, HI	57

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
f. Naval Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.	59
(1) DD Form 1391's:	
P-557S, Operational Trainer Facility, NTC Great Lakes, IL.	65
g. Philadelphia NSY, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.	67
(1) DD Form 1391's:	
P-591S, Utility Reconfigurations, NSY Philadelphia, PA	71
h. Naval Station, Puget Sound (Sand Point), Washington	73
(1) DD Form 1391's:	
P-300S, Administrative Office Building, NSB Bangor, WA.	79
P-211S, Automotive Vehicle Maintenance Shop, NS Everett, WA	81
P-011S, Reserve Readiness Command Facility, NRC Everett, WA	83
P-315S, Brig, NSB Bangor, WA.	85
P-104S, Transient Personnel Facilities, NSB Bangor, WA.	87
i. Naval Station, Treasure Island, California.	89
j. Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California.	93
(1) DD Form 1391's:	
P-004S, Operations, Maintenance, and Supply Facilities (Phase I), MCAS Twentynine Palms, CA.	99
P-999S, Runway, Site Preparation, and Infrastructure, MCAS Twentynine Palms, CA	103
P-521S, Access Roads, MCAS Twentynine Palms, CA	105

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
k. Naval Command Control and Ocean Surveillance Center, San Diego, California.	107
(1) DD Form 1391's:	
P-120S, Electronic Systems Engineering Staging Facility, NCCOSC, San Diego, CA.	113
P-121S, In-Service Engineering Laboratory, NCCOSC, San Diego, CA	115
l. Naval Surface Warfare Centers	117
(1) DD Form 1391's:	
P-172S, Composite Materials Laboratory, NSW Carderock Div, Bethesda, MD	123
P-179S, Ships Materials Technology Facility, NSWC Carderock Div, Bethesda, MD.	125
P-267S, Sewage Treatment Plant Upgrade, NSWCDIV Dahlgren, VA.	127
P-010S, Gas Turbine Ship Building Modifications, NSWCDIV Philadelphia, PA.	129
P-273S, Combined Research Laboratory, NSWCDIV Dahlgren, VA.	131
m. Naval Air Warfare Centers	133
(1) DD Form 1391:	
P-930S, Science and Engineering Facilities (Phase I), NAWCACDIV Patuxent River, MD.	139
P-940S, Science and Engineering Facilities (Phase II), NAWCACDIV Patuxent River, MD.	141
n. Naval Undersea Warfare Centers.	143
(1) DD Form 1391's:	
P-020S, Engineering Research Laboratory, NUWCDIV Newport, RI	149

iii

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 5

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification _____	
By _____	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
o. Project Reliance.	151
(1) DD Form 1391:	
P-569S, Dental Research Facilities Renovation, NDRI	
Great Lakes, IL	155
P-425S, Applications Laboratory, NMRI Bethesda, MD. . .	157
P-086S, Research Laboratory, NMRI Bethesda, MD. . . .	159
3. Planning/Design and Management.	161

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	28.5	125.6	559.0	54.7	3.8	0.0	771.6
Family Housing							
Construction	0.0	0.0	34.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.4
Operations	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.3	4.3	3.9	3.5
Environmental	[38.9]	[133.8]	[131.6]	[98.9]	[84.1]	[28.3]	[515.6]
Studies	4.5	6.4	3.4	0.9	0.5	0.0	15.6
Compliance	6.3	26.6	45.6	35.7	43.6	2.0	159.8
Restoration	28.1	100.8	82.6	62.3	40.0	26.3	340.1
Operation & Maintenance	0.2	92.6	142.3	79.5	118.3	13.1	446.1
Military Personnel - PCS	0.0	0.0	9.7	2.2	7.7	0.0	9.6
Other	0.1	0.0	24.5	17.2	1.3	0.1	43.1
Homeowners Assistance	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	0.1	0.0	1.8	-6.1	-671.3	-92.8	-768.3
TOTAL COSTS	67.8	352.0	906.2	248.7	-451.8	-47.3	1075.6
SAVINGS:							
Military Construction	-13.9	0.0	-13.6	-6.3	-3.8	0.0	-37.5
Family Housing							
Construction	-51.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-51.1
Operations	-0.8	-1.8	-1.6	-4.5	-4.0	-3.5	-16.1
Operations & Maintenance	-12.7	-18.3	-136.0	-233.8	-260.7	-263.6	-925.2
Military Personnel	-1.6	-18.5	-50.0	-81.9	-123.2	-152.0	-427.2
Other	-19.3	-97.7	-100.8	-163.9	-172.7	-155.1	-709.5
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-1552]	[-2765]	[-3685]	[-4318]	[-4237]	[3718]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[-87]	[-970]	[-1723]	[-2355]	[-3128]	[-3421]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-99.3	-136.4	-302.0	-490.5	-564.3	-574.2	-2166.7

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN MILLIONS)

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: (Funded by other Appropriations)	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9
Family Housing	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Operation & Maintenance	25.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.6
Military Personnel - PCS	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Other	8.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1
TOTAL COSTS	40.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.7

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	20.6	125.6	545.3	48.4	0.0	0.0	740.0
Family Housing	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Construction	-51.1	0.0	34.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	-16.8
Operations	-0.8	-1.8	1.4	-2.2	0.3	0.4	-2.6
Environmental	[38.9]	[133.8]	[131.6]	[98.9]	[84.1]	[28.3]	[515.6]
Studies	4.5	6.4	3.4	0.9	0.5	0.0	15.6
Compliance	6.3	26.6	45.6	35.7	43.6	2.0	159.8
Restoration	28.1	100.8	82.6	62.3	40.0	26.3	340.1
Operation & Maintenance	13.2	74.3	6.2	-154.3	-142.4	-250.4	-453.4
Military Personnel	-1.4	-18.5	-40.2	-79.7	-115.5	-152.0	-407.3
Other	-11.1	-97.7	-76.3	-146.8	-171.4	-155.1	-658.3
Homeowners Assistance	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0.1	0.0	1.8	-6.1	-671.3	-92.8	-768.3
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-1552]	[-2765]	[-3685]	[-4318]	[-4237]	[-3718]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[-87]	[-970]	[-1723]	[-2355]	[-3128]	[-3421]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	9.2	215.6	604.2	-241.8	-1016.1	-621.5	-1050.4

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NAS CHASE FIELD TX

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	1500	0	0	0	1500
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	521	537	1514	1280	3852
Environmental	[2819]	[7356]	[2931]	[16500]	[200]	[1100]	[30615]
Studies	1028	20	0	0	0	0	1048
Compliance	1500	1831	1216	0	0	0	4547
Restoration	291	5505	1715	16500	200	1100	25311
Operation & Maintenance	40	6607	1775	1596	1596	1596	13210
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	70	0	0	0	70
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
meowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
and Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	125	0	0	-2000	-1875
TOTAL COSTS	2859	13963	6922	18633	3310	1976	47663

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	-766	-1768	-1618	-1257	-650	-448	-6507
Operations & Maintenance	-2898	-1685	-13843	-14641	-15227	-15731	-64025
Military Personnel	0	-2993	-9169	-12513	-12994	-13482	-51151
Other	0	0	0	-16200	-34600	-37700	-88500
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-69]	[-146]	[-195]	[-195]	[-195]	[-195]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-175]	[-349]	[-349]	[-349]	[-349]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-3664	-6446	-24630	-44611	-63471	-67361	-210183

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

(Funded by other Appropriations)

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	1624	0	0	0	0	0	1624
Military Personnel - FCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	1624	0	0	0	0	0	1624

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	0	0	1500	0	0	0	1500
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	-766	-1768	-1097	-720	864	832	-2655
Environmental	[2819]	[7356]	[2931]	[16500]	[200]	[1100]	[30615]
Studies	1028	20	0	0	0	0	1048
Compliance	1500	1831	1216	0	0	0	4547
Restoration	291	5505	1715	16500	200	1100	25311
Operation & Maintenance	-1234	4922	-12068	-13045	-13631	-14135	-49191
Military Personnel	0	-2993	-9099	-12513	-12994	-13482	-51081
Other	0	0	0	-16200	-34600	-37700	-88500
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	125	0	0	-2000	-1875
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-69]	[-146]	[-195]	[-195]	[-195]	[-195]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-175]	[-349]	[-349]	[-349]	[-349]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	819	7517	-17708	-25978	-60161	-65385	-160896

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL AIR STATION, CHASE FIELD, TEXAS

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

The Naval Air Station (NAS) is located east of Beeville, Texas, in the South Coastal Region. The base consists of approximately 9,800 acres, including airfield runways, taxiways and aprons, industrial, commercial, residential, recreation and open space land uses. The Naval Air Station command was deactivated 1 February 1993. Training squadron operations were relocated to Naval Air Stations, Kingsville and Meridian prior to the end of FY 1992. The outlying field at Goliad was also closed. The training range at McMullen has been retained to support training operations from Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: The estimated construction cost resulting from the closure of NAS Chase Field reported to the Base Closure Commission was \$6.6M. As a result of further analysis and review, the construction requirement was reduced to \$1.5M.

<u>Location/Project Title</u>		<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount \$ 000</u>
Kingsville	Operational Trainer Facility Addn	1994	1,500
		Total	1,500

Family Housing Construction: No requirement.

Family Housing Operations: The family housing inventory at Chase Field totals 415 units. Beginning in FY 1994 and continuing through 1997, there are housing operation costs associated with caretaker status.

Environmental:

Studies: An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be necessary to document impacts resulting from Navy disposal of facilities and land at NAS Chase Field. Impacts to be addressed include air and water quality (e.g., reuse to an industrial park may result in increased air and water emissions), reuse of buildings that are potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, and changes in land use (especially if the subsequent use is radically different than the current use of NAS Chase Field). Given the economic dependency of Beeville on the NAS, the community is instrumental in developing alternatives for reuse. The disposal EIS began in June 1992 and is scheduled to be completed in May 1993.

Cleanup: Hazardous waste disposal will be required, and underground storage tanks will be sampled and either closed, removed, or monitored.

In addition, the hazardous waste storage facility will be closed according to regulations. An asbestos inventory has been conducted and all asbestos that is hazardous to human health will be abated.

Installation Restoration (IR): Previous budget estimates were based on extremely limited data. The preliminary assessment was performed in 1985 and the site inspection (SI) phase had yet to begin when closure budgets were first discussed in 1991. A RCRA Facilities Assessment (RFA) has also been performed and was not conducted until late October of 1991 by EPA VI (note that activity was not a permitted facility, it was conducted only because the base was closing). Final results and actions required as a consequence of the RFA were not known until April of 1992 after review and release by the Texas Water Commission. One hundred and twelve solid waste management units were identified (five already being addressed in SI under IR Program), 44 require further assessment. The SI is still on-going, but groundwater contamination has been detected. We are in the process of evaluating the extent of this contamination. New cost estimates are based on the above information requiring an increased level of effort for studies and remediation efforts.

Operations & Maintenance: Funds were required for the packing, crating, and shipping of equipment from NAS Chase to receiving activities, and severance pay and permanent change-of-station for civilians at the losing activity. Relocation costs associated with contractor personnel performing aircraft/simulator maintenance and simulator instructions were required. Caretaker costs are included in FY 1994 through FY 1997.

Other: None.

Revenue from Land Sales: Navy has screened the property with other Federal, state, and local agencies and the public according to the normal federal disposal process. This may result in sale to a state or local government either at fair market value or discounted under a variety of statutory programs. If the property survives the screening process, then the property will ultimately be disposed of by public sale. The \$2M included as proceeds for land sales will only be realized if the property is transferred or sold at fair market value.

Secretary of Defense Aspin approved the Navy's plan to establish interim leases with the community for the family housing and hangars. These leases were effective 16 February 1993.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: None.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: Inactivation of family housing units occurred during FY 93, in conjunction with the withdrawal of military families from the area.

Operations & Maintenance: Resultant savings from reduced pilot training rate and efficiency from operations consolidation.

Military Personnel: Reduction of 23 officers at \$1,939K and 326 enlisted at \$11,543K.

Other: None.

1. COMPONENT NAVY		FY 19 ⁹⁴ MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA		2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION /UIC:N60241 NAVAL AIR STATION, KINGSVILLE, TEXAS			4. PROJECT TITLE OPERATIONAL TRAINER FACILITY ADDITION	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0805796N	6. CATEGORY CODE 171.35	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-240S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 1,500	

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
OPERATIONAL TRAINER FACILITY ADDITION.	SF	15,000	-	1,150
BUILDING ADDITIONS	SF	8,000	122.00	(980)
BUILDING MODIFICATIONS	SF	7,000	24.00	(170)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	190
SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION FEATURES.	LS	-	-	(50)
UTILITIES, PAVING, SITE IMPRV. & DEMOLITION.	LS	-	-	(140)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	1,340
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	70
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	1,410
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%)	-	-	-	90
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	1,500
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(15,000)

10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION

Two metal-frame building additions, drilled and belled concrete piers, concrete slab on grade, masonry walls, built-up roof, heat ventilation, air conditioning, air filtration system, overhead track and hoist, fire protection sprinklers, fire alarm system; building modifications, utilities, concrete sidewalks, flexible pavement, and partial demolition of one building.

11. REQUIREMENT: 15,000 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SF SUBSTANDARD: (7,000) SF

PROJECT:

Provides an operational trainer facility addition.

REQUIREMENT:

Adequate and properly-configured facility addition to house new equipment scheduled for delivery in 1995 for T-45 simulator training. The Naval Air Station, Chase Field is to close as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. Therefore, this activity is to receive an operational flight trainer originally scheduled for Chase Field.

CURRENT SITUATION:

There is no space available in the existing trainer facility to accommodate the new trainer.

IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:

Without this project, this activity will not be able to meet the expanded

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAVAL AIR STATION, KINGSVILLE, TEXAS														
4. PROJECT TITLE OPERATIONAL TRAINER FACILITY ADDITION	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-240S													
11. REQUIREMENT: (CONTINUED) <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> (CONTINUED) training requirements. There will be no facility to house the new trainer. This will impact on this activity's ability to meet its pilot training requirements and the base closure decision.														
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. 05-92 (B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993 45 (C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE 09-92 (D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE 08-93 (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES___NO <u>X</u> (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) (A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS (78) (B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS (125) (C) TOTAL 203 (D) CONTRACT (152) (E) IN-HOUSE (51) (4) CONSTRUCTION START. 11-93 (MONTH AND YEAR) B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE</th> <th style="text-align: left;">PROCURING APPROPRIATION</th> <th style="text-align: left;">FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED</th> <th style="text-align: left;">COST (\$000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>OPERATIONAL FLIGHT TRAINER</td> <td>APN</td> <td>1995</td> <td>15,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: right;">TOTAL</td> <td>15,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)	OPERATIONAL FLIGHT TRAINER	APN	1995	15,000	TOTAL			15,000
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)											
OPERATIONAL FLIGHT TRAINER	APN	1995	15,000											
TOTAL			15,000											

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NCBC DAVISVILLE RI

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	14302	0	0	0	0	14302
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[3295]	[3470]	[8240]	[14550]	[500]	[500]	[30555]
Studies	230	250	20	0	0	0	500
Compliance	1260	195	2505	0	0	0	3960
Restoration	1805	3025	5715	14550	500	500	26095
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	2340	0	0	0	2340
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	4	0	330	165	140	-21885	-21246
TOTAL COSTS	3299	17772	10913	14715	640	-21385	25954

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	-133	-134	-139	-406
Operations & Maintenance	-255	-418	1752	1576	1546	1517	5718
Military Personnel	0	0	-16	-105	-183	-190	-494
Other	-68	0	0	0	0	0	-68
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[-10]	[-10]	[-10]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[-1]	[-4]	[-4]	[-4]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-323	-418	1736	1338	1229	1188	4750

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

**ONE-TIME
IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:**
(Funded by other Appropriations)

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel - PCS	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	10	0	0	0	0	0	10

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	0	14302	0	0	0	0	14302
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	-133	-134	-139	-406
Environmental	[3295]	[3470]	[8240]	[14550]	[500]	[500]	[30555]
Studies	230	250	20	0	0	0	500
Compliance	1260	195	2505	0	0	0	3960
Restoration	1805	3025	5715	14550	500	500	26095
Operation & Maintenance	-255	-418	4092	1576	1546	1517	8058
Military Personnel	10	0	-13	-105	-183	-190	-481
Other	-68	0	0	0	0	0	-68
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	4	0	330	165	140	-21885	-21246
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[-10]	[-10]	[-10]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[-1]	[-4]	[-4]	[-4]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	2986	17354	12649	16053	1869	-20197	30714

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTALION CENTER, DAVISVILLE, RHODE ISLAND

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

The Construction Battalion Center (CBC) is to be deactivated by the end of FY 1994. Prepositioned war reserve material stock (PWRMS) required by the Naval Construction Force will be shipped to CBC Port Hueneme, CA and CBC Gulfport, MS for on-site storage. All facilities and real property, including nine units of family housing, will be excessed after PWRMS is shipped to the other Construction Battalion Centers. Tenant commands will be disestablished or relocated. Camp Fogarty, 374 acres of land located away from the main site, was transferred to the Army on 26 January 1993 for use by the Rhode Island National Guard.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: Closure requires shipment of PWRMS to the other CBCs for on-site storage. Projects have been developed to construct the following warehouse facilities:

<u>Location/Project Title</u>	<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount (\$000)</u>
Gulfport Controlled Humidity Warehouse	1993	7,900
Port Hueneme General Purpose Warehouse	1993	6,402
	Total	14,302

Family Housing Construction: No Requirement.

Family Housing Operations: No Requirement.

Environmental:

Cleanup/Compliance: Hazardous waste disposal will be required, and underground storage tanks will be sampled. The tanks will be either closed, removed, or monitored. Removal of approximately 60 abandoned tanks is ongoing. An asbestos inventory will be completed and all damaged asbestos will be abated. Polychlorinated bi-phenyl (PCB) equipment will be removed in accordance with applicable regulations.

Installation Restoration (IR): CBC Davisville is listed on the National Priority List (NPL). Of the 14 sites identified in the initial assessment, two were found to require no further action and two PCB sites are presently being cleaned up. Ten sites are being addressed under the IR Program. A Phase I Remedial Investigation has been completed. The Phase II RI/FS field work was started in the first quarter of FY 1993. The milestone schedule included in the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) with EPA and the state of Rhode Island projects the final Record of Decision in FY 1995.

The FFA was completed and signed on March 23, 1992, and the agreement became effective July 8, 1992 without modification. Cleanup of sites will occur progressively beginning in FY 94 and could last until FY 2000, if groundwater treatment is required.

Studies: Issues to be addressed include increased traffic, land use changes, wetlands, and water emissions.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be developed in 1993. The EIS will document impacts resulting from Navy disposal of facilities and land at CBC Davisville. While the local community will play a major role in assisting the Navy in developing reuse alternatives, it seems likely that the Rhode Island Port Authority (the same organization that acquired NAS Quonset Point in 1974) will acquire CBC. Based on their reuse of NAS Quonset Point, significant changes in land use, traffic, and air and water emissions should be anticipated. Impacts to be addressed would include increased air and water quality (reuse to an industrial park, which is the most likely reuse, may result in increased air and water emissions), impacts from reuse of buildings that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, changes in land use (which may be radical depending on the nature of the potential industrial park), changes in traffic (which could be radical depending on potential reuse). CBC is contaminated with numerous hazardous waste sites, and is on the NPL for cleanup under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). The EIS would examine impacts on and from hazardous waste sites. The disposal EIS is expected to be completed by September 1994.

Operations & Maintenance: Costs identified cover the following: Movement of PWRMS (three Reserve Naval Mobile Construction Battalion TOAs) to the gaining Construction Battalion Centers, relocation of warehoused submarine parts and components belonging to Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA), movement of material and equipment assigned to units of the Reserve Naval Construction Force who are tenants of CBC Davisville, and relocating assets of Defense Reutilization Management Office (DRMO), also a tenant. Additionally, one-time O&MN costs include severance pay for civilian employees of CBC Davisville.

Other: None.

Revenue from Land sales: Navy has begun screening the property with other Federal, state and local agencies and the public according to the normal federal disposal process. Screening is proceeding on schedule and is expected to be completed in 1993. This may result in transfer to another federal agency, a homeless provider, sale to a state or local government either at fair market value or discounted under a variety of statutory programs. If the property survives the screening process, then the property will ultimately be disposed of by public sale. The \$21,885,000 included as proceeds for land sales will only be realized if the property is transferred or sold at fair market value.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: None.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: The family housing inventory at Davisville totals nine units. Operation of these units will cease after FY 1994. Anticipated savings begin in FY 1995.

Operations & Maintenance: Savings are attributable to the phased reduction and total elimination of all base operations support. Costs incurred include leased space for continuing storage of NAVSEA submarine parts and components, and for the storage, maintenance and repair of PWRMS relocated to the other Construction Battalion Centers.

Military Personnel: Military billets at CBC Davisville will be reduced from eight in FY 1992 to four in FY 1995 through FY 1997; continuing requirement supports the cleanup of the hazardous disposal sites. Incumbent personnel will leave through normal reassignment.

Other: Savings to OPN in FY 1992 for Civil Engineering Support Equipment (CESE) that is no longer required.

