From: Naval Inspector General
To: Distribution

Subj: AREA VISIT OF NAVAL SUPPORT ACTIVITY MONTEREY

Ref: (a) SECNAVINST 5040.3A
     (b) SECNAVINST 5430.57G

1. The Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) conducts Readiness and Quality of Life (QOL) Area Visits to naval installations worldwide as directed by references (a) and (b). Area visit reports provide senior Navy leadership with objective assessments of readiness, Fleet support, and QOL issues that cut across command levels and component lines to identify Navy-wide concerns. They also identify specific issues that can only be addressed enterprise-wide by senior Navy leadership.

2. NAVINSGEN conducted an Area Visit of Naval Support Activity (NSA) Monterey from 14-18 March 2016. This was our first visit to NSA Monterey since the command was established in 2010. This report documents our findings.

3. This report contains an Executive Summary, our observations and findings, and documented deficiencies noted during the inspection. A summary of survey and focus group data, as well as a complete listing of survey frequency data, is included.

4. During our visit, we assessed quality of life and quality of work for Navy military, civilian personnel, and their families at NSA Monterey; facilities, safety and environmental programs, security, and good order and discipline. Additionally, we conducted surveys and focus group discussions to support our assessment of quality of home life (QOHL) and work life (QOWL).

5. Our overall assessment is that NSA Monterey is supporting tenant commands and ensuring that quality of life issues for Sailors, families, and civilian employees are adequately addressed under existing resource constraints.

6. Corrective actions


   b. Additionally, NAVINSGEN provided NSA Monterey with 35 recommendations relating to Command Communications, Customer Service Desk, Total Force Manpower, Information Technology Infrastructure, Environmental Readiness, Cultural Resources, Energy Conservation,
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c. Correction of each deficiency or adoption of recommendations, and a description of action(s) taken or rationale of why recommendations were not adopted, shall be reported via Implementation Status Report (ISR), OPNAV 5040/2 no later than 30 September 2016. Deficiencies not corrected or recommendations not adopted by this date or requiring longer-term solutions should be updated quarterly until completed.
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Executive Summary
The Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) conducted an Area Visit of Naval Support Activity (NSA) Monterey from 14-18 March 2016. This was our first area visit of NSA Monterey. The team was augmented with subject matter experts, including personnel from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Safety (DASN Safety); Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC); Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy for Policy (DUSN (P)); Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC); Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS); Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR); Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OPNAV), Chief of Navy Chaplains (OPNAV N097); Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Manpower, Personnel, Education, and Training (OPNAV N1); and Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR).

Our overall assessment is that NSA Monterey is supporting tenant commands and ensuring that quality of life (QOL) issues for Sailors, families, and civilian employees are adequately addressed within existing financial constraints. During our visit, we assessed facilities, safety and environmental programs, security, good order and discipline, and QOL. Additionally, we conducted surveys and focus group discussions to assess the quality of home life (QOHL) and work life (QOWL).

Our survey and focus groups discussions found that QOHL and QOWL at NSA Monterey were higher than our historical area visit averages. Rated on a 10-point scale, the QOHL and QOWL was 8.1 and 6.63, respectively; the corresponding historical averages are 7.18 and 6.39. Major negative impacts to QOHL and QOWL included concerns over manning, pay, and security. Concerns regarding manning centered on a perceived lack of organizational manpower, personnel cuts, and changes to the mission without corresponding changes in requirements. Specific comments from focus groups and surveys were passed to Commander, Navy Region Southwest (CNRSW) and NSA Monterey leadership and are included in our report.

KEY FINDINGS
Mission Performance
Resource constraints and regionalization impacts limit NSA Monterey’s ability to provide responsive base operations support to tenant commands, Sailors and their families, and Department of the Navy (DON) civilians. The CNIC regionalization model presents challenges for smaller installations like NSA Monterey. Though installation commanders retain full responsibility, they may experience reduced command authority due to lack of overall budget visibility, regionalization of staff positions, and instances where local civilian program directors report to and are evaluated by program managers at the Region vice the installation commander.

Command Relationships
The NSA Monterey Commanding Officer has developed strong relationships with tenant commands and the surrounding community. His meaningful engagement with the President, Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) and the local school board are particularly beneficial to military families.

Customer Service Desk
Customer Service Desk (CSD) Monterey maintains a timeliness rate of 87 percent, below the DON standard of 97 percent, with timeliness concerns principally due to the late receipt of legal documents and paperwork concerning new personnel gains.
Total Force Manpower Support
We found that the NSA Monterey 2009 Shore Manpower Requirements Determination was not fully implemented, making a planned small staff even smaller. Staff size limits NSA Monterey’s ability to provide support services to tenant commands resulting in frequent reliance on NPS for program support. Additionally, we have concerns with NSA Monterey Security Department manning levels.