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NAVAL COMPLEX LONG BEACH CA

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	9160	0	0	0	9160
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	2000	1200	1300	1350	5850
Environmental	[1340]	[14571]	[3425]	[8732]	[13500]	[24000]	[65568]
Studies	340	1551	250	200	0	0	2341
Compliance	0	3000	1325	5132	2000	2000	13457
Restoration	1000	10020	1850	3400	11500	22000	49770
Operation & Maintenance	0	500	2600	2427	2058	370	7955
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	2832	1881	30	0	4743
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	40	0	183	93	105	-35717	-35296
TOTAL COSTS	1380	15071	20200	14333	16993	-9997	57980

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	-520	0	-844	-6297	-3346	0	-14007
Family Housing							
Construction	-51128	0	0	0	0	0	-51128
Operations	0	0	0	-770	-4035	-4035	-8840
Operations & Maintenance	-1055	-2608	-37455	-53716	-63137	-78497	-236468
Military Personnel	0	-4351	-13942	-24615	-41047	-53357	-137312
Other	0	0	0	-540	-560	-580	-1680
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-5]	[-16]	[-176]	[-270]	[-333]	[-333]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-300]	[-467]	[-701]	[-869]	[-1004]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-55703	-6959	-52241	-85938	-112125	-136469	-449435

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

(Funded by other Appropriations)

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	800	0	0	0	0	0	800
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	800	0	0	0	0	0	800

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	-3520	0	8316	-6297	-3346	0	-4847
Family Housing	800	0	0	0	0	0	800
Construction	-51128	0	0	0	0	0	-51128
Operations	0	0	2000	430	-2735	-2685	-2990
Environmental	[1340]	[14571]	[3425]	[8732]	[13500]	[24000]	[65568]
Studies	340	1551	250	200	0	0	2341
Compliance	0	3000	1325	5132	2000	2000	13457
Restoration	1000	10020	1850	3400	11500	22000	49770
Operation & Maintenance	-1055	-2108	-34855	-51289	-61079	-78127	-228513
Military Personnel	0	-4351	-11110	-22734	-41017	-53357	-132569
Other	0	0	0	-540	-560	-580	-1680
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	40	0	183	93	105	-35717	-35296
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-5]	[-16]	[-176]	[-270]	[-333]	[-333]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-300]	[-467]	[-701]	[-869]	[-1004]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	-53523	8112	-32041	-71605	-95132	-146466	-390655

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NS LONG BEACH CA

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	8440	0	0	0	8440
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	2000	1200	1300	1350	5850
Environmental	[1340]	[14566]	[2850]	[8400]	[13500]	[24000]	[64656]
Studies	340	1546	250	0	0	0	2136
Compliance	0	3000	750	5000	2000	2000	12750
Restoration	1000	10020	1850	3400	11500	22000	49770
Operation & Maintenance	0	500	819	2117	1893	200	5529
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	2804	1852	0	0	4656
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
meowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	2	0	86	43	43	-20217	-20043
TOTAL COSTS	1342	15066	16999	13612	16736	5333	69088

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	-3520	0	0	0	-923	0	-4443
Family Housing							
Construction	-51128	0	0	0	0	0	-51128
Operations	0	0	0	-770	-4035	-4035	-8840
Operations & Maintenance	-187	-1658	-2577	-4615	-9674	-25300	-42011
Military Personnel	0	-4351	-13462	-23137	-38487	-50170	-129607
Other	0	0	0	-540	-560	-580	-1680
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-5]	[-16]	[-31]	[-125]	[-188]	[-188]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-300]	[-437]	[-641]	[-779]	[-914]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-54835	-6009	-16039	-29062	-53679	-78085	-237709

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: (Funded by other Appropriations)							
	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	800	0	0	0	0	0	800
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	800	0	0	0	0	0	800
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:							
Military Construction	-3520	0	8440	0	-923	0	3997
Family Housing	800	0	0	0	0	0	800
Construction	-51128	0	0	0	0	0	-51128
Operations	0	0	2000	430	-2735	-2685	-2990
Environmental	[1340]	[14566]	[2850]	[8400]	[13500]	[24000]	[64656]
Studies	340	1546	250	0	0	0	2136
Compliance	0	3000	750	5000	2000	2000	12750
Restoration	1000	10020	1850	3400	11500	22000	49770
Operation & Maintenance	-187	-1158	-1758	-2498	-7781	-23100	-36482
Military Personnel	0	-4351	-10658	-21285	-38487	-50170	-124951
Other	0	0	0	-540	-560	-580	-1680
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	2	0	86	43	43	-20217	-20043
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-5]	[-16]	[-31]	[-125]	[-188]	[-188]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-300]	[-437]	[-641]	[-779]	[-914]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	-52693	9057	960	-15450	-36943	-72752	-167821

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NAVHOSP LONG BEACH CA

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	720	0	0	0	720
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[0]	[5]	[575]	[332]	[0]	[0]	[912]
Studies	0	5	0	200	0	0	205
Compliance	0	0	575	132	0	0	707
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	1781	310	165	170	2426
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	28	29	30	0	87
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	38	0	97	50	62	-15500	-15253
TOTAL COSTS	38	5	3201	721	257	-15330	-11108

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	-844	-6297	-2423	0	-9564
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	-868	-950	-34878	-49101	-53463	-55197	-194457
Military Personnel	0	0	-480	-1478	-2560	-3187	-7705
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[-145]	[-145]	[-145]	[-145]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[-30]	[-60]	[-90]	[-90]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-868	-950	-36202	-56876	-58446	-58384	-211726

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

(Funded by other Appropriations)

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	0	0	-124	-6297	-2423	0	-8844
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[0]	[5]	[575]	[332]	[0]	[0]	[912]
Studies	0	5	0	200	0	0	205
Compliance	0	0	575	132	0	0	707
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	-868	-950	-33097	-48791	-53298	-55027	-192031
Military Personnel	0	0	-452	-1449	-2530	-3187	-7618
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	38	0	97	50	62	-15500	-15253
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[-145]	[-145]	[-145]	[-145]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[-30]	[-60]	[-90]	[-90]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	-830	-945	-33001	-56155	-58189	-73714	-222834

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL STATION AND NAVAL HOSPITAL, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

Close Naval Station Long Beach by the end of FY 1996. Transfer ship support functions and land to Naval Shipyard Long Beach. Decommission 12 ships and reassign all remaining ships to other Pacific Fleet homeports. Close Naval Hospital (NAVHOSP) Long Beach by the end of FY 1996 and disperse staff to locations of greatest need.

Facilities expected to remain open for support of ships in overhaul include 1,033 units of family housing, morale, welfare, and recreation facilities (consolidated clubs, marina, golf course, gymnasium, fitness center, playing field, and bowling center), Navy exchange (NEX) facilities (NEX store, Navy lodge, gas station/garage and mini-mart), BOQ, BEQ, galley, Family Service Center, Personnel Support Detachment (PSD), Navy Relief, credit union, Navy Legal Service Office, and Naval Supply Center, household goods office, medical/dental clinics, chapel, child care center, and commissary. Twenty-five buildings will be demolished.

Security and police remain to support the residual support functions. The fire department remains for both the residual support activities and the shipyard. Facilities management, including personnel to operate and maintain the telephone system that serves both the residual support activities and the shipyard and the remaining buildings and family housing will be retained. The residual activities will also retain staffing for budget and accounting, safety management, and supply.

The following is a nominal disposition of homeported ships and staffs:

<u>Fiscal</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>Ship Type</u> <u>(#) / Staff</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
1992	BB	Decommission
	FF (2)	Decommission
	FFG	San Diego
	LSD (2)	San Diego
	DD	San Diego
1993	NRF FFG (3)	San Diego
	AOR	Oakland
	LHA	San Diego
	FF (2)	Decommission
	Tender	Decommission

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Ship Type (#) / Staff</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
1994	FFG	San Diego
	FFG (2)	Everett
	FFG	Pearl Harbor
	NRF FFG (2)	San Diego
	NRF LST (2)	Decommission
	LST	Decommission
	AOR	Decommission
1995	CG (2)	Alameda
	DD (2)	Everett
1996	LPD	Decommission
	ARS	Decommission

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: Construction projects listed below must be completed to implement recommendations of the Commission. The Long Beach project is required for facilities consolidation.

<u>Location / Project Title</u>		<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount (\$000)</u>
San Diego	Dredging	1994	1,540
	Dredging	1994	3,900
Long Beach	Administrative Offices Alterations	1994	3,000
Twentynine Palms	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	1994	720
Total			9,160

Family Housing Construction: No requirement related to base closure actions.

Family Housing Operations: The housing inventory at Long Beach totals 2,139 units. Approximately 50% of the inventory will be excessed. One-time operations and maintenance costs associated with the closure of NAVSTA Long Beach are a result of an increase in change of occupancy.

Environmental:

Studies: An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be necessary to document impacts resulting from Navy disposal of facilities and land at NAVSTA. While the local community will play a major role in assisting the Navy in developing reuse alternatives, there is some potential that the Port of Los Angeles/Long Beach will "acquire" some NAVSTA assets for use as port facilities. Issues to be addressed in the EIS would include in-water construction for piers, bulkheads and wharfs, dredging and dredge material disposal, and changes in land use, ship and vehicular traffic, and air and water emissions associated with port construction and operations. The disposal EIS will begin March 1995 and be completed October 1996.

Relocation of ships to NAVSTA San Diego will require an Environmental Assessment (EA) to study needed dredging. EPA and COE have been working with Navy to resolve long standing dredge material disposal problems; nonetheless, material to be dredged must be characterized in accordance with COE & EPA protocols. This funding also provides for National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 compliance actions to accommodate historic resources.

Compliance: Hazardous waste disposal will be required, and underground storage tanks will be sampled and either closed, removed, or monitored. An asbestos inventory will be conducted and all asbestos that is hazardous to human health will be abated.

Installation Restoration: Costs are for continuation of the Installation Restoration (IR) Program. There are seven sites contaminated with hazardous or toxic substances. All seven sites are located on the main Naval Station and the Mole Pier area. Six sites are starting the Remedial Investigations/Feasibility Studies (RI/FS) stage. One site is scheduled for an extended SI in FY 1993. The purpose of the extended SI is to obtain enough data to determine if we can recommend no further action at that site. Site investigation data indicates an RI/FS may not be necessary.

Operations and Maintenance: Costs associated with civilian permanent change-of-station/reduction-in-force, planning and design costs to transfer facilities to the shipyard, housing security and mobilization/moving costs.

Other: None required.

Revenue from Land Sales: The Navy will screen excess property with other federal, state and local agencies, and the public according to the normal federal disposal process. This may result in transfer to another federal agency, a homeless provider, sale to a state or local government either at fair market value or discounted under a variety of statutory programs. If the property survives the screening process, it will ultimately be disposed of by public sale.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: Savings associated with cancelling NAVSTA projects for Pier E, utilities improvements, in FY 1992 and a hazardous and flammable storehouse in FY 1996.

Family Housing Construction: While shown as savings in FY 1992, construction savings are actually linked to the cancellation of the FY 1989 MILCON project for 300 enlisted units at \$26,110K (project H-054), and cancellation of the FY 1991 MILCON project for 300 enlisted units at \$25,018K (project H-082). Congress redirected these savings to fund FY 1992 family housing construction projects at PWC San Diego and PWC San Francisco.

Family Housing Operations: Operation of the 254 unit Savannah housing project and the 28 unit NAVHOSP site will cease after FY 1994. Likewise, the operation of the 684 unit Cabrillo housing project, and the 140 unit Taper

Avenue housing project will cease after FY 1995. Anticipated O&M savings need to be revised in the base closure budget to reflect recurring operations and maintenance costs needed to support the inactive housing units once they are placed in caretaker status. Periodic facility and grounds maintenance, and security coverage all contribute to the recurring costs associated with closure of these housing areas; costs which were not addressed in the FY 1993 base closure budget. The exception is the NAVHOSP housing site which reverts back to the city in accordance with the 21 December 1967, Deed of Grant between the City of Long beach and the federal government.

Operations & Maintenance: Savings are associated with the consolidated infrastructure, phase-out of some tenants and reductions in remaining tenants. Departing activities include Chief of Naval Education and Training (CNET) Navy Campus, Naval Sea Support Center, Oceanographer Weather Detachment, NTISA, Naval Youth Programs, and various fleet support offices. Various tenant organizations/units under claimancy of Army, NAVFAC, NAVSUP, DLA, MSC, COMNAVCOMTELCOM and COMNAVRESFOR are unaffected by closure of the NAVSTA.

Military Personnel: Savings will result from the NAVSTA closure and the reduction/disestablishment of tenant organizations including COMNAVSURFGRU, COOPMINEUNIT 3, SIMA, SURFPAC MTT, MOTU, CAAC, and PSD.2.

1. COMPONENT NAVY		FY 19 ⁹⁴ MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION /UIC: N00245 NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA				4. PROJECT TITLE DREDGING		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0204796N		6. CATEGORY CODE 165.10		7. PROJECT NUMBER P-332S		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 1,540
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST
DREDGING				CY	240,000	5.00
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.				-	-	180
MOBILIZATION/DEMOBILITIZATION.				LS	-	(180)
SUBTOTAL				-	-	1,380
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).				-	-	70
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.				-	-	1,450
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .				-	-	90
TOTAL REQUEST.				-	-	1,540
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .				-	-	(NON-ADD) (0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Dredging to a depth of -37 feet mean-lower-low-water (MLLW) with 2 foot overdredge; remove dredging materials.						
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>240,000</u> CY ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> CY SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> CY						
<u>PROJECT:</u> Provides for dredging the approach to Pier 2 outside the main channel. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Because of the President's recommendation to close the Naval Station Long Beach and move ships to San Diego, this station will see an increase of homeported deep draft power intensive (DDPI) ships from 14 to 20. While Pier 2 has sufficient depth pier-side to support DDPI ships, the approach channel to the pier requires dredging. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> This station does not have sufficient berths to homeport the DDPI ships being relocated here as a result of the closure of Long Beach. Presently, only Piers 2, 7, 8 and 13 are configured to support DDPI ships. Piers 1, 4, 5, and 6 have inadequate power to support them. Piers 10, 11, 12, and the Mole are inadequate to support combatant; however, they continue to be used for amphibious class ships. The fact that the majority of DDPI ships cannot be nested exacerbates the lack of berthing space.						

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 19<u>94</u> MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE DREDGING	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-332S	
11. REQUIREMENT: (CONTINUED) <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Naval Station San Diego will not be able to support the President's recommendation of closing Naval Station Long Beach due to the lack of berthing piers required to accommodate the additional ships to be relocated here from Long Beach.		
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. <u>03-92</u> (B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993 <u>35</u> (C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE <u>01-93</u> (D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE <u>10-93</u> (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES___NO <u>X</u> (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) (A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS (<u>92</u>) (B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS (<u>98</u>) (C) TOTAL <u>190</u> (D) CONTRACT (<u>170</u>) (E) IN-HOUSE (<u>20</u>) (4) CONSTRUCTION START. <u>12-93</u> (MONTH AND YEAR) B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE		

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: NO0245 NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA			4. PROJECT TITLE DREDGING	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0204796N	6. CATEGORY CODE 165.10	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-338S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 3,900	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
DREDGING	CY	350,000	10.00	3,500
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	3,500
CONTINGENCY (5.0%)	-	-	-	180
TOTAL CONTRACT COST	-	-	-	3,680
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%)	-	-	-	220
TOTAL REQUEST	-	-	-	3,900
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Dredging pier berths and approach to a depth of -37 feet mean lower low water (MLLW) with a two-foot overdredge allowance.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>350,000</u> CY ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> CY SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> CY				
<u>PROJECT:</u> Provides dredging of Pier 3 and its approach to the outside main channel. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Because of the President's recommendation to close the Naval Station Long Beach and move ships to San Diego, this station will see an increase of homeported deep draft power intensive (DDPI) ships of from 14 to 20. While Pier 3 has sufficient utilities and is configured to support DDPI ships, the pier and its approach require dredging. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> This station does not have sufficient berths to homeport the DDPI ships being relocated here as a result of the closure of Long Beach. Presently, only Piers 2, 7, 8, and 13 are configured to support DDPI ships. Piers 1, 4, 5, and 6 have inadequate power to support them. Piers 10, 11, 12, and the Mole are inadequate to support combatants; however, they continue to be used for amphibious class ships. The fact that the majority of DDPI ships cannot be nested exacerbates the lack of berthing space. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without this project, this station will not be able to support the President's recommendation for closing Long Beach because of the lack of berthing piers.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE										
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N00245 NAVAL STATION, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA												
4. PROJECT TITLE DREDGING		5. PROJECT NUMBER P-338S										
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.")												
(1) STATUS: <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">03-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">01-93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10-93</td> </tr> </table>			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	03-92	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	35	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-93	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	10-93		
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	03-92											
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	35											
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-93											
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	10-93											
(2) BASIS: <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">YES ___ NO <u>X</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">_____</td> </tr> </table>			(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ___ NO <u>X</u>	(E) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____						
(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ___ NO <u>X</u>											
(E) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____											
(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(234)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(122)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) TOTAL.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">356</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) CONTRACT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(316)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(40)</td> </tr> </table>			(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(234)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(122)	(C) TOTAL.	356	(D) CONTRACT	(316)	(E) IN-HOUSE	(40)
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(234)											
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(122)											
(C) TOTAL.	356											
(D) CONTRACT	(316)											
(E) IN-HOUSE	(40)											
(4) CONSTRUCTION START. 12-93 (MONTH AND YEAR)												
B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE												

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N68311 NAVAL STATION, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA			4. PROJECT TITLE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES ALTERATIONS	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT O204796N	6. CATEGORY CODE 610.10	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-227S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 3,000	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES ALTERATIONS	SF	57,600	24.00	1,380
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	1,320
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT.	LS	-	-	(310)
DEMOLITION	LS	-	-	(1,010)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	2,700
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	140
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	2,840
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	160
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	3,000
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Alters and reconfigures interiors of four buildings, metal frame walls, dry walls, drop ceilings, and demolition of 14 wood-frame, nine steel and two concrete buildings.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>57,600</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SF SUBSTANDARD: (<u>57,600</u>) SF				
<u>PROJECT:</u> Provides alterations to existing offices to consolidate administrative functions from multiple facilities into three buildings. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate facilities to consolidate and relocate administrative functions into three centrally-located facilities to enable more efficient space utilization and reduce maintenance and operating costs. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Because of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, this station will close, and there will be a significant drop in personnel loading on-base resulting in many buildings being underutilized. However, numerous functions including the Personnel Support Detachment, Family Services, Household Effects, Family Housing Maintenance, Security, Navy Relief, Red Cross, Legal Services, Credit Union, Morale Welfare and Recreation, and storage supporting these functions will remain at current or reduced levels after closure. These functions are currently located in twenty-two, fifty-year old facilities dispersed throughout the station. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without this project, consolidation and relocation of administrative functions cannot be achieved. Continued use of existing facilities will result in high facilities maintenance and operating costs.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N68311 NAVAL STATION, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES ALTERATIONS	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-227S																							
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr><td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED</td><td style="text-align: right;"><u>09-92</u></td></tr> <tr><td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993</td><td style="text-align: right;"><u>35</u></td></tr> <tr><td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td><td style="text-align: right;"><u>01-93</u></td></tr> <tr><td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td><td style="text-align: right;"><u>01-94</u></td></tr> </table> (2) BASIS: <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr><td>(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:</td><td style="text-align: right;">YES ___ NO <u>X</u></td></tr> <tr><td>(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:</td><td style="text-align: right;">_____</td></tr> </table> (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr><td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td><td style="text-align: right;">(<u>174</u>)</td></tr> <tr><td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td><td style="text-align: right;">(<u>105</u>)</td></tr> <tr><td>(C) TOTAL</td><td style="text-align: right;"><u>279</u></td></tr> <tr><td>(D) CONTRACT</td><td style="text-align: right;">(<u>239</u>)</td></tr> <tr><td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td><td style="text-align: right;">(<u>40</u>)</td></tr> </table> (4) CONSTRUCTION START. <u>03-94</u> (MONTH AND YEAR)			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	<u>09-92</u>	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993	<u>35</u>	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	<u>01-93</u>	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	<u>01-94</u>	(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ___ NO <u>X</u>	(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____	(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(<u>174</u>)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(<u>105</u>)	(C) TOTAL	<u>279</u>	(D) CONTRACT	(<u>239</u>)	(E) IN-HOUSE	(<u>40</u>)
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	<u>09-92</u>																							
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993	<u>35</u>																							
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	<u>01-93</u>																							
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	<u>01-94</u>																							
(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ___ NO <u>X</u>																							
(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____																							
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(<u>174</u>)																							
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(<u>105</u>)																							
(C) TOTAL	<u>279</u>																							
(D) CONTRACT	(<u>239</u>)																							
(E) IN-HOUSE	(<u>40</u>)																							
B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE																								

1. COMPONENT NAVY		FY 19 ⁹⁴ MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION /UIC: N35949 NAVAL HOSPITAL, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA				4. PROJECT TITLE BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0807796N		6. CATEGORY CODE 721.11	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-998S		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 720	
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)	
BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS		SF	5,340	100.00	530	
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.		-	-	-	120	
UTILITIES.		LS	-	-	(50)	
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT.		LS	-	-	(70)	
SUBTOTAL		-	-	-	650	
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).		-	-	-	30	
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.		-	-	-	680	
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .		-	-	-	40	
TOTAL REQUEST.		-	-	-	720	
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .		-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)	
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Single-story concrete and masonry building, concrete foundation, built-up roofing, air conditioning, fire protection system, utilities; twelve two-person rooms, lounge, laundry room, storage; parking. Grade mix: 23 E1-E6. Total: 23.						
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>23</u> PN ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> PN SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> PN						
<u>PROJECT:</u> Provides a bachelor enlisted quarters. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate housing for enlisted personnel assigned to the Naval Hospital. Because of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Naval Hospital, Long Beach, California, will close, and Marines and their families are to be relocated to Twentynine Palms. Additional housing will be required to handle the increased staff at the Naval Hospital. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> A deficit of adequate bachelor housing units exists for enlisted personnel assigned to the Naval Hospital. An increase in personnel cannot be accommodated, and the remoteness of this activity, severely, limits the availability of affordable, suitable housing in the private community.						

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 19<u>94</u> MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAVAL HOSPITAL, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-998S	
11. REQUIREMENT: (CONTINUED) <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Inadequate housing will impose a hardship on Naval Hospital staff, leading to decreased morale with an adverse impact on readiness and mission accomplishment.		
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. <u>09-92</u> (B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993 <u>35</u> (C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE <u>01-93</u> (D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE <u>07-93</u> (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES___NO <u>X</u> (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) (A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS (<u>0</u>) (B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS (<u>0</u>) (C) TOTAL <u>0</u> (D) CONTRACT (<u>0</u>) (E) IN-HOUSE (<u>0</u>) (4) CONSTRUCTION START. <u>11-93</u> (MONTH AND YEAR) B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE		

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NAF MIDWAY ISLAND

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	900	0	0	0	0	900
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
and Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	0	900	0	0	0	0	900

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	-1000	-3800	-3584	-3363	-3055	-3038	-17840
Military Personnel	0	-15	-102	-210	-310	-399	-1036
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-1]	[-4]	[-6]	[-8]	[-9]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-1000	-3815	-3686	-3573	-3365	-3437	-18876

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: (Funded by other Appropriations)							
	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	400	0	0	0	0	0	400
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	400	0	0	0	0	0	400
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:							
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	0
Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	-600	-2900	-3584	-3363	-3055	-3038	-16540
Military Personnel	0	-15	-102	-210	-310	-399	-1036
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-1]	[-4]	[-6]	[-8]	[-9]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	-600	-2915	-3686	-3573	-3365	-3437	-17576

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL AIR FACILITY, MIDWAY ISLAND

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

Rampdown of operations was completed in FY 1992. The contractor force was reduced from 250 personnel to approximately 160 to maintain the capability to surge to support intermittent special operations. Because of the remoteness of NAF Midway Island, a residual infrastructure is required to support remaining personnel. Support personnel must provide electrical power, water, sewage treatment, galley operations, telephones and VHF radio watch, aircraft refueling (island support aircraft), and air conditioning/maintenance repair. Additionally, five enlisted military personnel will be retained for administration of the Base Operating Support (BOS) contract. The existing BOS contract has been readvertised and reawarded after being significantly downsized in scope from \$7.2M to \$4.2M starting in FY 1993. All facilities operations and maintenance beyond that essential to support the caretaker posture and intermittent "Pony Express" have been eliminated.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: None required.

Family Housing Construction: None required.

Family Housing Operations: None required.

Environmental:

No environmental clean-up and compliance costs are identified because this is a realignment and costs will be part of the normal operating budget.

Operations & Maintenance: The \$900K for FY 1993 was required to complete projects for placing the facility in caretaker status.

Other: None required.

Revenues from Land Sales: No land will be sold as part of this realignment.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: None identified.

Family Housing Construction: None identified.

Family Housing Operations: None identified.

Operations & Maintenance: Annual reduction of operations and maintenance and BOS contract costs.

Military Personnel: Savings are based on the elimination of two officers and five enlisted billets.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS (FUNDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS): FY 1992
realignment costs funded from NAS Barbers Point O&MN accounts.

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NAS MOFFETT FIELD CA

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	29200	32800	0	0	0	62000
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	34370	0	0	0	34370
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[7855]	[6475]	[17928]	[7109]	[4736]	[2496]	[46599]
Studies	825	970	140	0	0	0	1935
Compliance	1530	3488	10000	0	0	0	15018
Restoration	5500	2017	7798	7109	4736	2496	29646
Operation & Maintenance	0	18375	16047	0	0	0	34422
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	5873	0	0	0	5873
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	150	-7000	0	0	-6850
TOTAL COSTS	7855	54050	107168	109	4736	2496	176414

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	-1000	0	0	0	0	0	-1000
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	1445	2699	2370	6514
Operations & Maintenance	-2300	-6379	-16463	-25251	-25256	-25262	-100911
Military Personnel	0	-1627	-5179	-8947	-12697	-16416	-44866
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-93]	[-137]	[-319]	[-323]	[-329]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-96]	[-198]	[-294]	[-381]	[-462]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-3300	-8006	-21642	-32753	-35254	-39308	-140263

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: (Funded by other Appropriations)	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
 NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:							
Military Construction	-1000	29200	32800	0	0	0	61000
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	34370	0	0	0	34370
Operations	0	0	0	1445	2699	2370	6514
Environmental	[7855]	[6475]	[17928]	[7109]	[4736]	[2496]	[46599]
Studies	825	970	140	0	0	0	1935
Compliance	1530	3488	10000	0	0	0	15018
Restoration	5500	2017	7788	7109	4736	2496	29646
Operation & Maintenance	-2300	11996	-416	-25251	-25256	-25262	-66489
Military Personnel	0	-1627	694	-8947	-12697	-16416	-38993
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	150	-7000	0	0	-6850
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-93]	[-137]	[-319]	[-323]	[-329]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-96]	[-198]	[-294]	[-381]	[-462]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	4555	46044	85526	-32644	-30518	-36812	36151

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL AIR STATION, MOFFETT FIELD, CALIFORNIA

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

The activities located at Naval Air Station (NAS), Moffett Field, support maritime patrol and anti-submarine warfare (ASW) operations and training for the U. S. Pacific Fleet. NAS Moffett Field also provides support for reserve maritime patrol squadrons, NASA-Ames Research Center, Onizura AFB, and other miscellaneous activities. Outlying field, NALF Crows Landing will cease operations by 1 July 1993. Closure of NAS and transfer of base facilities to NASA-Ames or the Air Force is planned for FY 1994. The following actions are planned:

a. The mission of the NAS will be eliminated, resulting in disestablishment or relocation of Navy tenant activities which support the current mission of the air station.

b. One active duty maritime patrol (MPA) squadron was decommissioned in FY 1992. The remaining active duty MPA squadrons and the fleet replacement squadron (FRS) will be relocated. Principal receiving bases for MPAs squadrons are NAS Barbers Point, NAS Brunswick, and NAS Jacksonville. FRS squadron will be consolidated at NAS Jacksonville.

c. The reserve maritime patrol squadron, air reserve center, reserve wing, and Navy Plant Representative Office (NAVPRO) will be transferred to NAS Alameda.

d. Tenant activities will either disestablish, relocate, or be consolidated with existing activities at NAS Barbers Point, NAS Jacksonville, or NAS Brunswick in support of relocated operational units.

e. Air Force Space Command intends to take over operation of all family housing units.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: The following projects are required to construct the facilities listed below for proper implementation of the recommendations of the Commission:

<u>Location/Project Title</u>		<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount \$ 000</u>
Barbers Point	Const WINGSPAC Bldg	1993	3,600
Jacksonville	Trainer Facility	1993	4,000
	Bachelor Officer Quarters	1993	8,600
	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	1993	13,000
	Total		29,200

<u>Location/Project Title</u>		<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount \$ 000 .</u>
Barbers Point	Aviation Training Facility	1994	5,500
Jacksonville	Applied Instruction Building	1994	4,000
	Parking Apron	1994	3,600
	Maintenance Hangar/ Applied Instruction Facility	1994	15,600
Alameda	Hangar Modifications	1994	<u>4,100</u>
Total			32,800

Family Housing Construction: The following projects are required to provide housing for junior enlisted (E1-E6) families migrating to locations experiencing a net gain in baseloading.

<u>Location</u>	<u>Number of Units</u>	<u>Composition</u>	<u>Fiscal Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount (\$000)</u>
San Francisco (Alameda)	71	53 JEM2, 13 JEM3, 5 JEM4	1994	8,670
Barbers Point	154	114 JEM2, 30 JEM3, 10 JEM4	1994	<u>25,700</u>
Total				34,370

Family Housing Operations: No requirement.

Environmental:

Studies: Environmental studies for NEPA compliance are required at the closure site and all receiving sites. Planning for the Moffett Field disposal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has begun. A tentative agreement has been reached for NASA/USAF to acquire the facility. Therefore, NEPA effort required for disposal has been substantially reduced.

Relocation of assets to NAS Barbers Point and NAS Jacksonville require Environmental Assessments (EAs) to study effects of required MILCON, changes in land use, and Air Installation Compatible Use Zones (AICUZ). It is anticipated that the squadron relocation to Brunswick may be categorically excluded. This funding also provides for National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 compliance actions to accommodate historic resources.

Compliance: NAS Moffett Field has hazardous waste accumulation sites which will be closed in accordance with applicable regulations. All asbestos that is hazardous to human health will be abated, and underground storage tanks will be sampled and either closed, removed, or monitored.

Installation Restoration (IR): Costs for continuation of the IR Program at this National Priority List site. An additional \$6.2M will be required to complete restoration in out years. The site has been divided into six operable units (OU). The Record of Decision for the OU's is scheduled for completion on 15 August 1996. The Remedial Investigations (RI) for OU 2 and 4 are being completed and preparation of the Feasibility Studies (FS) have begun. Removal actions to address leaking tanks and sumps began in 1990. Evaluation and closure of abandoned wells, that were potential conduits for subsurface cross-contamination, were completed in early 1992. Construction of a pump-and-treat system, and a concrete treatment pad were completed in 1992. A contract for bioremediation of soil from Site 12 was awarded in 1992 with remediation scheduled for completion in 1993.

Operations & Maintenance:

CIVPERS: Costs include permanent change of station (PCS) required to move 94 civilian personnel relocating from NAS Moffett Field and tenant activities to receiving sites, and reduction-in-force of the remaining 105 personnel.

Administrative & Planning: Costs associated with planning requirements at NAS Moffett Field and receiving sites. Included are construction planning costs based on revised construction costs at NAS Jacksonville and NAS Barbers Point.

Special Projects: Includes projects required to place any Moffett Field facilities (NAS/tenant) not required by NASA/USAF into a "secure" condition, and for special projects at receiving sites to improve quality of life facilities which become inadequate as a result of increased base loading.

Freight: Includes freight costs for relocating activities, including reserves to NAS Alameda. Also, two FRS trainer disassembly/reassembly costs associated with consolidation at NAS Jacksonville.

Military Personnel-PCS: PCS required to move military personnel relocating from NAS Moffett Field as a result of closure. Includes PCS required to move personnel from decommissioning/disestablishing activities.

Other: Includes cost to terminate the Consolidated Area Telephone Service (CATS) long-term contract (\$5300K) at NAS Moffett Field and costs of collateral equipment procurement/installation (\$4120K in FY 1994 and \$905K in FY 1995) at NAS Jacksonville.

Revenue from Land sales: As recommended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission, the Navy may transfer the property to other federal agencies.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: Cost associated with an FY 1990 project for construction of a child development center at NAS Moffett Field.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations & Maintenance: The current plan is to transfer all 806 housing units to USAF in FY 1995.

Operations and Maintenance: Includes programmed decreases from previous O&M funding levels for FY 1992 through FY 1994 because of reduced operations at NAS Moffett Field during the closure.

Other (VHA): FRS consolidation and relocation of one VP squadron to NAS Jacksonville and one VP squadron to NAS Brunswick (low-cost areas) from NAS Moffett Field (high-cost area) will result in variable housing allowance savings.

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: NOO334 NAVAL AIR STATION, BARBERS POINT, HAWAII			4. PROJECT TITLE AVIATION TRAINING FACILITY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0204696N	6. CATEGORY CODE 171.20	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-261S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 5,500	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
AVIATION TRAINING FACILITY	SF	28,250	122.00	3,450
SUPPORTING FACILITIES	-	-	-	1,460
ELECTRICAL UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(860)
MECHANICAL UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(150)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT	LS	-	-	(450)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	4,910
CONTINGENCY (5.0%)	-	-	-	250
TOTAL CONTRACT COST	-	-	-	5,160
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.5%)	-	-	-	340
TOTAL REQUEST	-	-	-	5,500
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION One-story concrete masonry building, concrete foundation, reinforced concrete floor slab, built-up roof on concrete roof deck, raised computer flooring, distribution transformers, air conditioning, fire protection system, provisions for intrusion detection system, and utilities.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>28,250 SF</u> ADEQUATE: <u>0 SF</u> SUBSTANDARD: <u>0 SF</u> PROJECT: Provides an aviation training facility. REQUIREMENT: Adequate and properly-configured facilities to provide academic classroom and laboratory-type technical training for the Naval Air Maintenance Training Group Detachment (NAMTRAGRUDET), and the Fleet Aviation Specialized Operational Training Group Pacific (FASOTRAGRUPAC). NAMTRAGRUDET and FASOTRAGRUPAC provide formal aviation maintenance training and a centralized resource within PACFLT Maritime Patrol Aviation to train pilots, Naval Flight Officers, aircrew and maintenance personnel to maintain and operate the P-3 aircraft so that PACFLT patrol squadrons may achieve the highest possible degree of combat readiness. Because of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California, will close and NAMTRAGRUDET and FASOTRAGRUPAC are to be relocated to this station, which will be established as the Pacific Fleet Master Anti-Submarine Warfare Base. CURRENT SITUATION: NAMTRAGRUDET and FASOTRAGRUPAC are currently home based at Moffett Field, which is the only base in the Pacific providing formal aviation maintenance training to support PACFLT patrol squadrons. Upon closure of Moffett Field, aviation maintenance training units consisting of NAMTRAGRUDET and FASOTRAGRUPAC will relocate from Moffett Field to this station. No facilities exist to accommodate the relocation of these units.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: NO0207 NAVAL AIR STATION, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT O204696N	6. CATEGORY CODE 171.20	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-207S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 4,000	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING	SF	34,090	-	3,060
BUILDING	SF	34,090	80.00	(2,730)
BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT	LS	-	-	(260)
TECHNICAL OPERATING MANUALS.	LS	-	-	(70)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	530
ELECTRICAL UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(160)
MECHANICAL UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(100)
UTILITIES, PAVING, AND SITE IMPROVEMENT. . .	LS	-	-	(270)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	3,590
CONTINGENCY (5.0%)	-	-	-	180
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	3,770
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	230
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	4,000
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Single-story, high-bay, steel-frame and concrete masonry building; concrete foundation and floors, built-up roof, fire protection system, grounding, 400 hz power supply, cranes and 40-foot high training device area; lightning protection, air conditioning, and utilities.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>34,090 SF</u> ADEQUATE: <u>0 SF</u> SUBSTANDARD: <u>0 SF</u> <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides an applied instruction building. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate and properly-configured facilities to house lecture rooms and classrooms, instructor pilot offices, ready rooms, flight planning rooms, briefing rooms, administrative, and other support areas to support an additional 690 aviation maintenance students being transferred to this station. As a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California will close and the VP-31 flight training mission will move to this station. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> There are no facilities available to accommodate the training requirements of the VP-31 being transferred Jacksonville. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Students will be assigned to temporary and overcrowded facilities, reducing training effectiveness, to the detriment of fleet readiness. The base closure and realignment action to close Moffett Field cannot be properly implemented because of a lack of adequate facilities to accommodate the relocation of the VP-31 training mission.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

F418P (08/00/01)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: NO0207 NAVAL AIR STATION, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA		
4. PROJECT TITLE APPLIED INSTRUCTION BUILDING		5. PROJECT NUMBER P-207S
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. 05-92 (B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993. 35 (C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE 11-92 (D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE 07-93 (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES__NO <u>X</u> (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) (A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS (120) (B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS (90) (C) TOTAL 210 (D) CONTRACT (195) (E) IN-HOUSE (15) (4) CONSTRUCTION START. 12-93 (MONTH AND YEAR)		
B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE		

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N00207 NAVAL AIR STATION, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA			4. PROJECT TITLE PARKING APRON	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0204696N	6. CATEGORY CODE 113.20	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-209S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 3,600	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
PARKING APRON.	SY	52,000	41.00	2,130
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	1,110
ELECTRICAL UTILITIES.	LS	-	-	(240)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT.	LS	-	-	(780)
DEMOLITION.	LS	-	-	(90)
SUBTOTAL.	-	-	-	3,240
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	160
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	3,400
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	200
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	3,600
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Reinforced concrete parking apron, grounding points, striping, railroad, fencing, underground telephone ductbank, demolition of one building and relocation of one magazine.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>52,000</u> SY ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SY SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> SY <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides an aircraft parking apron for additional P-3 aircraft. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Additional parking ramp space adjacent to an existing hangar is needed for nine additional aircraft. As a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California will close and the VP-31 ASW pilot training and patrol P-3 aircraft will move to this station. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> There is insufficient parking apron space in the VP maintenance and parking area to handle the 24 additional VP-31 aircraft. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Unsafe aircraft taxiing and parking conditions will result from the 24 additional aircraft, and the base closure and realignment action to close Moffett Field cannot be properly implemented.				
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. <u>04-92</u> (B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992. <u>35</u> (C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE <u>08-92</u> (CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)				

P. 1187/10/NOV/91

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N00207 NAVAL AIR STATION, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA																				
4. PROJECT TITLE MAINTENANCE HANGAR AND APPLIED INSTRUCTION FACILITY		5. PROJECT NUMBER P-210S																		
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:																				
A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED</td> <td style="text-align: right;">04-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992</td> <td style="text-align: right;">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">08-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12-93</td> </tr> </table> (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES ___ NO <u>X</u> (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(208)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(202)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">410</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) CONTRACT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(380)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(30)</td> </tr> </table> (4) CONSTRUCTION START. 02-94 (MONTH AND YEAR) B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	04-92	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992	35	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	08-92	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	12-93	(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(208)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(202)	(C) TOTAL	410	(D) CONTRACT	(380)	(E) IN-HOUSE	(30)
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	04-92																			
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992	35																			
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	08-92																			
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	12-93																			
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(208)																			
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(202)																			
(C) TOTAL	410																			
(D) CONTRACT	(380)																			
(E) IN-HOUSE	(30)																			

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N00236 NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA			4. PROJECT TITLE HANGAR MODIFICATIONS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT O204696N	6. CATEGORY CODE 211.06	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-320S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 4,100		
9. COST ESTIMATES					
ITEM		U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
HANGAR MODIFICATIONS		SF	29,800	123.00	3,670
SUBTOTAL		-	-	-	3,670
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).		-	-	-	180
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.		-	-	-	3,850
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .		-	-	-	250
TOTAL REQUEST.		-	-	-	4,100
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .		-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Rehabilitate hangars to include new carpet, light fixtures, drop ceilings, dry wall repairs, heating systems; convert existing hangar space to include prefabricated metal siding, steel frame, concrete floors, seismic provisions, utilities, and provisions for intrusion detection system.					
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>29,800</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SF SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrades two hangars to accommodate two P-3 flight simulators, administrative, and maintenance space. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate and properly-configured facilities to accommodate the Reserve Patrol Wing Pacific, and VP-91 relocating to this station as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to close the Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Existing facilities are in substandard condition and were not originally designed to accommodate P-3 aircraft. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> This station will not be able to support the closure of Moffett Field because of a lack of adequate facilities to support the units being relocated here.					

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	94 FY 19__ MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA		2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PUBLIC WORKS CENTER SAN FRANCISCO, CA		4. PROJECT TITLE FAMILY HOUSING	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT	6. CATEGORY CODE 711	7. PROJECT NUMBER H-206	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) \$ 8,670

9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
FAMILY HOUSING:	FA	71	81,873	5,813
Buildings	SF	72,450	64.50	(4,673)
Fire Sprinkler System	FA	380,000	3.00	(1,140)
SUPPORTING COST:				1,976
PAVING & SITE IMPROVEMENTS				(934)
UTILITIES				(701)
LANDSCAPING				(187)
RECREATION				(70)
SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION FEATURES				(84)
SUBTOTAL				7,789
CONTINGENCY (5%)				389
TOTAL CONTRACT COST				8,178
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%)				491
TOTAL REQUEST				8,669
TOTAL REQUEST (ROUNDED)				8,670

10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION						
Two story family housing units; wood frame or masonry with stucco or pre-finished siding, covered parking, patios, exterior storage, privacy fencing and recreational facilities. Special construction features include seismic bracing.						
Grade	Bedroom	Net Area	Project Factor	Unit Cost	No. Units	(\$000) Total
JEM	2	950	1.2648	\$51.00	54	3,309
JEM	3	1200	1.2648	\$51.00	12	929
JEM	4	1350	1.2648	\$51.00	5	435
					71	4,673

11. REQUIREMENT:

Project: Construct 71 adequate family housing units for enlisted personnel.

Requirement: Adequate housing is needed for married personnel at this location where there is a critical shortage of affordable, suitable housing.

Current Situation: This project is required to support base closure requirements. Families looking for housing in the private community face housing problems almost unparalleled in the Navy. Housing costs are among the highest in the nation with two-bedroom units in the City of San Francisco

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA		2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION PUBLIC WORKS CENTER SAN FRANCISCO, CA			
4. PROJECT TITLE FAMILY HOUSING		5. PROJECT NUMBER H-206	
PUBLIC WORKS CENTER SAN FRANCISCO, CA (Continued) <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> (Continued) renting for an average of \$800 per month plus utilities and for-sale units selling for \$175,000 and up. Military families must compete for scarce affordable assets with a large low-income population in a market largely driven by new construction for middle and high-income professionals, singles, and childless working couples. Housing allowances fall far short of standard rents throughout the Central Bay area. The waiting list for Government quarters consists of approximately 1,400 families who must wait up to two years for Navy family housing. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Military members will be forced to choose between involuntary separation from their families or accepting housing that is unaffordable or unsuitable. Either choice will likely lead to poor morale and dissatisfaction with the Navy. Retention will be adversely impacted. Project design conforms to Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide".			

1. COMPONENT NAVY		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA		2. DATE Jun 92	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAS Barbers Point, HI			4. PROJECT TITLE Family Housing		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT		6. CATEGORY CODE 711	7. PROJECT NUMBER H-208		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 25,700

8. COST ESTIMATES

ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
Family Housing:	FA	154	92,282	14,211
Buildings	SF	157,800	82.6172	(13,037)
Fire Sprinkler System	SF	157,800	3.00	(473)
Solar System	FA	154		(701)
Supporting Costs:				8,795
Paving & Site Improvements				(3,350)
Utilities				(4,425)
Landscaping				(654)
Recreation				(235)
Special Construction Features				(131)
Sub Total				23,006
Contingency (5%)				1,150
Total Contract Cost				24,157
Supervision, Inspection, & Overhead (6.5%)				1,570
Total Request				25,727
Total Request (Rounded)				25,700

10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION

Two story family housing units; wood frame or masonry with stucco or prefinished siding, covered parking, patios, exterior storage, privacy fencing, and recreational facilities.

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Bedroom</u>	<u>Net Area</u>	<u>Project Factor</u>	<u>Unit Cost</u>	<u>No. Units</u>	<u>(\$000) Total</u>
JEM	2	950	1.5300	\$54.00	114	8,948
JEM	3	1200	1.5300	\$54.00	30	2,974
JEM	4	1350	1.5300	\$54.00	10	1,115
					154	13,037

11. Requirement:

Project: Construction of 154 adequate family housing units for junior enlisted personnel. Current mission to include base realignment and closure (BRC) migrations for one P-3 squadron from Moffett Field.

Requirement: This project is required to provide additional family housing to support BRC requirements. Housing shortages exist primarily in the enlisted and non-commissioned officer personnel categories. This deficit is due to the service member's inability to acquire/rent adequate housing and DoD's revised policy to provide family housing for enlisted (E1-E3) service members.

1. COMPONENT NAVY	94 FY 19__ MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAS BARBERS POINT, OAHU, HI		
4. PROJECT TITLE FAMILY HOUSING		5. PROJECT NUMBER
<u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Development of affordable private sector housing is extremely restricted due to limited availability of land. Military families assigned to the area are required to commute thru heavy traffic corridors from metropolitan area around Honolulu. Although distance traveled is relatively short (10-20 miles), one hour and a half to two hours travel time is normally required due to the volume of traffic. The shortage of adequate civilian sector housing is projected by the State of Hawaii to exceed 40,000 units within the next five years. The rental vacancy rate is among the lowest in the nation at 1.2 percent while the national rate is at 5 percent. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> If the project is not provided, junior enlisted families will continue to be either involuntarily separated or forced to reside in inadequate housing off-base because of exorbitant rents and competition with civilians for limited housing. Degrading the quality of life for military families will adversely affect job proficiency and retention. This project is essential to alleviate housing deficits and to ease the hardship on military families. Project design conforms to Part II of Military Handbook 1190, "Facility Planning and Design Guide". Necessary coordination with local school districts will be pursued.		

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NS PHILADELPHIA PA

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	22200	0	0	0	22200
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	451	587	1514	1280	3832
Environmental	[457]	[12079]	[309]	[211]	[1440]	[0]	[14496]
Studies	190	616	309	211	0	0	1326
Compliance	267	5263	0	0	1000	0	6530
Restoration	0	6200	0	0	440	0	6640
Operation & Maintenance	0	1058	4225	11191	988	726	18188
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	143	53	106	0	302
Other	0	0	0	8701	0	0	8701
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	690	310	290	-19720	-18430
TOTAL COSTS	457	13137	28018	21053	4338	-17714	49289

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	-3807	-1842	-1182	-6831
Operations & Maintenance	-1989	-1755	-11411	-15547	-18807	-22019	-71528
Military Personnel	0	-1496	-4432	-7453	-14104	-21387	-48872
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-13]	[-31]	[-79]	[-132]	[-234]	[-247]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-78]	[-153]	[-227]	[-591]	[-667]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-1989	-3251	-15843	-26807	-34753	-44588	-127231

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

(Funded by other Appropriations)

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	326	0	0	0	0	0	326
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	326	0	0	0	0	0	326

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	0	0	22200	0	0	0	22200
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	451	-3220	-328	98	-2999
Environmental	[457]	[12079]	[309]	[211]	[1440]	[0]	[14496]
Studies	190	616	309	211	0	0	1326
Compliance	267	5263	0	0	1000	0	6530
Restoration	0	6200	0	0	440	0	6640
Operation & Maintenance	-1663	-697	-7186	-4356	-17819	-21293	-53014
Military Personnel	0	-1496	-4289	-7400	-13998	-21387	-48570
Other	0	0	0	8701	0	0	8701
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	690	310	290	-19720	-18430
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-13]	[-31]	[-79]	[-132]	[-234]	[-247]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-78]	[-153]	[-227]	[-591]	[-667]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	-1206	9886	12175	-5754	-30415	-62302	-77616

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL STATION, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

The activities located at Naval Station (NAVSTA) Philadelphia support ship repair personnel employed at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, ship crews, and Navy and Marine reserve activity personnel. In addition, the NAVSTA is host for several regional support commands and other miscellaneous activities.

NAVSTA Philadelphia: All homeported ships are to depart by the end of FY 1993. Naval Station reductions will be phased so that needed support is available during the USS Kennedy overhaul, with the station being disestablished by the end of FY 1996.

Naval Sea Logistics Center Detachment: Will relocate to SPCC Mechanicsburg.

Naval Aviation Engineering Service Unit: Will relocate.

Navy Damage Control Training Center: Will relocate to Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, IL, requiring military construction (MILCON) for new facilities.

Naval Regional Contracting Center: Will relocate to ASO Philadelphia, requiring military construction for renovation of existing facilities.

Naval Reserve Activities: Will relocate to Fort Dix, except for the Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity which will be disestablished.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: Construction of the following project is required:

<u>Location/Project Title</u>	<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount \$ 000</u>
Great Lakes Operational Trainer Facility	1994	<u>22,200</u>
	Total	22,200

Family Housing Construction: No requirement.