Civilian Hiring Process
Though impressed with local practices, the overall hiring process is negatively impacted by the length of time it takes the OCHR Stennis Operations Center to issue hiring certificates to NSA Monterey hiring managers. NSA Monterey is receiving hiring certificates within 58 days for Security Department vacancies and 67 days for other vacancies, significantly exceeding the DON goal of 25 days or less.

Civilian Human Resource Processes
We reviewed a random sample of fiscal year 2015 (FY15) DON Interim Performance Management System appraisals and found untimely execution of NSA Monterey civilian employee performance plans, progress reviews, and annual appraisals.

Military and Civilian Training
NSA Monterey FY15 training completion rates were 46 percent for military personnel, 50 percent for civilian personnel, and 50 percent for supervisors of civilians.

Equal Employment Opportunity
NSA Monterey Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) programs are managed by CNRSW and are assessed as compliant in general. Two sub-areas are not fully compliant: Reasonable Accommodation and Special Emphasis programs. Reasonable Accommodations are not provided within the 30-day standard and the Region does not provide full Special Emphasis program services to NSA Monterey. We recommend periodic onsite Region EEO visits to facilitate face-to-face engagement with NSA Monterey employees and leadership.

Information Technology Infrastructure
NPS provides IT, telecommunications, and video teleconferencing infrastructure to NSA Monterey at no cost and enables NSA Monterey to operate on the nps.edu domain. The installation recently requested a survey and rate card from a Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) Naval Enterprise Network contractor to provide NMCI connectivity to all NSA Monterey buildings. NSA Monterey is not an education facility and is not eligible for continued education domain use (.edu).

Facilities, Environmental, Energy Conservation, and Safety and Occupational Health

Facilities Management
Facilities programs were not fully compliant due to the intermittent performance of fire alarm systems. NSA Monterey maintains seven proprietary fire alarm systems serviced by a single contract; fire alarm configuration management and maintenance response issues need to be addressed. NSA Monterey’s ability to sustain and restore aging facilities is complicated by limited facility sustainment funding and the fact that the major NSA Monterey tenant command is a university, which adversely impacts military construction project scoring as compared to operational commands.
Safety and Occupational Health
Safety and Occupational Health programs were not compliant, due to numerous self-identified deficiencies resulting from the NSA Monterey FY15 Navy Occupational Safety and Health Program Self-Assessment. These programs are functional and support tenant commands; however, there are unacceptable delays in the abatement of identified hazards and deficiencies associated with Hazardous Energy Control, Confined Space, Fall Protection, and Recreation/Off-Duty Safety programs.

Environmental
NSA Monterey environmental program were not fully compliant. Not all backflow preventers were tested annually, as required, and the last drinking water Sanitary Survey was completed in 2010. Internal environmental audits are not properly conducted, procedures for facility project reviews need to be formally codified, and a storage tank management plan needs to be developed and implemented.

Security Programs and Cybersecurity/Technology

Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection

Information and Personnel Security
The NSA Monterey Information and Personnel Security programs are not fully compliant with governing directives. CNRSW performs Information and Personnel Security functions for NSA Monterey with no evidence of a required Security Servicing Agreement. Additionally, NSA Monterey does not have a security directive, as required in SECNAV M-5510.30 and SECNAV M-5510.36, DON Information Security Program.

Operations Security
NSA Monterey’s Operations Security (OPSEC) program is not fully compliant with governing directives. The installation lacks a command specific Critical Information List that is readily in use and understood by the workforce. The OPSEC officer has not attended required training and is not conducting OPSEC reviews of contracts.

Emergency Management
Emergency Management (EM) at NSA Monterey is not fully compliant with governing directives. The Installation EM Manager is experienced;

Compliance and Prevention, Quality of Life, and Community Support
We observed that services and programs, including the commissary, Navy Exchange, Child Development Center, Military and Family Service Center, Religious Programs, Legal, and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation were effective in supporting the NSA Monterey community QOL.
Casualty Assistance Calls Program
NSA Monterey’s Casualty Assistance Calls program is not compliant with governing directives. NSA Monterey relies on NPS for support, but there is no memorandum of agreement (MOA) or memorandum of understanding (MOU) to codify this arrangement.

Command Managed Equal Opportunity Program
The NSA Monterey Command Managed Equal Opportunity program is not compliant with governing directives. NSA Monterey does not have an effective system in place to resolve complaints of unlawful discrimination and sexual harassment at the lowest level. In addition, CNRSW is providing all Managed Equal Opportunity program support.

Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Program
The NSA Monterey Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention program is not compliant with governing directives. Drug and Alcohol Program Advisor (DAPA) functions are provided by the CNRSW DAPA. The informal arrangement to use the NPS DAPA for alcohol related incidents, positive urinalysis events, and to conduct required training needs to be formally codified in a MOA or MOU.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
The Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) program at NSA Monterey is not compliant with governing directives. While area leaders are committed to maintaining an environment free of sexual assault and victim care, we observed several administrative and training deficiencies. Required SAPR training had not been completed and the existing program relationship between NPS and NSA Monterey needs to be codified.