Family Housing Operations: Supports the draw-down of the family housing inventory to support the overhaul of the USS Kennedy and the subsequent caretaker costs.

Environmental:

Studies: An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be required to relocate personnel to Aviation Support Office (ASO) Philadelphia; the primary issue to be studied is traffic and parking. An EA will be required to move the damage control school to NTC Great Lakes; issues that would be addressed include increased water and air emissions and increased utility demands. While no MILCON is associated with moving reserve frigates to NAVSTA Staten Island, an EA is required to study the change in NAVSTA mission from active to reserve status. While NAVSTA Staten Island was the subject of extensive environmental documentation, much of the traffic mitigation promised (generally the City's share) has not been implemented. Impacts to be studied would primarily involve changes in traffic (weekend traffic is contentious on Staten Island). This funding also provides for National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 compliance actions to accommodate historic resources.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be necessary to document impacts resulting from Navy disposal of facilities and land at NAVSTA. Impacts to be addressed would include air and water quality (reuse to an industrial park may result in increased air and water emissions), reuse of buildings that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and changes in land use (especially if the subsequent use is radically different than the current use of NAVSTA). Given the interest by the residents of Philadelphia to reuse the NAVSTA, it seems likely that the community will be instrumental in developing alternatives for reuse; however, these alternatives are currently unknown. The disposal EIS would begin March 1995 and be complete September 1996.

Compliance: Abatement of asbestos that is hazardous to human health is required at Naval Station Philadelphia, as well as closure, removal, or monitoring of underground storage tanks. PCB contaminated equipment will be removed in accordance with applicable regulations.

Installation Restoration (IR): The Philadelphia Naval Base Complex is not on the National Priority List (NPL). Twelve sites are being addressed under the IR Program, of which nine are on land owned by COMNAVBASE. Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Studies will be completed by FY 1993. Records of Decision will be completed by FY 1994 and final cleanup by FY 1995.

Operations & Maintenance: One-time operation and maintenance implementation costs are included for personnel relocation, new hire, equipment relocation and procurement to provide for relocation of Navy Legal Support Office, Naval Industrial Resources Support Activity (NAVIRSA), Naval Regional Contracting Center, Naval Reserve Functions, Navy Damage Control Training Center, COMNAVBASE Philadelphia, and NAVSEALOGCEN.

Other: Equipment procurement costs are those required to outfit the Applied Instruction Facility MILCON project that will support training in hull maintenance and repair at Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois.

Revenue from Land Sales: Navy will screen the property with other federal, state, and local agencies and the public according to the normal federal disposal process. This may result in transfer to another federal agency, a homeless provider, sale to a state or local government either at fair market value or discounted under a variety of statutory programs. If the property survives the screening process, then the property will ultimately be disposed of by public sale. The \$20M included as proceeds for land sales will only be realized if property is transferred or sold at fair market value.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: None.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: The family housing inventory at NAVSTA Philadelphia totals 965 units. Operation of these units will cease after FY-1994.

Operations & Maintenance: Operation and maintenance cost savings result from elimination of billets, and associated non-labor other base operations support (OBOS). Operation and maintenance costs include day-to-day operating cost increases resulting from relocation of the Naval Regional Contracting Center, reserve functions, and the Navy Damage Control Training Center, and also lease costs for CCPO and NAVIRSA.

Military Personnel: Savings are due to elimination of military billets.

Other: None.

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: NO0210 NAVAL TRAINING CENTER, GREAT LAKES, ILLINOIS			4. PROJECT TITLE OPERATIONAL TRAINER FACILITY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0805796N	6. CATEGORY CODE 171.35	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-557S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 22,200	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
OPERATIONAL TRAINER FACILITY	SF	79,220	-	16,020
FIRE FIGHTER TRAINER FACILITIES.	SF	21,780	269.00	(5,860)
BUILDING ALTERATIONS	SF	57,440	54.00	(3,100)
ADVANCED DAMAGE CONTROL TRAINER FACILITY . .	LS	-	-	(4,660)
BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT	LS	-	-	(2,070)
TECHNICAL OPERATING MANUALS.	LS	-	-	(330)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	3,920
UTILITIES.	LS	-	-	(2,110)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT.	LS	-	-	(1,450)
DEMOLITION	LS	-	-	(360)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	19,940
CONTINGENCY (5.0%)	-	-	-	1,000
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	20,940
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	1,260
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	22,200
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Three multi-story steel-framed concrete reinforced buildings, reinforced concrete foundations and floors; renovations to an existing building to accommodate classrooms and training labs; ventilation systems, fire protection systems, computer flooring, air conditioning, and utilities; pollution abatement system, fuel, water, and waste water storage tanks; compressed air systems; cranes; and demolition of one building.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>79,220</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SF SUBSTANDARD: (<u>57,440</u>) SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides hull technician "A" school, surface vessel fire fighter and damage control training facilities. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate facilities to accommodate the relocation of Hull Maintenance Technician "A" and Damage Controlman "A" schools from the Naval Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to this center as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> There are no facilities available at this center to accommodate the schools being relocated. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Facilities will not be available on the east coast to provide hull technician "A" school and fire fighter and damage control training. The closure of Philadelphia could not be properly implemented.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: NOO210 NAVAL TRAINING CENTER, GREAT LAKES, ILLINOIS																				
4. PROJECT TITLE OPERATIONAL TRAINER FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-557S																			
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:																				
A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">04-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">09-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10-93</td> </tr> </table> (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES ___ NO <u>X</u> (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1,300)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(190)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1,490</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) CONTRACT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(1,400)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(90)</td> </tr> </table> (4) CONSTRUCTION START. 01-94 (MONTH AND YEAR) B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	04-92	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	35	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	09-92	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	10-93	(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(1,300)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(190)	(C) TOTAL	1,490	(D) CONTRACT	(1,400)	(E) IN-HOUSE	(90)
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	04-92																			
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	35																			
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	09-92																			
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	10-93																			
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(1,300)																			
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(190)																			
(C) TOTAL	1,490																			
(D) CONTRACT	(1,400)																			
(E) IN-HOUSE	(90)																			

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NSY PHILADELPHIA PA

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	11800	0	0	0	11800
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[3332]	[6534]	[12837]	[5017]	[15945]	[0]	[43665]
Studies	0	485	1050	5	0	0	1540
Compliance	192	333	2468	135	11130	0	14258
Restoration	3140	5716	9319	4877	4815	0	27867
Operation & Maintenance	200	2691	28951	23698	41728	0	97268
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	8	0	0	0	8
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
and Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	3532	9225	53596	28715	57673	0	152741

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	-7000	0	0	0	0	0	-7000
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	0	0	-2366	-61739	-84635	-87847	-236587
Military Personnel	0	0	0	-184	-381	-395	-960
Other	0	0	0	-6570	-2620	-2981	-12171
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[-17]	[-37]	[-86]	[-86]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[-7]	[-7]	[-7]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-7000	0	-2366	-68493	-87636	-91223	-256718

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: (Funded by other Appropriations)							
	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:							
Military Construction	-7000	0	11800	0	0	0	4800
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[3332]	[6534]	[12837]	[5017]	[15945]	[0]	[146632]
Studies	0	485	1050	5	0	0	1540
Compliance	192	333	2468	135	11130	0	14258
Restoration	3140	5716	9319	4877	4815	0	27867
Operation & Maintenance	200	2691	26585	-38041	-42907	-87847	-139319
Military Personnel	0	0	8	-184	-381	-395	-952
Other	0	0	0	-6570	-2620	-2981	-12171
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[-17]	[-37]	[-86]	[-86]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[-7]	[-7]	[-7]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	-3468	9225	51230	-39778	-29963	-91223	-103977

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL SHIPYARD, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

Close and preserve Naval Shipyard (NSY), Philadelphia for emergent requirements. Closure to be completed by the end of FY 1996. The propeller facility, the Naval Inactive Ships Maintenance Facility, and the Naval Ship Systems Engineering Station will remain in active status. Several drydocks and portal cranes will be maintained in a certified condition. Pier 6 and several production facilities will be preserved and maintained in a ready for emergent use condition. The power and steam plant will remain operational, as will the fire protection water mains.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: Reconfiguration of the shipyard's utility systems will be required to accomplish this partial shutdown of facilities.

<u>Location/Project Title</u>	<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount (\$000)</u>
NSY Philadelphia, PA Utility Reconfigurations	1994	11,800
	Total	11,800

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Environmental:

Studies: Included in NS Philadelphia.

Compliance: NSY Philadelphia operates a conforming storage facility under interim status, which will be closed according to environmental regulations. In addition, the underground storage tanks at the NSY will be sampled for leakage and either closed, removed, or monitored. Asbestos will be inventoried, the asbestos that is hazardous to human health will be abated, and PCB equipment will be removed in accordance with applicable regulations.

Installation Restoration (IR): The Philadelphia Naval Base Complex is not on the National Priority List. Twelve sites are being addressed under the IR Program, of which nine are on land owned by COMNAVBASE. Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Studies will be completed by FY 1993. Records of Decision will be completed by FY 1994 and final cleanup by FY 1995.

Operations & Maintenance: Funds included for permanent change of station, reduction-in-force, lump-sum payment of leave, and unemployment costs. Also includes costs for the inactivation and preservation of facilities, for cleaning, decontamination, and preservation of shop equipment, and for the collection, inventorying and distribution of hand tools.

Other: None.

Revenue from Land sales: None.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: A hazardous and flammable material storehouse project was authorized and appropriated in FY 1990, but not yet constructed. The difference between the appropriated amount and the cost of a portion of the storehouse needed for the activities to remain is reflected as savings.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Operations & Maintenance: Savings include reduced fixed overhead costs associated with maintaining one less naval shipyard and higher utilization of the remaining seven yards. In addition, savings are included for reduced workload requirements at the Naval Publications and Printing Service Branch Office and at the Naval Supply Center, Norfolk Detachment at Philadelphia, both of which serve the shipyard.

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: NO0151 NAVAL SHIPYARD, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA			4. PROJECT TITLE UTILITY RECONFIGURATIONS	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0702228N	6. CATEGORY CODE 932.20	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-591S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 11,800	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
UTILITY RECONFIGURATIONS	LS	-	-	10,600
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	10,600
CONTINGENCY (5.0%)	-	-	-	530
TOTAL CONTRACT COST	-	-	-	11,130
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%)	-	-	-	670
TOTAL REQUEST	-	-	-	11,800
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Modifications to existing utility systems to include downsizing transformers, installation of new feeders, low voltage systems, and power for fire alarm systems and security lighting; construction of sewage pumping station; installation of storm sewer lines, manholes, and pumping station; potable water system piping modifications and backflow prevention; installation of backup fire pump; capping of steam lines and associated asbestos insulation removal.				
11. REQUIREMENT: AS REQUIRED <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides a major reconfiguration and capping-off of the shipyard's utility systems. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> As a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, this activity is to be closed. Closure and preservation of the shipyard is required while continuing the active status of the propeller facility, the Naval Inactive Ships Maintenance Facility, and the Naval Ship Systems Engineering Station now served by the shipyard utility systems. This requires the electrical, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, potable water, fire protection, and steam distribution systems to be separated into two components; one supporting the retained property and one supporting the excess property. The sanitary sewer and storm sewer systems remaining to serve the active Naval facilities must be severed from the excess property in order to limit the Navy's environmental liability. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> All of the Naval activities are served by continuous utility distribution systems. Modifications must be made to the existing sanitary and storm sewer systems to prevent the Navy from being liable for improper discharges by future owners of the excess property.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N00151 NAVAL SHIPYARD, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE UTILITY RECONFIGURATIONS		5. PROJECT NUMBER P-591S
11. REQUIREMENT: (CONTINUED) IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The shipyard will not be able to support the closure action while retaining the active status of certain activities. Also, the Navy could remain liable for environmental damage done by future owners and would be put in the position of providing them with utility services.		
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. 03-93 (B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993. 0 (C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE 08-93 (D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE 01-94 (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES NO <u>X</u> (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) (A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS (600) (B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS (360) (C) TOTAL. 960 (D) CONTRACT (850) (E) IN-HOUSE (110) (4) CONSTRUCTION START. 04-94 (MONTH AND YEAR) B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE		

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NS PUGET SOUND WA

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	10600	19910	0	0	0	30510
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[810]	[1600]	[7130]	[2000]	[0]	[0]	[11540]
Studies	560	0	500	0	0	0	1060
Compliance	0	1000	2730	2000	0	0	5730
Restoration	250	600	3900	0	0	0	4750
Operation & Maintenance	0	800	4372	2283	2250	0	9705
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	301	56	0	0	357
Other	0	0	1900	300	0	0	2200
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	60	100	0	-13600	-13440
TOTAL COSTS	810	13000	33673	4739	2250	-13600	40872

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	-27	-27	-54
Operations & Maintenance	0	-1500	-6419	-6637	-7122	-7346	-29024
Military Personnel	-1173	-3803	-6393	-9067	-10670	-11018	-42124
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[-52]	[-52]	[-52]	[-52]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[-70]	[-142]	[-209]	[-275]	[-273]	[-272]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-1173	-5303	-12812	-15704	-17819	-18391	-71202

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

(Funded by other Appropriations)

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	200	0	0	0	0	0	200
Military Personnel - PCS	30	0	0	0	0	0	30
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	230	0	0	0	0	0	230

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	0	10600	19910	0	0	0	30510
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	-27	-27	-54
Environmental	[810]	[1600]	[7130]	[2000]	[0]	[0]	
Studies	560	0	500	0	0	0	1060
Compliance	0	1000	2730	2000	0	0	5730
Restoration	250	600	3900	0	0	0	4750
Operation & Maintenance	200	-700	-2047	-4354	-4872	-7346	-19119
Military Personnel	-1143	-3803	-6092	-9011	-10670	-11018	-41737
Other	0	0	1900	300	0	0	2200
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	60	100	0	-13600	-13440
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[-52]	[-52]	[-52]	[-52]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[-70]	[-142]	[-209]	[-275]	[-273]	[-272]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	-133	7697	20861	-10965	-15569	-31991	-30100

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL STATION, PUGET SOUND (SAND POINT), WASHINGTON

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

Total closure of Naval Station (NS) Puget Sound (Sand Point) involves migration of tenants and closure of facilities still present after realignment of NS Puget Sound in accordance with the 1988 Base Realignment and Closure Act. The receiving sites for tenants migrating from NS Puget Sound are NS Puget Sound (Everett); Fort Lewis, Washington; Naval Shipyard Bremerton, Washington; Madigan Army Medical Center; McChord AFB; and Naval Submarine Base Bangor, Washington. Most tenants are to be relocated in FY 1994. Complete deactivation of Sand Point is targeted for the end of FY 1995.

The Base Closure and Realignment Commission report recommended study of the brig relocation and the construction of a new brig to satisfy the Navy's requirement. This project has been added to our military construction list, with the new brig to be built at Bangor. Planned construction of the correctional facility in downtown Bremerton, at the NSY, met with community and political resistance. Also brig construction would have negatively impacted on plans to provide critically needed parking spaces for personnel. The transient personnel facilities have been collocated with the brig at no additional cost.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: The facilities listed below must be constructed to implement the recommendations of the commission.

<u>Location/Project Title</u>		<u>Year of</u>	<u>Amount</u>
		<u>- ' -</u>	<u>(\$000)</u>
Everett	Land Acquisition	1993	500
Fort Lewis	Readiness Support Site	1993	3,400
Fort Lewis	Reserve Training Center	1993	<u>6,700</u>
		Total	10,600
Bangor	Administrative Office Bldg	1994	3,200
Everett	Automotive Vehicle Maintenance Shop	1994	1,110
Everett	Reserve Readiness Command Fac	1994	4,400
Bangor	Brig	1994	6,000
Bangor	Transient Personnel Facs	1994	<u>5,200</u>
		Total	19,910

Family Housing Construction: No requirement.

Family Housing Operations: No requirement.

Environmental:

Studies: An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be necessary to document impacts resulting from Navy disposal of facilities at Sand Point. The community is interested in a diverse range of reuse options. Impacts to be studied include changes in land use, air and water emissions, and traffic.

An Environmental Assessment (EA) is required to construct and operate the new Seabee Reserve Center at Fort Lewis, which includes a training area for tactical construction equipment. The EA will address impacts to non-point water pollution, endangered species, wetlands, and air and water emissions. EAs will also be required to relocate assets to NS Everett and, potentially, PSNSY Bremerton. Issues being addressed include changes in land use, changes in traffic, and changes in air and water emissions. This funding also provides for National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Section 106, compliance actions to accommodate historic resources.

Compliance: Hazardous waste disposal is required, and underground storage tanks are being sampled and either closed, removed, or monitored. An asbestos study is being conducted, and all asbestos that is hazardous to human health will be abated.

Installation Restoration (IR): Costs are for continuation of the IR Program at Sand Point. The IR Program at NS Puget Sound is in the beginning stages. The contract for the site inspection (SI) was awarded in July of 1992. Although no sampling or analysis has been conducted to date, there are six possible sites of contamination. Suspected contaminants include chlorinated solvents, pesticides/herbicides, volatile organic chemicals, and PCBs. The SI is due to be completed in April of 1993 and more information will be available at that time.

Operations & Maintenance: Reflects civilian personnel permanent change of station, rehabilitation of receiving facilities, conversion of Sand Point to caretaker status, freight charges for moving material and equipment, and planning/engineering associated with closure.

Other: Costs for collateral equipment associated with the transportation maintenance shop and other equipment which must be replaced because of the closure action.

Revenue from Land sales: Navy is screening the NS property with other federal, state, and local agencies and the public according to the normal federal disposal process. This may result in transfer to another federal agency or homeless provider, or sale to a state or local government, whether at fair market value or discounted under a variety of statutory programs. If the property survives the screening process, it will ultimately be disposed of by public sale. The \$13,600K included as proceeds for land sales will only be realized if property is transferred or sold at fair market value.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: None identified.

Family Housing Construction: None identified.

Family Housing Operations: Savings are associated with excessing the five on-base units beginning in FY 1995.

Operations and Maintenance: Complete closure eliminates the requirement for facilities and grounds maintenance; custodial, refuse and pest control; and special projects at Sand Point.

Military Personnel: Savings include reductions to Naval Station Personnel Support Detachment, COMNAVBASE staff, and Defense Commissary Agency.

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N68436 NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, BANGOR, WASHINGTON			4. PROJECT TITLE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE BUILDING	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0101896N	6. CATEGORY CODE 610.10	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-3005	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 3,200	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE BUILDING	SF	23,000	105.00	2,420
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	460
UTILITIES, PAVING, AND SITE IMPROVEMENT. . .	LS	-	-	(460)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	2,880
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	140
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	3,020
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	180
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	3,200
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Two-story textured reinforced concrete building, reinforced slab on grade, sloped standing seam roof, soundproofing in practice rooms and rehearsal hall, fire protection system, loading dock, utilities, and parking.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>23,000</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SF SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> SF PROJECT: Provides an administrative office building to accommodate the Commander, Naval Base Seattle (COMNAVBASE) and the Navy Band. REQUIREMENT: COMNAVBASE Seattle, his staff, and the Navy Band are to be relocated to this activity because of the President's recommendation to close the Naval Station, Sand Point, Washington. CURRENT SITUATION: This activity does not have the administrative space required to accommodate the COMNAVBASE Seattle staff. It also lacks the space to house individual soundproof practice rooms and a rehearsal hall needed by the Navy Band. No existing facilities can house these functions. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: This activity will not be able to support the President's recommendation for closing Sand Point because of a lack of adequate administrative space to house the commands being relocated here.				
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. <u>06-92</u> (CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)				

1391 (10-76)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N00255EV NAVAL STATION, EVERETT, WASHINGTON			4. PROJECT TITLE AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT O204796N	6. CATEGORY CODE 214.20	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-211S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 1,110	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP.	LS	-	-	850
MAINTENANCE SHOP	SF	7,470	86.00	(640)
PARKING.	SY	4,800	19.00	(90)
BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT	LS	-	-	(120)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	150
UTILITIES.	LS	-	-	(70)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT.	LS	-	-	(80)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	1,000
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	50
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	1,050
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%)	-	-	-	60
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	1,110
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION One-story steel-framed structure, reinforced concrete foundation, precast concrete walls, concrete floor slab, steel-framed roof, standing seam aluminum roof, design to Zone 3 seismic forces, fire protection system, heat ventilation system, communication lines, parking, and utilities.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>AS REQUIRED</u> <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides an automotive vehicle maintenance shop. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate and properly-configured facilities for the maintenance of fleet and station vehicles required to support the homeporting of a Nimitz-class carrier battle group at this station, and to support the closure of the Naval Station, Puget Sound (Sand Point) as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> No facilities exist at this station to accommodate these functions. It was originally intended to use existing transportation, maintenance, and motorpool facilities at Sand Point to support the homeported carrier battlegroup; however, the closure of Sand Point precludes this. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without this project, there will be no facilities to accomplish repair and maintenance on more than 300 vehicles supporting the Everett mission. (CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)				

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE										
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: NOO255EV NAVAL STATION, EVERETT, WASHINGTON												
4. PROJECT TITLE AUTOMOTIVE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP		5. PROJECT NUMBER P-211S										
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.")												
(1) STATUS: <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">10-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">01-93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">09-93</td> </tr> </table>			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	10-92	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	35	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-93	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	09-93		
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	10-92											
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	35											
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-93											
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	09-93											
(2) BASIS: <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">YES ___ NO <u>X</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ___ NO <u>X</u>	(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____							
(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ___ NO <u>X</u>											
(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____												
(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(66)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(44)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">110</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) CONTRACT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(85)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(25)</td> </tr> </table>			(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(66)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(44)	(C) TOTAL	110	(D) CONTRACT	(85)	(E) IN-HOUSE	(25)
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(66)											
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(44)											
(C) TOTAL	110											
(D) CONTRACT	(85)											
(E) IN-HOUSE	(25)											
(4) CONSTRUCTION START. 04-94 (MONTH AND YEAR)												
B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE												

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N62144 NAVAL RESERVE CENTER, EVERETT, WASHINGTON			4. PROJECT TITLE RESERVE READINESS COMMAND FACILITY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0505096N	6. CATEGORY CODE 171.15	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-0115	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 4,400	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
RESERVE READINESS COMMAND FACILITY	SF	35,460	87.00	3,090
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	860
SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION FEATURES.	LS	-	-	(230)
ELECTRICAL UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(130)
MECHANICAL UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(200)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT.	LS	-	-	(300)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	3,950
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	200
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	4,150
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	250
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	4,400
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Two-story steel-frame building with exposed aggregate concrete tilt-up walls, fluted metal deck roof with polyurethane foam covering and operable metal frame double-glazed windows, lighting, fire protection system, heating, ventilation, air conditioning, parking, security lighting, and utilities.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>35,460</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SF SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Constructs a Reserve Readiness Command Facility in support of recruiting, training, and administration. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate and properly-configured facilities to support recruiting, training, and administration for Commander, Naval Reserve Readiness Command Region Twenty-Two, Mobile Inshore Undersea Warfare Unit 101, Mobile Dive and Salvage Unit, Naval Construction Battalion 10 Detachment and Headquarters Fleet Hospital Unit 2 being relocated to this center as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to close the Naval Station, Puget Sound (Sand Point), Washington. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> There are no facilities available which can accommodate the reserve units forced to relocate as a result of the President's base closure recommendation. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Reserve components will not have a much needed facility to relocate in the Puget Sound area, and the base closure and realignment action cannot be properly implemented. (CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)				

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N68436 NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, BANGOR, WASHINGTON			4. PROJECT TITLE BRIG	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT O101228N	6. CATEGORY CODE 730.15	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-315S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 6,000	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
BRIG	SF	32,500	-	3,860
BUILDING	SF	32,500	103.00	(3,350)
RECYCLING CENTER REPLACEMENT	LS	-	-	(350)
BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT	LS	-	-	(160)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES	-	-	-	1,530
UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(80)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT	LS	-	-	(1,160)
DEMOLITION	LS	-	-	(290)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	5,390
CONTINGENCY (5.0%)	-	-	-	270
TOTAL CONTRACT COST	-	-	-	5,660
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%)	-	-	-	340
TOTAL REQUEST	-	-	-	6,000
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Three-story reinforced concrete structure, pile foundation, masonry walls, fire protection system, ventilation and air conditioning, elevator, emergency power generator, parking, sidewalks, fenced recreation and evacuation areas, demolition of two buildings and recycling center, and replacement of recycling center.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>32,500 SF</u> ADEQUATE: <u>0 SF</u> SUBSTANDARD: <u>0 SF</u> PROJECT: Provides a 60-person brig. REQUIREMENT: Adequate and properly-configured facility to support the Navy's mission in the region and to replace a facility to be closed at the Naval Station, Puget Sound (Sand Point), Washington, as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. CURRENT SITUATION: This activity has been designated as host for the brig for this area as a result of the President's base closure decision. There are no facilities available to support this function. IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Without this project, there will be no facilities available to house the brig and the base closure action cannot be properly implemented.				
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. <u>04-92</u> (CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)				

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N68436 NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, BANGOR, WASHINGTON			4. PROJECT TITLE TRANSIENT PERSONNEL FACILITIES	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0101228N	6. CATEGORY CODE 721.40	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-104S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 5,200	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
TRANSIENT PERSONNEL FACILITIES	SF	27,000	-	2,900
BUILDING	SF	27,000	103.00	(2,780)
BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT	LS	-	-	(120)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	1,770
SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION FEATURES.	LS	-	-	(180)
UNDERGROUND PARKING.	LS	-	-	(830)
UTILITIES.	LS	-	-	(410)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT.	LS	-	-	(350)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	4,670
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	230
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	4,900
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	300
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	5,200
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Three-story reinforced concrete frame building, pile foundation, elevators, ventilation, fire protection system, emergency power generator; includes BEQ spaces (open-bay and individual rooms) for E1-E9 personnel, administrative spaces, laundry, courtroom, temporary holding cells, seabag/personal effects storage, medical evaluation room, barber shop, underground parking, and utilities.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u> </u> O PN ADEQUATE: <u> </u> O PN SUBSTANDARD: <u> </u> O PN <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides quarters and essential transient personnel facilities. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate facilities to house transient personnel, as well as personnel in a disciplinary status and those awaiting administrative discharge. Facility will replace existing 160-person facility being closed at the Naval Station, Puget Sound (Sand Point), Washington, as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> There are no existing facilities available to accommodate the additional transient personnel. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> No facilities will be available to house the transient personnel and the base closure and realignment action to close Sand Point cannot be properly implemented. (CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)				

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NS TREASURE ISLAND (HUNTERS PT ANNEX)

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[7128]	[26800]	[27690]	[9040]	[16300]	[0]	[87228]
Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compliance	1543	4800	5050	4400	4100	0	19893
Restoration	5585	22000	22640	4640	12200	0	67065
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	3500	500	500	0	4500
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
and Sales Revenue (-)	20	0	60	50	50	0	180
TOTAL COSTS	7148	26800	31250	9590	16850	0	91638

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	-701	-719	-730	-1740	-1744	-1764	-7398
Military Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-701	-719	-730	-1740	-1744	-1764	-7398

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: (Funded by other Appropriations)							
	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:							
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[7128]	[26800]	[27690]	[9040]	[16300]	[0]	0
Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compliance	1543	4800	5050	4400	4100	0	19893
Restoration	5585	22000	22640	4640	12200	0	67065
Operation & Maintenance	-701	-719	2770	-1240	-1244	-1764	-2898
Military Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	20	0	60	50	50	0	180
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	6447	26081	30520	7850	15106	-1764	84240

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL STATION TREASURE ISLAND, HUNTERS POINT ANNEX, CALIFORNIA

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

A significant factor in planning the closure of Hunters Point Annex (HPA) is Section 2824 of Public Law 101-50, as amended by the FY 1992 Defense Authorization Act, which directs the Navy to lease, by 30 May 1993, not less than 260 acres of land at HPA to the City of San Francisco for a period of not less than 30 years. Lease would be subject to continued occupancy of space by the Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair and the Planning, Estimating, Repair and Alterations Detachment. Lease negotiations are ongoing. However, because of the following issues, the likelihood that this deadline can be met is problematic:

- National Priority List (NPL) clean-up operations at the site which limit interim land uses.
- The economic viability of interim use of HPA by the city.
- The Navy's retrocession of legislative jurisdiction to the State of California.
- Agreement on fair market rental value.
- Clean-up of non-NPL items (asbestos, PCB, etc).

The current provisions in the concept of the lease would have the Navy and the city signing a master agreement by 30 May 1993 to meet the deadline. The city would not actually assume control of any of HPA, however, until parcels are cleaned and cleared by regulatory agencies. The first of five proposed parcels will be ready for turnover to the city no sooner than FY 1994. At that time, the city would also assume the management, but not lease, of the remaining parcels until they are also cleaned. Compensation to the city for this management would be revenues from the civilian tenants. This approach attempts to address the city's concerns over toxic tort liability and their budgetary constraints. Several obstacles remain, including gaining the acceptance of the parcelization approach to cleanup and how interim use will be addressed by regulatory agencies. A considerable risk remains for the city in the lease of HPA, and it appears that quickly executing the lease by the May 1993 deadline may not be in the city's interest.

Based on the above situation and future reductions in NAVSTA Treasure Island's base operating support budgets, contingencies have been included in this exhibit to accommodate the possibility that the city will not assume management of HPA. Regardless of the outcome of the lease, the environmental cleanup of both NPL and non-NPL items must be completed for closure of HPA.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: None required.

Family Housing Construction and Operations: None required.

Environmental:

Studies: Additionally, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis will be required to address reuse and changes in land use as a result of outleasing HPA.

Compliance: Closure of HPA will necessitate proper abatement and disposal of hazardous wastes and substances not addressed by the Installation Restoration Program.

Installation Restoration (IR): This is a NPL site. At Hunters Point Annex, there are currently 20 sites in the RI/FS phase and 38 sites in the SI phase. Interim remedial actions will be implemented for the sites that are most contaminated. The Federal Facilities Agreement schedule will be re-negotiated to reflect geographic parcelization for expedited cleanup, transfer, and reuse.

Operations & Maintenance: Operations and maintenance costs are dependent on the lease agreement with the city. If the lease is executed by May of 1993, all indications are that the city would assume jurisdiction of HPA in FY 1994. At that time, a reduction-in-force will be required to delete the civilian fire fighting specialists positions located at HPA.

Military Personnel - PCS: Not required.

Other: None required.

Homeowners Assistance Program: Not required.

Revenues from Land Sales: None identified.

Savings: None identified.

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: MCAS TUSTIN CA

ONE-TIME
IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	227620	43000	0	0	270620
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[10547]	[51743]	[49800]	[33680]	[30700]	[0]	[176470]
Studies	0	1500	1100	500	0	0	3100
Compliance	0	6700	19400	23700	25350	0	75150
Restoration	10547	43543	29300	9480	5350	0	98220
Operation & Maintenance	0	1634	404	8136	6204	0	16378
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	7358	0	7358
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
and Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	40	30	-671970	0	-671900
TOTAL COSTS	10547	53377	277864	84846	-627708	0	-201074

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	-2350	0	0	0	0	0	-2350
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	0	500	500	500	-220	-330	950
Military Personnel	0	0	0	-1349	-6410	-6607	-14366
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-2350	500	500	-849	-6630	-6937	-15766

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

(Funded by other Appropriations)

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	3096	0	0	0	0	0	3096
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	3096	0	0	0	0	0	3096

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	-2350	0	227620	43000	0	0	268270
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[10547]	[51743]	[49800]	[33680]	[30700]	[0]	[270790]
Studies	0	1500	1100	500	0	0	3100
Compliance	0	6700	19400	23700	25350	0	75150
Restoration	10547	43543	29300	9480	5350	0	98220
Operation & Maintenance	3096	2134	904	8636	5984	-330	20424
Military Personnel	0	0	0	-1349	948	-6607	-7008
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	40	30	-671970	0	-671900
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	11293	53877	278364	83997	-634338	-6937	-213744

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, TUSTIN, CALIFORNIA

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

It is recommended to realign the Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS), Tustin, California by:

- (1) Closure and sale of the operations portion of the installation.
- (2) Reassignment of family housing and related personnel support areas to MCAS El Toro, for continued support of Marines and other military personnel in the region.
- (3) Reassignment of Helicopter Outlying Landing Field (HOLF) Mile Square (off-site location) to MCAS El Toro.
- (4) Transfer of the Armed Forces Reserve Center to Army.
- (5) Constructing a new air station at Twentynine Palms.
- (6) Construction of required facilities at MCAS Camp Pendleton to support compositing Marine Aircraft Group (MAG) 39.
- (7) Compositing of MAG's 16 and 39.
- (8) Relocation of MAG-16, station headquarters and support staff, and related units to the newly established MCAS Twentynine Palms.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: The following facilities must be constructed to accommodate closure of MCAS Tustin. The total construction cost of \$270.6M is budgeted in FY 1994 and 1995.

<u>Location/Project Title</u>	<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount \$000</u>
Twentynine Palms Operations, Maintenance, and Supply Facilities (Phase I)	1994	47,720
Twentynine Palms Runway, Site Preparation and Infrastructure	1994	165,700
Twentynine Palms Access Road	1994	14,200
	Subtotal	227,620
MCAS Camp Pendleton Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	1995	36,000
MCAS Camp Pendleton Warehouse and Special Storage Facilities	1995	7,000
	Subtotal	43,000
	Total	270,620

Family Housing Construction: Family housing construction maybe necessary for the transfer of 5,017 Marines and their families.

Family Housing Operations: There are no one-time family housing operations costs.

Environmental:

In general, the closure of MCAS Tustin will have a positive impact by expediting environmental restoration and compliance activities, and remove a significant local noise source. At MCAS Camp Pendleton, the limited amount of new construction may have an impact on wetlands and/or habitat of the least bell's vireo, both of which are capable of mitigation. Noise generated by air operations will be comparable to current levels. At Twentynine Palms, there is some potential for impact on the desert tortoise habitat, which would require mitigation. Other potential impacts stem from dust associated with construction, increased water use/treatment, additional hazardous waste treatment/storage and solid waste disposal, and the addition of new air emission sources. None of these potential impacts appear to be significant, within the realm of available mitigation measures. Studies, compliance, and restoration costs to complete closure of MCAS Tustin by 1997 and for construction sites at MCAS Twentynine Palms and MCAS Camp Pendleton total \$270,790K. Total costs at each base are as follows:

	<u>FY 92</u>	<u>FY 93</u>	<u>FY 94</u>	<u>FY 95</u>	<u>FY 96</u>	<u>FY 97</u>
Tustin	2,530	34,200	13,500	30,130	22,700	-0-
Pendleton	-0-	1,800	3,800	3,550	2,400	-0-
29 Palms	8,017	15,743	32,500	-0-	5,600	-0-

A summary of environmental requirements is provided below:

Planning/Compliance: Environmental studies include asbestos/PCB surveys, air emission evaluation, fugitive dust evaluation, solid/hazardous waste evaluation, and stormwater discharge/wastewater management plans. Environmental compliance requirements include Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) closures/corrective actions (active solid waste management units), underground storage tank removal and remediation, PCB and asbestos removal and remediation, Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and RCRA permit application/modification requirements, and wetlands/endangered species habitat mitigation. Planning and Compliance costs are as follows:

	<u>FY 92</u>	<u>FY 93</u>	<u>FY 94</u>	<u>FY 95</u>	<u>FY 96</u>	<u>FY 97</u>
Studies	1,575	1,500	1,100	500	-0-	-0-
Compliance	1,350	6,700	19,400	23,700	25,350	-0-

Installation Restoration (IR): Environmental restoration includes identification, investigation and clean-up of past hazardous waste sites primarily in response to requirements under Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986. Installation and restoration costs are as follows:

	<u>FY 92</u>	<u>FY 93</u>	<u>FY 94</u>	<u>FY 95</u>	<u>FY 96</u>	<u>FY 97</u>
Restoration	7,622	43,543	29,300	9,480	5,350	-0-

Supplemental Funding: Supplemental funding for environmental projects in FY 1992 totals \$10,547K and has been applied to environmental restoration, planning, and compliance.

Operations and Maintenance:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount \$ 000</u>
Move/Relocation/ Civilian Benefits	None	1996	5,884
Mothball	None	1995	2,405
Collateral Equipment	Rifle racks, office furniture compressors, tire changers, test equipment, and booths billeting furnish, etc.	1995	5,371
Implementation Support	Personnel argumentation, planning studies	1993-1997	3,118

Revenues from Land Sales/Real Estate Disposal Costs: Revenues from land sales are expected no earlier than FY 1996.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: FY 1992, Flightline Security, MCAS Tustin.

Family Housing Construction: No savings will be realized.

Family Housing Operations: No savings will be realized. Operations cost will increase because housing at MCAS Tustin will remain in the Marine Corps inventory to be used by MCAS El Toro. New construction at Twentynine Palms will increase the Marine Corps inventory by 465 units and increases recurring operations and maintenance costs.

Operations and Maintenance: Savings represent the Maintenance of Real Property (MRP) and Other Base Operations Support (OBOS) budget for MCAS Tustin. Costs represent the MRP and OBOS budget for the newly constructed MCAS at Twentynine Palms. Also included in FY 1993, 1994, and 1995 are planning and support costs for implementation of base closure.

Military Personnel: Negative savings for military personnel costs of \$14,366K have been absorbed into the Marine Corps budget.

Other: No savings will be realized.

One-time Implementation Costs (funded by other appropriations):

No implementation costs were paid by other appropriations in 1992.

Net Implementation Costs:

Net implementation costs have increased by \$220,364K. Increases primarily include additional operations and maintenance and environmental funding for studies and investigations that will fully define the extent of contamination of both past and active hazardous waste sites at closing and receiving installations. These efforts are critical elements and, as such, directly affect crucial decisions regarding selection of construction sites at MCAGCC/MCAS Twentynine Palms and MCAS Camp Pendleton as well as eventual sale of MCAS Tustin. Increases in construction costs are the result of more detailed planning. The projects proposed to be added will address deficiencies to better meet the total replacement requirements at MCAS Twentynine Palms and MCAS Camp Pendleton. Realignment of construction costs between FY94 and FY95 has been proposed in order to more realistically match execution of construction at MCAS Twentynine Palms and MCAS Camp Pendleton.

3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION /UIC:M07862 MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA		4. PROJECT TITLE OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND SUPPLY FACILITIES (PHASE I)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0206496M	6. CATEGORY CODE 211.06	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-004S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 47,720	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE & SUPPLY FACILITIES. .	LS	-	-	108,730
MAINTENANCE HANGARS.	SF	496,290	145.00	(71,960)
APRON AND COMBAT LOADING PAD	SY	82,920	59.00	(4,890)
ENGINE SHOP AND TEST CELL.	SF	36,360	145.00	(5,270)
MAINTENANCE VAN PADS	SY	22,300	55.00	(1,230)
ATC TOWER, CPS BLDG, TRAINER, ARMORY, ADMIN.	SF	40,830	155.00	(6,330)
AVIATION/GROUND, ORDNANCE, AND POL STORAGE .	LS	-	-	(10,050)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	49,400
UTILITIES, PAVING, AND SITE IMPROVEMENT. .	LS	-	-	(49,400)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	158,130
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	7,910
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	166,040
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) .	-	-	-	9,960
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	176,000
LESS: PHASE II FY 95 FUNDING	-	-	-	- 128,280
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	47,720
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)

10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION

Maintenance Hangars: Type I and II steel-frame hangars, air conditioning, parking aprons, oil-water separators, hot refueling pits, ready fuel storage tanks, separate hazardous/flammable material and waste storage lockers, sun shelters for aircraft parking and apron maintenance areas. Aviation Logistics Squadron Complex: Type II steel-frame logistics hanger, access apron, engine maintenance shop, engine test cells. Special shops including avionics, aviation armament, parachute/survival equipment, hazardous/flammable materials and waste storage; complex for aircraft intermediate maintenance activity and ground support equipment (GSE) shop complex, GSE sheds, seismic measures, security measures for armory vault area, Marine Aviation Logistics Maintenance van pad complex sized for 300 vans, utility buildings.

Airfield Operational Facilities: Seven-story air traffic control tower, elevator, air traffic and range control facilities, flight simulator building for CH-46 and CH-53 trainers, communications and administrative building, combined crash/fire/rescue station, back-up and uninterruptible power for air traffic control, crash crew training facility.

Three and five-ton overhead cranes, aqueous fire fighting foam and pipe fire protection systems, air conditioning, sound attenuation, utility connections, vehicle and aircraft washracks and rinse facility, parking, roads, sidewalks, lighting, flightline security system.

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

DD FORM 1391
DEC 76
1-74 0107-1P-001-3910

PREVIOUS EDITIONS MAY BE USED INTERNALLY
UNTIL EXHAUSTED

PAGE NO.

COPY AVAILABLE TO DTIC DOES NOT PERMIT FULLY LEGIBLE REPRODUCTION

Best Available Copy

MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA

4. PROJECT TITLE

5. PROJECT NUMBER

OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND SUPPLY FACILITIES (PHASE I)

P-0046

6. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION: (CONTINUED)

provisions for intrusion detection systems.

11. REQUIREMENT: AS REQUIRED

PROJECT:

Provide adequate operations, maintenance, and supply facilities for squadrons being relocated from the Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California.

REQUIREMENT:

Adequate operations, maintenance and supply facilities for units being relocated from Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990.

CURRENT SITUATION:

MCAGCC is currently operating only an expeditionary airfield. MCAGCC does not perform organizational maintenance of helicopters or intermediate aircraft maintenance activities, has no existing facilities which could be expanded or renovated to accommodate airfield operational facilities, and does not have supply facilities that can accommodate the large requirements of the new air station.

IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:

Squadrons will not have facilities to perform organizational maintenance of helicopters. Intermediate maintenance activities will be performed outdoors. No operational facilities for flight operations, flight planning, air traffic control, airfield safety, and hands-on simulated flight training will exist. Aviation and operational supplies will be stored outside in open storage yards. Substances requiring a controlled environment will deteriorate and supplies will be subject to pilferage. Without a fire protection system, the inventory runs a high risk of fire damage as well as endangering the safety of personnel.

12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:

A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.")

(1) STATUS:

(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	07-92
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993	35
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-94
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	07-94

(CONTINUED ON DD FORM 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: M67862 MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA		4. PROJECT TITLE RUNWAY, SITE PREPARATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0206496M	6. CATEGORY CODE 111.15	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-999S		
8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 165,700				
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
RUNWAY, SITE PREPARATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE .	LS	-	-	148,880
RUNWAY, TAXIWAY, AND APRON	LS	-	-	(64,690)
GAS LINE	LS	-	-	(1,400)
WATER TREATMENT FACs, WELLS, AND PIPELINES .	LS	-	-	(25,580)
SANITARY SEWER	LS	-	-	(13,890)
WASTEWATER RECLAMATION FACILITY.	LS	-	-	(13,650)
FLOOD CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS	LS	-	-	(3,750)
ACCESS ROAD IMPROVEMENTS	LS	-	-	(10,500)
ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	LS	-	-	(4,580)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	LS	-	-	(10,840)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	148,880
CONTINGENCY (5.0%)	-	-	-	7,440
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	156,320
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	9,380
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	165,700
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Concrete runway, taxiways, aprons, shoulders and overruns; grading, soil stabilization and flood control; airfield lighting; helicopter landing and takeoff pads, hover pads, arm/dearm pads, compass calibration and power check pads, taxiways; aircraft rinse and wash facilities; aircraft direct refueling system with standby facility, truck filling stand, taxiways, spill prevention and control, long-term and ready service fuel storage tanks, associated piping and environmental measures; underground natural gas distribution; water treatment and waste water reclamation systems; sanitary sewer system and treatment plant; industrial waste collection and storage systems; storm drainage systems, communications and electrical distribution systems, utilities, site improvements, including rough and finish grading in support of all new facilities and associated requirements; roads and road improvements, parking, sidewalks; relocation of existing expeditionary airfield and support base.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>AS REQUIRED</u> <u>PROJECT:</u> Constructs a runway, taxiways, aprons, and provides site preparation, mass grading and roads, and utility infrastructure for the new air station at this location. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate runway, taxiways, aprons, site preparation and infrastructure for units being relocated from the Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms operates an expeditionary airfield only. The site has minimal improvements. Major infrastructure, site work, and construction of a concrete runway is necessary before an air station can be constructed and operated.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE																																																			
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: M67862 MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA																																																					
4. PROJECT TITLE RUNWAY, SITE PREPARATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE		5. PROJECT NUMBER P-999S																																																			
11. REQUIREMENT: (CONTINUED) IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: The remaining construction projects cannot be completed in time to meet the mandated deadline for closing Tustin. The new air station will not have the minimal operational facilities to operate safely and efficiently.																																																					
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.")																																																					
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td colspan="3">(1) STATUS:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">07-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">01-93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">10-93</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(2) BASIS:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">YES NO X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">(6,940)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">(2,290)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) TOTAL</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">9,230</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) CONTRACT</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">(8,340)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">(890)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">(4) CONSTRUCTION START.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">02-94</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: right;">(MONTH AND YEAR)</td> </tr> </table>			(1) STATUS:			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED		07-92	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.		35	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE		01-93	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE		10-93	(2) BASIS:			(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:		YES NO X	(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:			(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000)			(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS		(6,940)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS		(2,290)	(C) TOTAL		9,230	(D) CONTRACT		(8,340)	(E) IN-HOUSE		(890)	(4) CONSTRUCTION START.					02-94		(MONTH AND YEAR)	
(1) STATUS:																																																					
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED		07-92																																																			
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.		35																																																			
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE		01-93																																																			
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE		10-93																																																			
(2) BASIS:																																																					
(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:		YES NO X																																																			
(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:																																																					
(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000)																																																					
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS		(6,940)																																																			
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS		(2,290)																																																			
(C) TOTAL		9,230																																																			
(D) CONTRACT		(8,340)																																																			
(E) IN-HOUSE		(890)																																																			
(4) CONSTRUCTION START.																																																					
		02-94																																																			
	(MONTH AND YEAR)																																																				
B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE																																																					

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: M67862 MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA			4. PROJECT TITLE ACCESS ROAD	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT O206496M	6. CATEGORY CODE 851.10	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-521S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 14,200	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ACCESS ROAD	LS	-	-	14,200
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	14,200
CONTINGENCY (0.0%)	-	-	-	0
TOTAL CONTRACT COST	-	-	-	14,200
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (0.0%)	-	-	-	0
TOTAL REQUEST	-	-	-	14,200
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Access road from State Route 62, two lanes each way, shoulders, median, parkway, drainage features, design to Caltrans and FHWA standards for H-20 wheel loads and traffic conditions.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>AS REQUIRED</u> <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides an access road onto the station in addition to the present entrance via Adobe Road at the southernmost boundary of the station. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> An adequate access road from State Route 62 for personnel assigned to the units being relocated from the Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California, as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. The new air station's projected loading for 1997 includes aviation units with organizational personnel allowances of over 5,000 and 180 assigned aircraft. Approximately 3,000 dependents of the military members will reside at Twentynine Palms. The relocation of units from Tustin nearly doubles the base loading of Twentynine Palms. The proposed route will enter the center approximately 3.2 miles west of the Octillo family housing area and will connect with the new air station in the vicinity of Deadman Lake. Funds for this off-base road construction will be transferred to the Federal Highway Administration in accordance with Title 23 USC Section 210. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> No access road currently exists for the new air station. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Lack of an adequate access road will severely limit mission essential vehicular access required for essential logistics support to the relocated aviation units at this remotely-located activity.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE																		
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: M67862 MARINE COF AIR STATION, TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA																				
4. PROJECT TITLE ACCESS ROAD	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-521S																			
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:																				
A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: right;">08-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993</td> <td style="text-align: right;">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">01-93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">02-94</td> </tr> </table> (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES___NO_X (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: right;">(0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) CONTRACT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(0)</td> </tr> </table> (4) CONSTRUCTION START. 06-94 (MONTH AND YEAR) B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	08-92	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993	35	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-93	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	02-94	(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(0)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(0)	(C) TOTAL	0	(D) CONTRACT	(0)	(E) IN-HOUSE	(0)
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	08-92																			
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993	35																			
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-93																			
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	02-94																			
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(0)																			
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(0)																			
(C) TOTAL	0																			
(D) CONTRACT	(0)																			
(E) IN-HOUSE	(0)																			

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NAVAL COMMAND CONTROL AND
OCEAN SURVEILLANCE CENTERS

ONE-TIME
IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	590	17400	0	0	0	17990
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[300]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[300]
Studies	300	0	0	0	0	0	300
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	6150	10843	16020	0	0	33013
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	51	37	0	0	88
Other	0	0	4903	0	0	0	4903
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	300	6740	33197	16057	0	0	56294

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	2539	2503	5585	-4331	5832	6047	18175
Military Personnel	-297	-1062	-1691	-2026	-2098	-2174	-9348
Other	14545	14934	12670	13366	13610	14056	83181
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-244]	[-244]	[-244]	[-244]	[-244]	[-244]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[-12]	[-27]	[-38]	[-38]	[-38]	[-38]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	16787	16375	16564	7009	17344	17929	92008

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

(Funded by other Appropriations)

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	2523	0	0	0	0	0	2523
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	467	0	0	0	0	0	467
TOTAL COSTS	2990	0	0	0	0	0	2990

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	0	590	17400	0	0	0	17990
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[300]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[300]
Studies	300	0	0	0	0	0	300
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	5062	8653	16428	11689	5832	6047	53711
Military Personnel	-297	-1062	-1640	-1989	-2098	-2174	-9260
Other	15012	14934	17573	13366	13610	14056	88551
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-244]	[-244]	[-244]	[-244]	[-244]	[-244]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[-12]	[-27]	[-38]	[-38]	[-38]	[-38]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	20077	23115	49761	23066	17344	17929	151292

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL COMMAND CONTROL AND OCEAN SURVEILLANCE CENTER

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

The Naval Command Control and Ocean Surveillance Center (NCCOSC) will be established at the site of the existing Naval Ocean Systems Center (NOSC), Point Loma, San Diego, CA. The Navy Space Systems Activity (NSSA), Los Angeles, CA, will be closed and functions relocated to Point Loma by the end of FY 1993. The closure and relocation of functions at the Naval Ocean Systems Center (NOSC) Detachment Kaneohe Bay, HI, to Point Loma and Pearl Harbor, HI, will be completed by the end of FY 1993. The Naval Electronic Engineering Activity, Pacific (NEEACTPAC), Pearl Harbor, HI will be realigned as part of the NCCOSC and will receive as a host a detachment of personnel from the Naval Ocean Systems Center Detachment, Kaneohe Bay, HI. NEEACTPAC will remain as a tenant of the Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, HI. The closure and relocation of functions at the Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center (NAVELEXCEN), San Diego, CA, to Point Loma will also be completed by the end of FY 1995. The closure and relocation of functions at the Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center (NAVELEXCEN), Vallejo, CA to Point Loma will be completed by the end of FY 1995. The transfer of torpedo and associated undersea warfare functions from San Diego to the Naval Undersea Warfare Center (NUWC), Newport/Keyport, and anti-submarine warfare functions to Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC), Dahlgren, will begin in FY 1993 and be completed in FY 1995. Required relocations of functions and personnel from the other Naval Warfare Centers to NCCOSC Point Loma will also occur. NCCOSC will assume control of certain unique facilities which remain at Warminster PA, when the Naval Air Development Center relocates to Patuxent River, MD, as part of the Naval Air Warfare Center.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: The project construction cost of this realignment was estimated at \$17.4M. The budget cost is \$18M, which is within inflation from FY 1992 dollars. There are three MILCON projects to be constructed at Pt. Loma in support of those functions being relocated from NAVELEXCEN San Diego, NAVELEXCEN Vallejo, and NOSC Detachment, Kaneohe Bay, HI. Two projects have been deferred from FY 1993 to FY 1994 because of execution problems.

<u>Location/Project Title</u>		<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount \$(000)</u>
San Diego	Marine Sciences Pier	1993	590
		Total	590

<u>Location/Project Title</u>		<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount \$(000)</u>
San Diego	Electronic Systems Engineering Staging Facility	1994	6,400
San Diego	In-Service Engineering Laboratory	1994	11,000
		Total	17,400

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Operations & Maintenance: O&MN includes relocation of personnel to include severance pay for personnel separated by reduction-in-force action and lump-sum leave payments; equipment downtime and relocation costs, including disassembly and reassembly; costs related to consolidation of policies and procedures; and collateral equipment costs.

Procurement Items: OPN and NIF funds will be required to purchase ancillary computer equipment to provide additional computer capacity for financial/supply systems and communication links with remote sites.

Revenue from Land sales: None.

Environmental:

Studies: An EIS will be necessary to create NCCOSC at NAVOCEANSYSCEN San Diego, CA. The issues to be studied include changes in land use, air and water emissions, traffic, hazardous waste sites, historic resources, and endangered species. The EIS began January of 1992 and will be completed July of 1993.

Cleanup/Compliance: No environmental clean-up and compliance costs were identified because this is a realignment and costs will be part of normal operating budget. Only environmental costs for property which will be excessed are included in this budget.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: None.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Operations & Maintenance: Savings are driven by salaries associated with military and civilian billets eliminated through consolidation efficiency. Reduced costs for plant operation and maintenance for Base Operating Support (BOS) funding result from a reduction in operating expenses once an activity is closed/relocated or functions are consolidated/relocated. Percentage savings for BOS were applied to budgeted BOS levels for each activity for each

fiscal year. Recurring costs for NCCOSC will include O&MN, NIF, and RDT&E. Costs will include BOS to support the functions relocated to San Diego. RDT&E funds will be required for base operating costs of the relocated NSSA from Los Angeles to San Diego. Currently, the BOS is provided free from the Air Force for NSSA Los Angeles. O&MN will be required for supporting the consolidations from NESEC's San Diego and Vallejo. NIF operations costs will be required to support the relocation and consolidation of NOSC Hawaii Detachment to San Diego.

Military Personnel: There are savings of \$1,433,000 from 17 officers and \$744,000 from 21 enlisted personnel.

Other: Includes NIF, OPN, RDT&E, SCN, and WPN savings generated by reduced labor expense. Labor cost reductions are a result of workload and workforce reductions, and economies and efficiencies of operations.

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N66001 NAV COM CONTROL & OCEAN SUR CENRDT&E DIV, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA			4. PROJECT TITLE ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS ENGINEERING STAGING FACILITY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0605096N	6. CATEGORY CODE 217.10	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-120S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 6,400	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS ENGINEERING STAGING FAC . .	SF	300,000	-	4,600
INTERIOR STAGING AREA.	SF	100,000	40.00	(4,000)
EXTERIOR STAGING AREA.	SF	200,000	3.00	(600)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	1,150
UTILITIES, PAVING, AND SITE IMPROVEMENT. . .	LS	-	-	(1,150)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	5,750
CONTINGENCY (5.0%)	-	-	-	290
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	6,040
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	360
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	6,400
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Single-story pre-engineered metal building, stacking height of 30 feet, roll-up doors, skylight, 12-ton bridge crane; loading dock; asphaltic concrete staging area; security lighting, fire protection system, and utilities.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>300,000</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SF SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> SF				
<u>PROJECT:</u> Provides a staging facility for electronic parts, systems, and equipment. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate interior and exterior staging for electronic parts, systems, and equipment from the fleet, other operating units and contractors. These items are on hold awaiting return to the user for rework, modification, and testing prior to their return. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Staging facilities are located at the Naval Electronics Systems Engineering Center (NESEC) San Diego at Air Force Plant 19 and NESEC Vallejo at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard. These sites have been recommended for closure, with their consolidated functions being relocated to Point Loma, San Diego, as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Staging capability is critical to the overall function of these centers and must be available for tasking as well as mission performance. Upon closure of the existing sites in San Diego and Vallejo, this center will be unable to provide in-service engineering and direct engineering support to ships of the fleet in critical electronics requirements. Without this project, base closure and realignment actions cannot be implemented.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N66001 NAV COM CONTROL & OCEAN SUR CENRDT&E DIV, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA														
4. PROJECT TITLE ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS ENGINEERING STAGING FACILITY	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-120S													
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.")														
(1) STATUS: <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED</td> <td style="text-align: right;">09-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992</td> <td style="text-align: right;">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">01-93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12-93</td> </tr> </table>			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	09-92	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992	35	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-93	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	12-93				
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	09-92													
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992	35													
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-93													
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	12-93													
(2) BASIS: <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">YES NO <u>X</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">_____</td> </tr> </table>			(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES NO <u>X</u>	(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____								
(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES NO <u>X</u>													
(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____													
(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">(\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(182)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(222)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">404</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) CONTRACT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(364)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(40)</td> </tr> </table>				(\$000)	(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(182)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(222)	(C) TOTAL	404	(D) CONTRACT	(364)	(E) IN-HOUSE	(40)
	(\$000)													
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(182)													
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(222)													
(C) TOTAL	404													
(D) CONTRACT	(364)													
(E) IN-HOUSE	(40)													
(4) CONSTRUCTION START. 03-94 (MONTH AND YEAR)														
B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE														

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N66001 NAV COM CONTROL & OCEAN SUR CENRDT&E DIV, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA			4. PROJECT TITLE IN-SERVICE ENGINEERING LABORATORY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0605096N	6. CATEGORY CODE 217.10	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-121S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 11,000	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
IN-SERVICE ENGINEERING LABORATORY.	SF	70,000	123.00	8,610
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	1,270
UTILITIES, PAVING, AND SITE IMPROVEMENT. . .	LS	-	-	(1,270)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	9,880
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	490
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	10,370
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	630
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	11,000
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Three-story steel frame building, pile foundation, concrete floor slab and wall panels, built-up roofing over concrete on metal decking, raised computer flooring, elevator, seismic construction, fire protection system, air conditioning, compressed air systems, loading dock, electrical substation, parking and lighting.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>70,000</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SF SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Constructs a facility for the performance of in-service engineering functions supporting fleet electronics requirements. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Electronic laboratories, shops and engineering administrative functions to provide in-service engineering and direct support to ships of the fleet. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> In-service engineering functions are accomplished at the Naval Electronics Systems Engineering Center (NESEC) San Diego at Air Force Plant 19 and NESEC Vallejo at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard. These sites have been recommended for closure, with their consolidated functions being relocated to Point Loma, San Diego, as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without this project, this center will be unable to provide facilities for in-service engineering and direct engineering support to ships of the fleet in critical electronics requirements, and base closure and realignment actions cannot be implemented.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N66001 NAV COM CONTROL & OCEAN SUR CENRDT&E DIV, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA														
4. PROJECT TITLE IN-SERVICE ENGINEERING LABORATORY		5. PROJECT NUMBER P-121S												
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.")														
(1) STATUS: <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">09-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">01-93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">12-93</td> </tr> </table>			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	09-92	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992.	35	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-93	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	12-93				
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	09-92													
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992.	35													
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	01-93													
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	12-93													
(2) BASIS: <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">YES__NO <u>X</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">_____</td> </tr> </table>			(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES__NO <u>X</u>	(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____								
(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES__NO <u>X</u>													
(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____													
(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">(\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(360)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(297)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">657</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) CONTRACT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(591)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) N-HOUSE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(66)</td> </tr> </table>				(\$000)	(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(360)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(297)	(C) TOTAL	657	(D) CONTRACT	(591)	(E) N-HOUSE	(66)
	(\$000)													
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(360)													
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(297)													
(C) TOTAL	657													
(D) CONTRACT	(591)													
(E) N-HOUSE	(66)													
(4) CONSTRUCTION START. <table style="width: 100%; margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">03-94</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">(MONTH AND YEAR)</td> </tr> </table>			03-94	(MONTH AND YEAR)										
03-94														
(MONTH AND YEAR)														
B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE														

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	81000	0	0	0	81000
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[495]	[500]	[893]	[344]	[0]	[0]	[2232]
Studies	495	500	0	0	0	0	995
Compliance	0	0	893	344	0	0	1237
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations and Maintenance	0	11147	20763	1447	4838	0	38195
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	124	15	21	0	160
Other	0	0	672	875	0	0	1547
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	495	11647	103452	2681	4859	0	123134

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	-12775	0	0	0	-12775
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	-9755	-1584	-36858	-45109	-45057	-28065	-166428
Military Personnel	-69	-229	-520	-905	-1179	-1368	-4270
Other	-6705	-51860	-54831	-66100	-65483	-52311	-297290
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-614]	[-1154]	[-1637]	[-1734]	[-1570]	[-1208]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[-2]	[-5]	[-15]	[-22]	[-25]	[-26]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-16529	-53673	-104984	-112114	-111719	-81744	-480763

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

(Funded by other Appropriations)

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	5600	0	0	0	0	0	5600
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	855	0	0	0	0	0	855
TOTAL COSTS	6455	0	0	0	0	0	6455

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	0	0	68225	0	0	0	68225
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[495]	[500]	[893]	[344]	[0]	[0]	[2232]
Studies	495	500	0	0	0	0	995
Compliance	0	0	893	344	0	0	1237
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	-4155	9563	-16095	-43662	-40219	-28065	-122633
Military Personnel	-69	-229	-396	-890	-1158	-1368	-4110
Other	-5850	-51860	-54159	-65225	-65483	-52311	-294888
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-614]	[-1154]	[-1637]	[-1734]	[-1570]	[-1208]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[-2]	[-5]	[-15]	[-22]	[-25]	[-26]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	-9579	-42026	-1532	-109433	-106860	-81744	-351174

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTIONS:

David Taylor Research Center (DTRC), Carderock (aka Bethesda), MD, David Taylor Research Center, Annapolis, MD, and Naval Ship Systems Engineering Center (NAVSES), Philadelphia, PA, are being realigned into the Naval Surface Warfare Center, (NSWC) Carderock Division. This division will provide research, development, test and evaluation, fleet support, and in-service engineering for surface and undersea vehicle hull, mechanical and electrical systems, and propulsors; provide logistics R&D and support to the Maritime Administration and maritime industry. One hundred thirty-seven billets will be eliminated through efficiencies gained from this consolidation. In addition, function realignments will effect the following personnel transfers: approximately 392 billets from DTRC Annapolis and 78 billets from NAVSES Norfolk to DTRC Carderock; and approximately 43 billets from DTRC Annapolis to NAVSES Philadelphia.

Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren, VA, and White Oak, MD, together with the Naval Coastal Systems Center (NCSC), Panama City, FL, are being realigned into the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division. This division will provide research, development, test and evaluation, engineering, and fleet support for surface warfare systems, surface ship combat systems, ordnance, mines, amphibious warfare systems, mine countermeasures, special warfare systems, and strategic systems. Two hundred and two billets will be eliminated through efficiencies gained from this consolidation. In addition, functional realignments will effect the following personnel transfers: approximately 775 billets from NSWC White Oak, five billets from NCSC Panama City, and 75 billets from Naval Ocean Systems Center (NOSC) San Diego to NSWC Dahlgren; and approximately 139 billets from NCSC Panama City to Naval Underwater Systems Center (NUSC), Newport.

Naval Weapons Support Center (NWSC) Crane, IN, and Naval Ordnance Station (NOS) Louisville, KY are being realigned into the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC), Crane Division. This division will provide engineering and industrial base support of weapons systems, subsystems, equipment, and components with principal emphasis on industrial and product engineering associated with surface warfare systems in the areas of electronics, ordnance, pyrotechnics, gun systems, microwave technology, small arms, and surface ship electronic warfare in-service engineering. One hundred and thirty billets will be eliminated through efficiencies gained from this consolidation. In addition, functional realignments will effect the following personnel transfers: approximately 25 billets from NOS Louisville to NWSC Crane; approximately 50 billets from NWSC Crane to NOS Louisville; approximately 72 billets from NWSC Crane to NUSC Newport, over a three-year period; and approximately 30 billets from NOS Louisville to Naval Ship Weapon Systems Engineering Station (NSWSES) Port Hueneme.

Naval Ship Weapon Systems Engineering Station, Port Hueneme, CA, Fleet Combat Direction Systems Support Activity (FCDSA), Dam Neck, VA, Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity (NMWEA), Yorktown, VA, and Integrated Combat System Test Facility (ICSTF), San Diego, CA are being realigned into the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Port Hueneme Division. This division will provide test and evaluation, in-service engineering, and integrated logistic support for surface and mine warfare combat systems, system interface, weapons systems and subsystems, unique equipment, and related expendable ordnance of the Navy surface fleet. Ninety-seven billets will be eliminated through efficiencies gained from this consolidation. In addition, functional realignments will effect the following personnel transfers: approximately 30 billets from NOS Louisville, and 40 billets from ICSTF San Diego to NSWSES Port Hueneme; approximately 186 billets from NMWEA Yorktown, and 48 billets from NSCSES Norfolk to FCDSSA Dam Neck; and approximately five billets from ICSTF San Diego to Naval Command Control and Ocean Surveillance Center (NCCOSC) San Diego.

The Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, MD, is being realigned into the Naval Surface Warfare Center as the Indian Head Division. Under the planned the realignment, this division will provide primary technical capability in energetics for all warfare centers through engineering, fleet and operational support, manufacturing technology, limited production, industrial base support, and secondary technical capability through research, development, test and evaluation for energetic materials, ordnance devices and components, and their propulsion systems, explosives, pyrotechnics, warheads, and simulators; provide support including special weapons support, explosive safety and ordnance environmental support to all Warfare Centers, military departments and the ordnance industry. Thirty billets will be eliminated through efficiencies gained from this consolidation.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: The following projects must be constructed in order to complete this realignment:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>(Amount) \$ (000)</u>
Bethesda	Composite Materials Laboratory	1994	3,500
Bethesda	Ships Materials Technology Facility	1994	26,800
Dahlgren	Sewage Treatment Plant Upgrade	1994	19,200
Philadelphia	Gas Turbine Ship Building Modifications	1994	5,100
Dahlgren	Combined Research Laboratory	1994	<u>26,400</u>
Total			81,000

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Environmental:

Studies: Relocation of assets to Dahlgren will require an Environmental Assessment (EA); issues to be studied include water quality and emissions from the sewage and industrial wastewater treatment plant, changes in land use, impacts to wetlands and endangered species, and impacts to community services (housing, police, fire, etc). Relocation of assets to Bethesda will require an EA; DTRC Bethesda is surrounded by an affluent residential neighborhood (Potomac, Maryland) that is concerned about increased traffic, changes in visual aesthetics, increased noise, and increased demands on local utility and community support systems. Consolidation of NAVSSES at NSY Philadelphia will also require an EA. Issues to be addressed primarily involve impacts in historic structures listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Relocation of assets to Port Hueneme and Crane can likely be categorically excluded, a small cost is associated with this planning effort. This funding also provides for National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Section 106, compliance actions to accommodate historic resources.

Compliance: Environmental compliance costs were identified only for cleanup of buildings being vacated at White Oak. Costs include removal of hoods, air systems, sinks, floor tiles, and cleaning of walls and floors for mercury, explosive residue, lead and lead paint. Asbestos removal is not included.

Installation/Restoration (IR): IR costs are only identified in Base Closure and Realignment Budget at sites involving property disposal.

Operation and Maintenance: Functional realignments occur from Annapolis, MD, to Carderock, MD; from Norfolk, VA, to Carderock, MD; from White Oak, MD, to Dahlgren, VA; from Panama City, FL to Dahlgren, VA; from San Diego, CA to Dahlgren, VA; from Crane, IN, to Louisville, KY; from Louisville, KY, to Crane, IN; from San Diego, CA, to Port Hueneme, CA; from Louisville, KY, to Port Hueneme, CA; from Yorktown, VA, to Dam Neck, VA. The functional realignments will involve transfer of approximately 1,939 billets of which approximately 1,054 people are expected to elect to transfer with their function. Personnel relocation costs include permanent change-of-station costs, relocation services, and relocation bonuses in order to encourage personnel to transfer with the function. This action is taken as a necessary step to minimize disruption to the transferring programs. Severance pay, unemployment compensation and lump-sum annual leave payments are budgeted for those personnel electing not to transfer to the receiving site. Vacancies at the receiving site, created by the transfer of unencumbered billets, must also be filled to prevent program disruption. When excess personnel are not available for reassignment at the receiving site, costs to relocate personnel from sites which have an excess have been included. Equipment relocation costs individual RDT&E, engineering and fleet support activities include the labor cost of disassembly, packing, shipping, reassembly, calibration and certification of naval vehicle and surface ship combat system materials, electronic devices and R&D equipment. Space modification costs include alterations of spaces to accommodate functional realignments at receiving sites.

Other: OPN for major and minor equipment procurements required to perform functions transferred from other activities to the new NSWC sites. Funds will procure equipment which cannot be transferred from the donor site because it is also required for remaining functions. Also includes furnishings necessary to adapt to new spaces.

Revenue from Land Sales: None.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: MILCON no longer required due to the consolidation including a ASW Systems Lab, at San Diego, CA (previously NOSC) and a Surface ASW Combat Systems Lab, at White Oak, MD.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Operations and Maintenance: Operation and maintenance savings are realized as the result of space reductions at Annapolis, MD; White Oak, MD; and San Diego, CA. These savings are offset by O&M cost increases at Carderock, MD; Philadelphia, PA; Dahlgren, VA; Crane, IN; Louisville; Port Hueneme, CA; and Dam Neck, VA as a function of functional realignments. Additional O&M was budgeted at Crane for annual operation and maintenance of additional ADP equipment and software. Increased costs for telephone, fax and mail was budgeted at each site. Cost of travel of management personnel from Louisville to Crane increased the annual O&M budget. Louisville O&M increases include telecommunications, locality pay, a Civilian Personnel Office, and communications for Port Hueneme.

Civilian Personnel: Includes avoided salary costs of 596 personnel attributable to consolidation efficiencies.

Military Personnel: There are savings for 25 military personnel.

Other: Includes recurring costs of military pay at Dam Neck and San Diego. These costs become real costs to these activities following the conversion of financial systems from Resource Management System to Defense Business Operations Fund in FY 1994 in accordance with the requirement to implement a common financial system across the warfare centers.

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N00167 NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER CARDEROCK DIV BETHESDA, MARYLAND			4. PROJECT TITLE COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0605096N	6. CATEGORY CODE 310.15	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-172S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 3,500	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY	SF	15,460	-	2,690
BUILDING	SF	15,460	153.00	(2,370)
BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT	LS	-	-	(320)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES	-	-	-	450
UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(290)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENTS	LS	-	-	(160)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	3,140
CONTINGENCY (5.0%)	-	-	-	160
TOTAL CONTRACT COST	-	-	-	3,300
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%)	-	-	-	200
TOTAL REQUEST	-	-	-	3,500
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Partial two-story steel-frame building, masonry walls, concrete foundation and floors, built-up roof, 12 feet high ceiling in first floor laboratory areas, laboratory fume hoods, special ventilation system, environmental control system, built-in freezer for materials, material and chemical storage areas, office and administrative areas, exterior unloading and storage areas, fire protection system, air conditioning, and utilities.				
11. REQUIREMENT: 15,460 SF ADEQUATE: 0 SF SUBSTANDARD: 0 SF PROJECT: Constructs a facility to house new Navy research and development capabilities in advanced composite materials science and technology to meet the increasing need for composite materials aboard Navy ships. Also provides specialized shop space areas, bench laboratory space, freezer storage, and required support space. REQUIREMENT: NSWC Carderock Division is the lead laboratory for Navy composite materials technology and development. The unique facilities and technical expertise are not found elsewhere. The cost effectiveness of composites make them essential for surface ship and submarine application. The tremendous potential of these unique materials for stealth enhancement, stealth countermeasures, weight reductions, maintenance reduction, and increased safety aboard surface ships and submarines will only be realized if the Navy responds to the opportunities available in the research, development, and accelerated usage of composites. This requires modern, secure, and adequate facilities to house developmental composite hardware for understanding its design, fabrication, mechanical response, and applications. The new facilities will support the following main technology areas; resin modifications and pre-pregging; lay-up; filament winding and automatic tape placement; molding and impregnations; mechanical response; pre-production hardware development and sample preparation and handling.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE																																
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N00167 NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER CARDEROCK DIV BETHESDA, MARYLAND																																		
4. PROJECT TITLE COMPOSITE MATERIALS LABORATORY		5. PROJECT NUMBER P-172S																																
11. REQUIREMENT: (CONTINUED) <u>REQUIREMENT: (CONTINUED)</u> New composite materials use and repair training space is required to capitalize on industrial expertise and to provide industry with guidance on specific Navy needs. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Facilities do not exist to adequately perform research, develop materials, and adapt composites to shipboard use. Layout and work spaces are inadequate for present programs. No space is available to accommodate the rapidly expanding marine composite technology and new equipment required to capitalize on the potential available for shipboard applications. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without this project, the Navy will not be able to take advantage of advancing technology and substantial savings associated with the development and use of composites on surface ships and submarines. Prototyping of new machinery and structural concepts will be restricted, transmitting composite hardware to the fleet will be impeded, and the applications of new composite materials will be delayed. The Navy will not be able to keep pace with the rapid expansion in marine composite technology and will be relegated to providing routine service work and continue to make unnecessary repairs and costly over-designs. The Navy will not experience the cost savings, stealth capabilities, weight reductions, and reductions in ship acquisition and maintenance costs that are available through research and development and the application of advanced marine composite materials.																																		
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") <table style="width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> <tr> <td colspan="2">(1) STATUS:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">02-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">05-92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">03-93</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">(2) BASIS:</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">YES ___ NO <u>X</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(190)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(140)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">330</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) CONTRACT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(280)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(50)</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">(4) CONSTRUCTION START.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">06-93 (MONTH AND YEAR)</td> </tr> </table> B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE			(1) STATUS:		(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	02-92	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	0	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	05-92	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	03-93	(2) BASIS:		(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ___ NO <u>X</u>	(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____		(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000)		(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(190)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(140)	(C) TOTAL	330	(D) CONTRACT	(280)	(E) IN-HOUSE	(50)	(4) CONSTRUCTION START.			06-93 (MONTH AND YEAR)
(1) STATUS:																																		
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	02-92																																	
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	0																																	
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	05-92																																	
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	03-93																																	
(2) BASIS:																																		
(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ___ NO <u>X</u>																																	
(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____																																		
(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000)																																		
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(190)																																	
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(140)																																	
(C) TOTAL	330																																	
(D) CONTRACT	(280)																																	
(E) IN-HOUSE	(50)																																	
(4) CONSTRUCTION START.																																		
	06-93 (MONTH AND YEAR)																																	

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N00167 NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER CARDEROCK DIV BETHESDA, MARYLAND			4. PROJECT TITLE SHIPS MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY FACILITY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0605096N	6. CATEGORY CODE 313.10	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-179S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 26,800	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
SHIPS MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY FACILITY.	SF	135,000	-	19,750
BUILDING	SF	135,000	127.00	(17,150)
BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT	LS	-	-	(2,600)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	4,330
ELECTRICAL UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(1,900)
MECHANICAL UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(1,600)
PAVING, SITE IMPROVEMENT & DEMOLITION.	LS	-	-	(830)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	24,080
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	1,200
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	25,280
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%)	-	-	-	1,520
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	26,800
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Three-story steel frame building with basement, concrete precast curtain walls, concrete floors, built-up roof over concrete on metal decking, hazardous waste mitigation, special environmental ventilation and exhaust systems for safety and pollution control, air conditioning, fire protection system, vibration and noise isolation, radiation shielding, secure vault, explosion-proof fixtures, high-bay areas; elastomeric engineering spaces metals, welding and nondestructive evaluation laboratories, nonmetallic materials laboratories, chemical and physical processes laboratories, chemical and paint laboratories; paved storage area, parking, utilities, and demolition of buildings.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>135,000 SF</u> ADEQUATE: <u>0 SF</u> SUBSTANDARD: <u>0 SF</u> <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides a facility for consolidating and integrating laboratories for naval ship and submarine metallic, non-metallic materials technology, and chemical and physical processes technologies. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> State-of-the-art laboratories in which to relocate 185 scientists and engineers from the Naval Surface Warfare Center Carderock Division Detachment (formerly the David Taylor Research Center) Annapolis, Maryland to this activity (formerly the David Taylor Research Center, Bethesda) as a result of the President's base closure and realignment recommendation. Materials efforts range from applied research to fleet support with the primary focus being advanced development. Laboratory space is required for materials manufacturing processes, engineering mechanics and reliability, chemical formulation, testing and characterization of metallic and non-metallic materials, and prototype production and testing of ships systems components. Laboratory functional capabilities include alloy development, forming, joining, materials processing, mechanical property testing, and prediction, fitness for service analysis, environmental testing, optical and electron microscopy, non-destructive evaluation, fuels, lubricants, bearings.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY		FY 19 ⁹⁴ MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION /UIC: N00178 NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER DIVISION, DAHLGREN, VIRGINIA				4. PROJECT TITLE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADE		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0605896N		6. CATEGORY CODE 831.10		7. PROJECT NUMBER P-267S		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 19,200
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST
SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADE				LS	-	-
SUBTOTAL				-	-	17,250
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).				-	-	860
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.				-	-	18,110
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .				-	-	1,090
TOTAL REQUEST.				-	-	19,200
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .				-	-	(NON-ADD) (0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Upgrade existing sewage treatment plant to increase capacity to 600,000 gallons-per-day; decontaminate existing plant, waste material, and contaminated sludge.						
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>AS REQUIRED</u> <u>PROJECT:</u> Upgrades the existing sewage treatment plant. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate sewage treatment capacity to accommodate the realignment of this activity (the former Naval Surface Warfare Center), with its detachment at White Oak, Maryland, and the Coastal Systems Station, Dahlgren Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center (formerly the Naval Coastal Systems Center), Panama City, Florida, into the Dahlgren Division. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> The existing sewage treatment plant has a capacity of 400,000 gallons-per-day. This capacity will be insufficient to handle the additional load imposed by the relocation of functions and personnel to accommodate the President's base closure and realignment recommendations to consolidate surface warfare functions, systems, and personnel. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The sewage treatment plant will not meet the Environmental Protection Agency and State of Virginia regulations, and the President's						

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

DD FORM 1391
1 DEC 78
S/N 0102-LF-001-3910

PREVIOUS EDITIONS MAY BE USED INTERNALLY
UNTIL EXHAUSTED

PAGE NO.

127

COPY AVAILABLE TO DTIC DOES NOT PERMIT FULLY LEGIBLE REPRODUCTION

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 19⁹⁴ MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER DIVISION, DAHLGREN, VIRGINIA		
4. PROJECT TITLE SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT UPGRADE	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-267S	
11. REQUIREMENT: (CONTINUED) <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED.</u> (CONTINUED) recommendation to realign the Surface Warfare Center cannot be implemented.		
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. 05-92 (B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993 45 (C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE 07-92 (D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE 08-93 (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES___NO <u>X</u> (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) (A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS (1.750) (B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS (100) (C) TOTAL 1.850 (D) CONTRACT (1.700) (E) IN-HOUSE (150) (4) CONSTRUCTION START. 10-93 (MONTH AND YEAR) B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE		

1. COMPONENT NAVY		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION /UIC:N65540 NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER DIVISION, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA				4. PROJECT TITLE GAS TURBINE SHIP BUILDING MODIFICATIONS		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0702896N		6. CATEGORY CODE 318.10		7. PROJECT NUMBER P-010S		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 5,100
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST
						COST (\$000)
GAS TURBINE SHIP BUILDING MODIFICATIONS.				SF	15,200	2,480
ENGINE TEST CONTROL ROOMS MODIFICATIONS.				SF	7,200	(1,100)
ENGINE TEST SUPPORT LAB MODIFICATIONS.				SF	6,400	(310)
ENGINE TEST CELLS MODIFICATIONS.				SF	1,600	(260)
ROOF ALTERATIONS				LS	-	(340)
BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT				LS	-	(470)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.				-	-	2,100
SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION FEATURES.				LS	-	(980)
MECHANICAL UTILITIES				LS	-	(710)
ELECTRICAL UTILITIES				LS	-	(410)
SUBTOTAL				-	-	4,580
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).				-	-	230
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.				-	-	4,810
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%)				-	-	290
TOTAL REQUEST.				-	-	5,100
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS				-	-	(NON-ADD) (0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION						
Building modifications, piling and reinforced concrete foundation for engine test beds, interior modular sound-attenuated buildings for engine testing, laboratory support and control rooms with raised computer flooring, roof structural modifications, overhead cranes and engine mount base-plates, fire protection and alarm systems, air conditioning, and support utilities.						
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>15,200</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u> </u> Q SF SUBSTANDARD: <u> </u> Q SF						
<u>PROJECT:</u> Modifies the gas turbine ship building and utility systems to provide additional foundations and test cells for hull, mechanical, and electrical (HM&E) systems and components.						
<u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Modifications to the gas turbine ship building are necessary to accommodate the In-Service Engineering (ISE) programs to be transferred from the David Taylor Research Center (DTRC), Annapolis, Maryland, as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. An integral part of the Navy's Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) Engineering and Fleet Support Consolidation Plan will be the transfer of all HM&E In-Service Engineering functions such as diesel engine, diesel propulsion systems						

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: NOO178 NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER DIVISION, DAHLGREN, VIRGINIA			4. PROJECT TITLE COMBINED RESEARCH LABORATORY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0605896N	6. CATEGORY CODE 310.33	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-2735	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 26,400	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
COMBINED RESEARCH LABORATORY	SF	165,700	-	17,570
BUILDING	SF	165,700	103.00	(16,570)
BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT	LS	-	-	(700)
TECHNICAL OPERATING MANUALS.	LS	-	-	(300)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	6,150
ELECTRICAL UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(1,690)
MECHANICAL UTILITIES	LS	-	-	(1,940)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT.	LS	-	-	(2,520)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	23,720
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	1,190
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	24,910
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%)	-	-	-	1,490
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	26,400
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Multi-story steel frame or load-bearing masonry building, administrative, computer, and support spaces; high-bay assembly areas, strong room facilities; emergency generators, fire protection system, air conditioning, provisions for security system and uninterruptible power supply, and utilities.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>165,700</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SF SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Constructs a comprehensive consolidated facility to provide space for long-term research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) of Surface Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) and Mine Warfare Systems. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate facilities to support the programs being relocated to Dahlgren from the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC), White Oak, Maryland; the Naval Coastal Systems Center (NCSC), Panama City, Florida; the Naval Ocean Systems Center (NOSC), San Diego, California; and the Naval Underwater Systems Center (NUSC), New London, Connecticut; to implement the consolidation of surface warfare centers as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> These programs are currently located in facilities recommended by the President for closure or realignment. Existing assets at Dahlgren are not adequate to fill this requirement. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The Navy's ability to implement the consolidation of surface warfare centers as proposed by the base closure and realignment act will be impaired. (CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)				

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: NO0178 NAVAL SURFACE WARFARE CENTER DIVISION, DAHLGREN, VIRGINIA																								
4. PROJECT TITLE COMBINED RESEARCH LABORATORY		5. PROJECT NUMBER P-2735																						
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr> <td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>03-92</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>35</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>09-92</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>01-94</u></td> </tr> </table> (2) BASIS: <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr> <td>(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">YES ___ NO <u>X</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:</td> <td style="text-align: right;">_____</td> </tr> </table> (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr> <td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(<u>1,400</u>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(<u>390</u>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(C) TOTAL.</td> <td style="text-align: right;"><u>1,790</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(D) CONTRACT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(<u>1,700</u>)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">(<u>90</u>)</td> </tr> </table> (4) CONSTRUCTION START. <u>05-94</u> (MONTH AND YEAR)			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	<u>03-92</u>	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	<u>35</u>	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	<u>09-92</u>	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	<u>01-94</u>	(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ___ NO <u>X</u>	(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____	(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(<u>1,400</u>)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(<u>390</u>)	(C) TOTAL.	<u>1,790</u>	(D) CONTRACT	(<u>1,700</u>)	(E) IN-HOUSE	(<u>90</u>)
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.	<u>03-92</u>																							
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	<u>35</u>																							
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	<u>09-92</u>																							
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	<u>01-94</u>																							
(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ___ NO <u>X</u>																							
(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____																							
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(<u>1,400</u>)																							
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(<u>390</u>)																							
(C) TOTAL.	<u>1,790</u>																							
(D) CONTRACT	(<u>1,700</u>)																							
(E) IN-HOUSE	(<u>90</u>)																							
B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE																								

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	12000	86290	11670	3800	0	113760
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[347]	[2150]	[385]	[1750]	[750]	[250]	[5632]
Studies	347	0	0	0	500	0	847
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	2150	385	1750	250	250	4785
Operation & Maintenance	0	27370	30904	1449	20300	8330	88353
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	305	162	168	0	635
Other	0	0	7195	1700	0	0	8895
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	28	0	170	130	135	100	563
TOTAL COSTS	375	41520	125249	16861	25153	8680	217838

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	-404	0	-404
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	0	0	-2478	12973	12994	13416	36905
Military Personnel	0	-2765	-8374	-14404	-20924	-24823	-71290
Other	-23553	-47768	-43399	-68081	-67559	-65868	-316228
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-725]	[-817]	[-699]	[-794]	[-753]	[-714]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-143]	[-287]	[-430]	[-574]	[-574]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	-23553	-50533	-54251	-69512	-75893	-77275	-351017

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

(Funded by other Appropriations)

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	4700	0	0	0	0	0	4700
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	2980	0	0	0	0	0	2980
TOTAL COSTS	7680	0	0	0	0	0	7680

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	0	12000	86290	11670	3396	0	113356
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[347]	[2150]	[385]	[1750]	[750]	[250]	[5632]
Studies	347	0	0	0	500	0	847
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	2150	385	1750	250	250	4785
Operation & Maintenance	4700	27370	28426	14422	33294	21746	129958
Military Personnel	0	-2765	-8069	-14242	-20756	-24823	-70655
Other	-20573	-47768	-36204	-66381	-67559	-65868	-304353
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	28	0	170	130	135	100	563
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[-725]	[-817]	[-699]	[-794]	[-753]	[-714]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[-143]	[-287]	[-430]	[-574]	[-574]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	-15498	-9013	70998	-52651	-50740	-68595	-125499

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

The Base Closure Commission concurred with the recommendations of SECNAV and SECDEF regarding creation of the Air Warfare Center to realign and consolidate Naval Aviation Aircraft and Weapon System RDT&E functions under a single command. The resulting centralized management is expected to result in mission purification, organizational and technical efficiencies and overhead savings. The organizational structure will consist of an aircraft division located on the east coast and weapons division on the west coast.

The Naval Weapons Center (NWC), China Lake, CA and the Pacific Missile Test (PMTTC) Center, Point Mugu, CA, will be administratively disestablished. They will become the primary consolidation sites for the weapons division of the Naval Air Warfare Center (NAWC). With the formation of the weapons division, technical and management decisions will be centralized and made at the weapons division level. This consolidation also affects the Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility (NWEF) at Albuquerque, NM, which will be disestablished and the majority of its functions transferred to China Lake and Point Mugu. A small detachment will remain at Albuquerque for interservice liaison. The Naval Ordnance Missile Test Station (NOMTS) at White Sands, NM, will become a supporting site of the weapons division.

The Base Closure Commission also recommended a major realignment of the Naval Air Development Center (NADC), Warminster, PA as a key element of the formation of the Naval Air Warfare Center. The majority of the aircraft systems R&D mission activities will be collocated with the T&E functions at the Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, MD. Several small specific functions will be relocated to other Air Warfare Center installations and few specialized high-cost facilities will remain at Warminster. Current shore activities consisting of the Navy Air Propulsion Center, Trenton, NJ; the Naval Air Engineering Center (NAEC), Lakehurst, NJ; and the Naval Avionics Center (NAC), Indianapolis, IN, will be administratively disestablished and become supporting sites of the aircraft division.

Actions required to accomplish the Warminster realignment include: construction/rehabilitation of replacement facilities at Patuxent River; disassembly, assembly, and recertification of high-value R&D industrial plant and computer equipment; environmental mitigation at Warminster; and relocation/assistance of personnel.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: The Base Closure Commission was told the Naval Air Warfare Center would result in construction requirements of \$121.1M. This budget is for \$122.2M which includes a \$12M project moved from the FY 1991 MILCON account into the FY 1993 Base Closure request. The FY 1991 project was

rescinded by Congress in FY 1992 due to closure of Warminster. The following facilities must be constructed to implement the recommendations of the commission:

<u>Location/Project Title</u>		<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount \$ 000</u>
Patuxent River	Aircraft Tech Lab	1993	<u>12,000</u>
		Total	12,000
Patuxent River	Science and Engineering Facilities (Phase I)	1994	54,100
Patuxent River	Science and Engineering Facilities (Phase II)	1994	32,190
		Total	<u>86,290</u>
Patuxent River	Science and Engineering Facilities (Phase III)	1995	11,670
		Total	<u>11,670</u>
Warminster	Laboratory Facility Consolidation	1996	3,800
		Total	3,800

Family Housing Construction: No requirement.

Family Housing Operations: No requirement.

Environmental:

Studies: The relocation of assets to Patuxent River will require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Issues to be addressed include water emissions from a new industrial wastewater treatment plant, in particular concerns over compliance with the Chesapeake Bay Protection Act and Clean Water Act will require substantial analysis of hazardous material handling. Other issues to be addressed include impacts to traffic, endangered species, wetlands, historic resources, and community infrastructure (police, fire, schools, housing). Since St. Mary's county is predominantly a rural area, the relocation of 1,800 personnel here will be environmentally controversial. This funding also provides for National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Section 106, compliance actions to accommodate historic resources.

While NADC Warminster is not being closed, some assets will no longer be needed and will be disposed of to the public. An EIS will be necessary to document impacts resulting from Navy's disposal of facilities and land. Given the interest of the local community to reuse these assets, the local community will be instrumental in defining reuse alternatives. However, these alternatives have not been formulated. It seems likely that subsequent reuse will be as an industrial park. Issues that would be addressed include changes in land use, traffic, air and water emissions.

The disposal EIS would begin October 1995 and be completed March 1997.

Installation Restoration (IR): NADC Warminster is included on the National Priority List (NPL). Eight sites are being addressed under the IR Program. A Federal Facility Agreement with EPA is in effect. Remedial Investigations/Feasibility Studies (RI/FS) are presently on-going and will be completed by second quarter FY 1993. The Record of Decision is scheduled for FY 1993 and Remedial Design will be done in FY 1994. Final cleanup may not be completed until FY 2000, as groundwater treatment appears necessary.

Operations & Maintenance: Costs include civilian moving, severance, and unemployment; equipment movement; facility consolidation/renovation; systems furniture; standard financial system; salaries and administrative planning costs.

Other: Costs associated with upgrading video tele-conferencing capabilities and integration of financial information systems for centralized management.

Revenue From Land Sales: Navy will screen the excess property at NADC Warminster with other federal, state, and local agencies and the public according to the normal federal disposal process. This may result in transfer to another federal agency, a homeless provider, sale to a state or local government either at fair market value or discounted under a variety of statutory programs. If the property survives the screening process, then the property will ultimately be disposed of by public sale.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: A child development center programmed for FY 1996 at the Naval Air Development Center at a cost of \$404K.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None. Retention of the 207 family housing units and the Family Housing Office at NADC is required. All housing functions will be transferred to Naval Air Station, Willow Grove. Historically, Warminster administered family housing for the area consisting of themselves, NAS Willow Grove, and Aviation Support Office, Philadelphia. Housing is a continuing requirement at the complex since NADC Warminster accounted for only a small portion of the family housing requirement and a deficit will still exist. As such, the housing inventory and staff will be transferred from Warminster to Willow Grove. The assets can easily be physically severed from the rest of the base.

Operations & Maintenance: A steady state savings is expected through reductions in Real Property Maintenance Activities (RPMA) and Base Operating Support (BOS) expenses at sites where facilities and personnel are being affected. An increase in RPMA and BOS is expected at the receiving sites upon completion of relocation, due to larger physical plants and base populations.

Military Personnel: The end-strength savings resulting from this realignment anticipated a reduction to overall end strength.

Other: Results of consolidation translates into more efficient operation accomplishment (lower personnel strength, plant account and overhead).

1. COMPONENT NAVY		FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION /UIC: N00421 NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER, AIRCRAFT DIV, PATUXENT RIVER, MARYLAND				4. PROJECT TITLE SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FACILITIES (PHASE I)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0605896N		6. CATEGORY CODE 311.10		7. PROJECT NUMBER P-930S		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 54,100
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST
SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FACILITIES				SF	777,000	-
BUILDINGS.				SF	598,000	105.00
BUILDING RENOVATION.				SF	179,000	49.00
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.				-	-	16,450
UTILITIES, PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT . . .				LS	-	(16,450)
SUBTOTAL				-	-	88,010
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).				-	-	4,400
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.				-	-	92,410
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .				-	-	5,550
SUBTOTAL				-	-	97,960
LESS: PHASE II FY 94 FUNDING				-	-	32,190
PHASE III FY 95 FUNDING.				-	-	11,670
TOTAL REQUEST.				-	-	54,100
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .				-	-	(NON-ADD) (5,000)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Multi-story steel-framed masonry, concrete, metal or composite panel buildings, concrete spread footing, slab on grade and reinforced concrete slab floors, steel-framed bar joists with metal deck and built-up roofing; chilled water system, air conditioning, raised computer flooring, explosion proof construction, special aircraft power systems, clean rooms, special compartmental intelligence facilities lab support systems, fire protection systems, elevators; utility upgrades; alterations to existing facilities to include upgrade of wall and floor systems, air conditioning, technical operating manuals, and utilities.						
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>777,000</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u> </u> Q SF SUBSTANDARD: (<u>179,000</u>) SF PROJECT: Provides a consolidated complex of buildings for science and engineering functions. REQUIREMENT: Adequate and properly-configured facilities to support the realignment of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Warminster, Pennsylvania (formerly the Naval Air Development Center) as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, to streamline the Department of Defense's RDT&E operations. A combination of new and renovated facilities will accommodate critical						

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	2. DATE												
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER, AIRCRAFT DIV, PATUXENT RIVER, MARYLAND														
4. PROJECT TITLE SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FACILITIES (PHASE I)	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-930S													
11. REQUIREMENT: (CONTINUED) <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> (CONTINUED) research and development for aircraft and air systems to meet future requirements of anti-submarine warfare and tactical air capabilities. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> NAWC Aircraft Division, Warminster, has been recommended for closure and its functions are to be moved to Patuxent River. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Without this project, this center will not be able to support the base closure and realignment action to close NAWC Warminster.														
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. 04-92 (B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993 10 (C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE 07-92 (D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE 08-93 (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES___NO <u>X</u>___ (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) (A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS (2,870) (B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS (2,590) (C) TOTAL 5,460 (D) CONTRACT (5,200) (E) IN-HOUSE (260) (4) CONSTRUCTION START. 10-93 (MONTH AND YEAR) B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE</th> <th style="text-align: left;">PROCURING APPROPRIATION</th> <th style="text-align: left;">FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED</th> <th style="text-align: left;">COST (\$000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LABORATORY EQUIPMENT</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: right;">TOTAL</td> <td>5,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)	LABORATORY EQUIPMENT			5,000			TOTAL	5,000
EQUIPMENT NOMENCLATURE	PROCURING APPROPRIATION	FISCAL YEAR APPROPRIATED OR REQUESTED	COST (\$000)											
LABORATORY EQUIPMENT			5,000											
		TOTAL	5,000											

1. COMPONENT NAVY		FY 19 ⁹⁴ MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA			2. DATE	
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION /UIC: N00421 NAVAL AIR WARFARE CENTER, AIRCRAFT DIV, PATUXENT RIVER, MARYLAND				4. PROJECT TITLE SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FACILITIES (PHASE II)		
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0605896N		6. CATEGORY CODE 311.10		7. PROJECT NUMBER P-940S		8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 32,190
9. COST ESTIMATES						
ITEM				U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST
SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FACILITIES				SF	777,000	-
BUILDINGS.				SF	598,000	105.00
BUILDING RENOVATION.				SF	179,000	49.00
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.				-	-	16,400
UTILITIES, PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT . . .				LS	-	(16,450)
SUBTOTAL				-	-	88,010
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).				-	-	4,400
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.				-	-	92,410
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .				-	-	5,550
SUBTOTAL				-	-	97,960
LESS: PHASE I FY 94 FUNDING				-	-	54,100
LESS: PHASE III FY 95 FUNDING				-	-	11,670
TOTAL REQUEST.				-	-	32,190
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .				-	-	(NON-ADD) (5,000)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Multi-story steel-framed masonry, concrete, metal or composite panel buildings, concrete spread footing, slab on grade and reinforced concrete slab floors, steel-framed bar joists with metal deck and built-up roofing; chilled water system, air conditioning, raised computer flooring, explosion proof construction, special aircraft power systems, clean rooms, special compartmented intelligence facilities, lab support systems, fire protection systems, elevators; utility upgrades; alterations to existing facilities to include upgrade of wall and floor systems, air conditioning, technical operating manuals, and utilities.						
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>777,000</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u> </u> SF SUBSTANDARD: (<u>179,000</u>) SF PROJECT: Provides a consolidated complex of buildings for science and engineering functions. REQUIREMENT: Adequate and properly-configured facilities to support the realignment of the Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Warminster, Pennsylvania (formerly the Naval Air Development Center) as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, to streamline the Department of Defense's RD&E operations. A combination of new and renovated facilities will						

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: NAVAL UNDERSEA WARFARE CENTER

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	13900	25000	0	0	0	38900
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[150]	[500]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[650]
Studies	150	500	0	0	0	0	650
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	12784	12687	8240	36030	400	70141
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	30	3	9	0	42
Other	0	0	6917	1675	35	0	8627
meowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	150	27184	44634	9918	36074	400	118360

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	4753	-898	-12267	-16807	-16806	-14678	-56703
Military Personnel	-84	-189	-145	-112	-235	-367	-1132
Other	-3478	-13025	-15198	-19819	-15461	-9755	-76736
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[83]	[-299]	[-484]	[-560]	[-459]	[-316]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[-3]	[-3]	[-2]	[-2]	[-9]	[-9]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	1191	-14112	-27610	-36738	-32502	-24800	-134571

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: (Funded by other Appropriations)	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	6900	0	0	0	0	0	6900
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	3781	0	0	0	0	0	3781
TOTAL COSTS	10681	0	0	0	0	0	10681
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:							
Military Construction	0	13900	25000	0	0	0	38900
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[150]	[500]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[650]
Studies	150	500	0	0	0	0	650
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	11653	11886	420	-8567	19224	-14278	20338
Military Personnel	-84	-189	-115	-109	-226	-367	-1090
Other	303	-13025	-8281	-18144	-15426	-9755	-64328
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[83]	[-299]	[-484]	[-560]	[-459]	[-316]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[-3]	[-3]	[-2]	[-2]	[-9]	[-9]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	12022	13072	17024	-26820	3572	-24400	-5530

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

NAVAL UNDERSEA WARFARE CENTER

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

Naval Underwater Systems Center (NUSC), Newport, RI, will be realigned into the Naval Undersea Warfare Center (NUWC), Newport Division. This division will have the combined mission and functions of the NUSC Newport and New London laboratories, the Trident Command & Control Systems Maintenance Activity (TRICCSMA), as well as responsibility for functional realignments from Naval Sea Combat Systems Engineering Station (NSCSES), Norfolk, VA; Naval Oceans Systems Center (NOSC), San Diego, CA; Naval Coastal Systems Center (NCSC), Panama City, FL; and Naval Weapons Support Center (NWSC), Crane, IN. The NUWC mission is to operate the Navy's full spectrum research, development, test and evaluation, engineering and Fleet support center for submarines, autonomous underwater systems, and offensive and defensive weapon systems associated with undersea warfare.

TRICCSMA Newport and NSCSES Norfolk will be administratively transferred in place and an additional 126 billets transferred to the Naval Surface Warfare Center. One hundred and forty workyears from NCSC Panama City, 195 workyears from NOSC San Diego, and 72 workyears from NWSC Crane will transfer to the NUWC Newport Division. Of these, 327 billets are accountable in the division summary, and 80 billets eliminated due to consolidation efficiency. The NUSC New London laboratory staff will be reduced to 492 by transfer of billets to Newport, to the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) Dahlgren Division, and elimination of civilian and military billets.

Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station (NUWES), Keyport, Washington will be realigned into the Naval Undersea Warfare Center (NUWC) as the Keyport Division. Under the planned realignment, NUWES will remain the Navy's unique undersea warfare engineering center providing engineering, scientific test and evaluation, design and performance analysis, and technical assessment for anti-submarine warfare/undersea warfare weapons, targets and countermeasures, acoustic systems, weapons control systems and testing ranges. NUWES will continue to function as the maintenance depot for undersea warfare systems, weapons and components, and continue to provide waterfront ordnance and retail ammunition services in the Puget Sound area. An additional 55 workyears of undersea weapons (MK 46, MK 48m ADCAP, MK 50 torpedoes) in-service engineering functions will migrate to NUWES.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: The Base Closure Commission was told that the construction costs from this realignment would be \$39.6M. This budget totals \$38.9M.

<u>Location/Project Title</u>	<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount \$(000)</u>
Newport Electro-Magnetics Lab	1993	<u>13,900</u>
	Total	13,900
Newport Engineering Research Lab	1994	<u>25,000</u>
	Total	25,000

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Environmental:

Compliance: No environmental clean-up and compliance costs were identified because this is a realignment and costs will be part of the normal operating budget. Only environmental costs for property which will be excessed are included in this budget.

Studies: Relocation of NUSC New London assets to NUSC Newport will require an Environmental Assessment (EA). Issues to be addressed include changes in land use, increases in air and water emissions (from labs), and increases in traffic. The EA would also study impacts to community infrastructure (police, fire, schools, housing) resulting from increases in personnel in the Newport area.

Operations & Maintenance: Personnel Relocation Costs: Realignment of TRICCSMA and NSCSES is accomplished in place, and personnel transfer acceptance is assumed to be 100%. In contrast, functional transfers from NCSC Panama City, NOSC San Diego, and NWSA Crane assume a transfer acceptance of under 10% after relocation bonuses have been offered. The NUSC New London transfer acceptance rate to positions in Newport has been assumed to be 60% to 80%, with use of relocation and retention bonuses and high-grade relocation services. The cost of bonuses is budgeted at the receiving activity. All other personnel relocation costs are budgeted at the losing activity. Equipment Relocation Costs: Costs for individual R&D laboratories include the labor cost of disassembly, reassembly, calibration and certification, as well as the cost of transporting the equipment to the receiving location. The cost of relocating equipment from New London to Newport is included in the budget exhibit. The cost of equipment relocation from Surface Warfare Center activities is an expense for the losing activity and is accounted for in other warfare center summaries. The "New Hire" category includes costs associated with hiring replacements for employees that decline to transfer.

Other: Procurement costs include secure digital communication systems to partner NUWC sites. Major equipment procurement are those used to perform functions transferred from other activities to the Newport site.

Revenue from Land sales: None.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: None.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Operations & Maintenance: Savings are driven by salaries associated with military and civilian billets eliminated through consolidation efficiency. Reduced costs for plant operation and maintenance at TRICCSMA are offset by similar increased costs (described above) at NUSC. All savings result from avoided salary costs of 250 workyear (civilian) efficiency gains. Workyear reduction occurs mid-year in FY 1996. Average salary cost is \$49K (FY 1996 dollars). Reflects additional travel costs to partner NUWC activities and operation/maintenance services for secure digital communications with partners. Operation and maintenance costs increase significantly at the Newport site because of the influx of personnel and increased plant operations cost from construction of new buildings. Military pay (NIF) costs increase from transfer of TRICCSMA (RMS funded) billets into the Newport (NIF) organization.

Military Personnel: There are savings of ten military personnel for a reduction of \$492,000.

Other: Includes NIF, OPN, RDT&E, SCN, and WPN savings generated by reduced labor expense. Labor cost reductions are a result of workload and workforce reductions and economies and efficiencies of operations.

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: PROJECT RELIANCE

ONE-TIME
IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	24280	0	0	0	24280
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	50	0	2915	3919	1240	75	8199
Land Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	50	0	27195	3919	1240	75	32479

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[-4]	[-4]	
	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS: (Funded by other Appropriations)	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:							
Military Construction	0	0	24280	0	0	0	24280
Family Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	0
Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	50	0	2915	3919	1240	75	8199
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[-4]	[-4]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	50	0	27195	3919	1240	75	32479

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT RELIANCE

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

Consolidate the Army Institute of Dental Research with the Navy Dental Research Institute (NDRI), Great Lakes, IL. Collocate the blood research functions from the closing Letterman Army Institute of Research with the Navy Medical Research Institute (NMRI), Bethesda, MD.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: Three projects are required at Navy installations receiving these functions to accommodate the increased workload and personnel.

<u>Location/Project Title</u>	<u>Year of Award</u>	<u>Amount (\$ 000)</u>
Great Lakes Dental Research Facilities Renovation	1994	5,280
Bethesda Applications Laboratory	1994	9,600
Bethesda Research Laboratory	1994	<u>9,400</u>
Total		24,280

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Environmental: None.

Operations & Maintenance: None.

Other: Collateral equipment for the new laboratories and leasing of facilities for use until construction projects are completed.

Revenue from Land sales: None.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: None.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Operations & Maintenance: None.

Military Personnel: There are no net savings as a result of these actions, because all Naval personnel are being transferred.

Other: None.

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N65786 NAVAL DENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, GREAT LAKES, ILLINDIS			4. PROJECT TITLE DENTAL RESEARCH FACILITIES RENOVATION	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0807796N	6. CATEGORY CODE 310.31	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-569S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 5,280	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
DENTAL RESEARCH FACILITIES RENOVATION.	LS	-	-	4,450
PREFABRICATED BUILDING INSTALLATION.	LS	-	-	(1,660)
ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING UPGRADE.	LS	-	-	(2,790)
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	290
UTILITIES UPGRADE.	LS	-	-	(150)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT.	LS	-	-	(140)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	4,740
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	240
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	4,980
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	300
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	5,280
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Renovations to four buildings to include extensive interior remodeling, moving electric, water, gas, and steam lines; upgrading utilities systems; providing backup power; providing laboratory ventilation and filtration hoods at one building; erecting two prefabricated buildings; and parking areas.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>AS REQUIRED</u> <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides for renovation of existing facilities to accommodate the relocation of the Army Dental Research Command from Fort Meade, Maryland to this activity. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate facilities to accommodate the Army Dental Research Command which is being relocated as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Existing facilities are inadequate and are not configured for laboratory and research work. Additional space is needed to house laboratory animals. Utility systems need to be upgraded to accommodate the larger electrical capacity and air conditioning demands of the Army's equipment. Unused administrative space must be renovated for additional personnel. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> The base closure and realignment action to collocate the Army and Navy Dental Research Commands at this activity cannot be implemented.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE																						
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N65786 NAVAL DENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, GREAT LAKES, ILLINOIS																								
4. PROJECT TITLE DENTAL RESEARCH FACILITIES RENOVATION	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-5695																							
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr><td>(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED</td><td style="text-align: right;"><u>05-92</u></td></tr> <tr><td>(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.</td><td style="text-align: right;"><u>40</u></td></tr> <tr><td>(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE</td><td style="text-align: right;"><u>09-92</u></td></tr> <tr><td>(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE</td><td style="text-align: right;"><u>12-93</u></td></tr> </table> (2) BASIS: <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr><td>(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:</td><td style="text-align: right;">YES ☐ NO ☒</td></tr> <tr><td>(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:</td><td style="text-align: right;">_____</td></tr> </table> (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"> <tr><td>(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td><td style="text-align: right;">(<u>178</u>)</td></tr> <tr><td>(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS</td><td style="text-align: right;">(<u>108</u>)</td></tr> <tr><td>(C) TOTAL</td><td style="text-align: right;"><u>286</u></td></tr> <tr><td>(D) CONTRACT</td><td style="text-align: right;">(<u>236</u>)</td></tr> <tr><td>(E) IN-HOUSE</td><td style="text-align: right;">(<u>50</u>)</td></tr> </table> (4) CONSTRUCTION START. <u>02-94</u> (MONTH AND YEAR)			(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	<u>05-92</u>	(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	<u>40</u>	(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	<u>09-92</u>	(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	<u>12-93</u>	(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ☐ NO ☒	(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____	(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(<u>178</u>)	(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(<u>108</u>)	(C) TOTAL	<u>286</u>	(D) CONTRACT	(<u>236</u>)	(E) IN-HOUSE	(<u>50</u>)
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED	<u>05-92</u>																							
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993.	<u>40</u>																							
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE	<u>09-92</u>																							
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE	<u>12-93</u>																							
(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:	YES ☐ NO ☒																							
(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:	_____																							
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS	(<u>178</u>)																							
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS	(<u>108</u>)																							
(C) TOTAL	<u>286</u>																							
(D) CONTRACT	(<u>236</u>)																							
(E) IN-HOUSE	(<u>50</u>)																							
B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE																								

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N64223 NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, BETHESDA, MARYLAND			4. PROJECT TITLE APPLICATIONS LABORATORY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0605896N	6. CATEGORY CODE 310.29	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-425S	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 9,600	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
APPLICATIONS LABORATORY.	SF	46,280	175.00	8,100
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	530
ELECTRICAL UTILITIES.	LS	-	-	(120)
MECHANICAL UTILITIES.	LS	-	-	(200)
PAVING AND SITE IMPROVEMENT.	LS	-	-	(210)
SUBTOTAL.	-	-	-	8,630
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	430
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	9,060
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	540
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	9,600
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NON-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Four-story reinforced concrete frame building, concrete and masonry walls, spread footings and pre-cast concrete roof with built-up roofing, animal housing area and administrative spaces, fire protection system, emergency power system, air conditioning, and utilities.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>46,280</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SF SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> SF <u>PROJECT:</u> Provides animal housing and associated administrative space. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> This activity provides overall animal and veterinary medical support to the Command's biomedical research programs. Adequate facilities are required to meet increased mission requirements as a result of actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, to collocate Army laboratory assets at this activity. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> Constructed in 1942, existing facilities are deteriorated, overcrowded, and have many life and safety violations endangering both animals and personnel. Animal housing laws require 100% outside air in animal areas, and no room meets this requirement. Regulations also require 12 air changes per hour per area, however, some areas only have one or two. These conditions endanger personnel who must breathe contaminated air from animal holding rooms. In addition, temperature control is not possible, with the temperature in some rooms rising above 90 degrees during summer days. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> Continue to subject both animals and personnel to life and safety violations, vermin infestation, and electrical hazards. The base closure and realignment action to collocate other service efforts at this site cannot be implemented.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N64223 NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, BETHESDA, MARYLAND		
4. PROJECT TITLE APPLICATIONS LABORATORY		5. PROJECT NUMBER P-425S
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA:		
A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.")		
(1) STATUS:		
(A) DATE DESIGN STARTED.		05-92
(B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1992.		40
(C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE		09-92
(D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE		07-93
(2) BASIS:		
(A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN:		YES ___ NO <u>X</u>
(B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED:		_____
(3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000)		
(A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS		(240)
(B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS		(140)
(C) TOTAL.		380
(D) CONTRACT		(355)
(E) IN-HOUSE		(25)
(4) CONSTRUCTION START.		
		10-93 (MONTH AND YEAR)
B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS:		
NONE		

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N64223 NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, BETHESDA, MARYLAND			4. PROJECT TITLE RESEARCH LABORATORY	
5. PROGRAM ELEMENT 0605896N	6. CATEGORY CODE 310.31	7. PROJECT NUMBER P-0865	8. PROJECT COST (\$000) 9,400	
9. COST ESTIMATES				
ITEM	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST (\$000)
RESEARCH LABORATORY.	SF	46,350	159.00	7,370
SUPPORTING FACILITIES.	-	-	-	1,080
UTILITIES, PAVING, AND SITE IMPROVEMENT. . .	LS	-	-	(1,080)
SUBTOTAL	-	-	-	8,450
CONTINGENCY (5.0%).	-	-	-	420
TOTAL CONTRACT COST.	-	-	-	8,870
SUPERVISION, INSPECTION & OVERHEAD (6.0%) . .	-	-	-	530
TOTAL REQUEST.	-	-	-	9,400
EQUIPMENT PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS .	-	-	(NEN-ADD)	(0)
10. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION Four-story steel-frame masonry building, limestone clad exterior, spread concrete footing foundation, elevators, air conditioning, fire protection system, and utilities.				
11. REQUIREMENT: <u>46,350</u> SF ADEQUATE: <u>0</u> SF SUBSTANDARD: <u>0</u> SF				
<u>PROJECT:</u> Constructs a research laboratory. <u>REQUIREMENT:</u> Adequate facility to consolidate Navy and Army medical research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) in blood research, blood processing, and blood substitutes is required to accommodate actions authorized by Public Law 101-510, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, to close the Letterman Army Institute of Research, and collocate the displaced functions with the Navy Medical Research Institute. This facility will also include relocation of the existing Tissue Bank into one environmentally-safe, certifiable building. <u>CURRENT SITUATION:</u> No facilities exist which are capable of providing the necessary space to accommodate the functions being relocated. <u>IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED:</u> This activity will not be able to support the base closure and realignment action to close the Letterman Army Institute of Research because of a lack of adequate RDT&E space to house the functions being relocated here.				

(CONTINUED ON DD 1391C)

1. COMPONENT NAVY	FY 1994 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	2. DATE
3. INSTALLATION AND LOCATION/UIC: N64223 NAVAL MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, BETHESDA, MARYLAND		
4. PROJECT TITLE RESEARCH LABORATORY	5. PROJECT NUMBER P-0865	
12. SUPPLEMENTAL DATA: A. ESTIMATED DESIGN DATA: (PROJECT DESIGN CONFORMS TO PART II OF MILITARY HANDBOOK 1190, "FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDE.") (1) STATUS: (A) DATE DESIGN STARTED. <u>04-92</u> (B) PERCENT COMPLETE AS OF JANUARY 1993. <u>35</u> (C) DATE DESIGN 35% COMPLETE <u>11-92</u> (D) DATE DESIGN COMPLETE <u>11-93</u> (2) BASIS: (A) STANDARD OR DEFINITIVE DESIGN: YES ___ NO <u>X</u> (B) WHERE DESIGN WAS MOST RECENTLY USED: _____ (3) TOTAL COST (C) = (A) + (B) OR (D) + (E): (\$000) (A) PRODUCTION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS (<u>0</u>) (B) ALL OTHER DESIGN COSTS (<u>0</u>) (C) TOTAL. <u>0</u> (D) CONTRACT (<u>0</u>) (E) IN-HOUSE (<u>0</u>) (4) CONSTRUCTION START. <u>01-94</u> (MONTH AND YEAR) B. EQUIPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED FROM OTHER APPROPRIATIONS: NONE		

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT LOCATION: P/D AND MANAGEMENT

ONE-TIME

IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	28543	45000	0	0	0	0	73543
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	0	2623	2840	2546	1832	1726	11567
Military Personnel - PCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
and Sales Revenue (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	28543	47623	2840	2546	1832	1726	85110

SAVINGS:

Military Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Family Housing							
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[35]	[35]	[35]	[29]	[26]	[20]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
TOTAL SAVINGS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NAVY FINANCIAL SUMMARY
(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

**ONE-TIME
IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:
(Funded by other Appropriations)**

	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	TOTAL
Military Construction	5943	0	0	0	0	0	5943
Family Housing	29	0	0	0	0	0	29
Operation & Maintenance	236	0	0	0	0	0	236
Military Personnel - PCS	200	0	0	0	0	0	200
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL COSTS	6408	0	0	0	0	0	6408

NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction	34486	45000	0	0	0	0	79486
Family Housing	29	0	0	0	0	0	29
Construction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	0
Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Compliance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Restoration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Operation & Maintenance	236	2623	2840	2546	1832	1726	11803
Military Personnel	200	0	0	0	0	0	200
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeowners Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land Sales Revenues (-)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian ES (End Strength)	[35]	[35]	[35]	[29]	[26]	[20]	
Military ES (End Strength)	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	
NET IMPLEMENTATION COSTS	34951	47623	2840	2546	1832	1726	91518

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT II
(1991 COMMISSION)
NARRATIVE SUMMARY

PLANNING/DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT

CLOSURE/REALIGNMENT ACTION:

These costs support base closure actions at multiple locations.

ONE-TIME IMPLEMENTATION COSTS:

Military Construction: MILCON project costs are all displayed in budget exhibits for the applicable closure/realignment action. These costs are for design and construction contract preparation (Planning & Design (P&D)).

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Operations & Maintenance: Provides for costs associated with shore facilities planning including review/validation of facility requirements and the engineering evaluation of existing building/structure assets, review of project documentation, project site approval, intergovernmental coordination, environmental review, review of economic analysis, and contract administration of related planning studies. Also includes costs associated with managing real estate actions.

Procurement Items: None.

Revenue from Land sales: None.

Environmental: None.

SAVINGS:

Military Construction: None.

Family Housing Construction: None.

Family Housing Operations: None.

Operations & Maintenance: None.

Military Personnel: None.

Other: None.