Suicide Prevention
The Suicide Prevention program is not compliant with governing directives. Required individual and watchstander training was not completed, suicide prevention resources and local contact information were not posted, and there were no procedures in place for heightened risk personnel.

Medical/Dental Support
Focus groups and local leadership expressed significant concerns over timely access to routine medical care. The Presidio of Monterey Army Health Clinic acknowledged access to care concerns and has a number of initiatives underway to resolve this issue.

Installation Voting Assistance
The NSA Monterey Installation Voting Assistance (IVA) program is not compliant with governing directives. The installation voting office is not clearly advertised, and the IVA office did not meet required timelines for return contact.
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Areas/Programs Assessed

- **Mission Performance**
  - Command Communications and Relationships
  - Customer Service Desk
  - Total Force Manpower
  - Civilian Hiring Process
  - Civilian Human Resources Processes
  - Military and Civilian Training
  - Equal Employment Opportunity
  - Information Technology Infrastructure

- **Facilities, Environmental, Energy Conservation, and Safety and Occupational Health**
  - Facilities Management
  - Safety and Occupational Health
  - Environmental
  - Energy Conservation
  - Public-Private Venture Family Housing
  - Presidio of Monterey Barracks

- **Security Programs and Cybersecurity/Technology**
  - Information Security
  - Personnel Security
  - Industrial Security
  - Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection
  - Operations Security
  - Counterintelligence Training and Support
  - Cybersecurity
  - Personally Identifiable Information
  - Emergency Management

- **Compliance and Prevention, Quality of Life, and Community Support Programs**
  - Casualty Assistance Calls Program
  - Command Managed Equal Opportunity
  - Hazing Policy Training and Compliance
  - Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
  - Overseas Screening
  - Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
  - Suicide Prevention
  - Transition GPS
  - Morale, Welfare, and Recreation
  - Commissary/Navy Exchange
  - Base Legal Support
  - Child and Youth Programs/Child Development Centers
  - Fleet and Family Support Center
  - Medical/Dental Support
  - Navy College/Educational Support
  - Religious Support
  - Installation Voting Assistance

- **Senior Enlisted Engagement**
Observations and Findings

MISSION PERFORMANCE

The Mission Performance Team obtained facts and opinions through survey and focus group responses, document reviews, group discussions, and face-to-face interviews to gather information and assess the mission performance of NSA Monterey. In performing our assessment, we reviewed applicable laws, regulations, and policies as they apply to the installation.

As part of our visit, we reviewed the following areas:

- Command Relationships
- Command Communications
- Customer Service Desk
- Total Force Manpower
- Civilian Hiring Process
- Civilian Human Resources Processes
- Military and Civilian Training
- Equal Employment Opportunity
- Information Technology Infrastructure

The Mission Team conducted an in-depth examination of the installation’s mission; to provide responsive base operations support to enable tenants to accomplish their mission, enhance quality of life (QOL) for employees and customers, and nurture effective relationships with the local community. We determined that NSA Monterey is performing its mission despite limited funding and regionalization challenges.

Tenant commands expressed, “NSA Monterey is providing the maximum support possible under their existing resource constraints.” Further, tenants communicated that base support had improved since NSA Monterey stood up as a command in September 2010. We observed several NSA Monterey processes that require additional maturation and codification and recommend that NSA Monterey formally codify its existing relationships with Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) for program support with a memorandum of agreement (MOA) or memorandum of understanding (MOU), as appropriate. These memoranda are necessary to delineate individual command responsibilities and formally establish review periodicities to ensure evolving program requirements remain supported under existing arrangements.

Command Relationships

The NSA Monterey Commanding Officer has developed strong relationships with tenant commanders, particularly NPS, Fleet Numerical Meteorology and Oceanography Center (FNMOC), and the Naval Research Lab (NRL) detachment via frequent collaborative engagements to include weekly President, NPS meetings; bi-weekly O-6 councils; tenant command participation in quarterly Safety Council, Environmental Management System Executive Steering Committee, Public Safety and Emergency Management Systems Working Group, Traffic and Parking Committee meetings, and other official and informal social gatherings. Additionally, NSA Monterey has forged strong ties with the local community, to include engagement with Team Monterey, a collaborative group consisting of regional DoD and national security organizations; the Monterey Business Council; Monterey Peninsula Chamber of
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Commerce; Fort Ord Area Retiree Council; Federal, state, local congressional members, and surrounding city managers.

**Command Communications**

NSA Monterey’s small size simplifies the Commanding Officer’s effective and informative weekly department head meetings, social media presence on Twitter and Facebook, and periodic town hall gatherings that collectively facilitate effective communication up and down the chain of command and with family members. The NSA Monterey Commanding Officer is actively engaged with his employees and has proven responsive to feedback.

Our inspection identified that some NSA Monterey employees were unaware that local command policies and instructions were posted on the Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC) Gateway portal and the NSA Monterey website. We suspect that this is because NSA Monterey lacks a Command Indoctrination program due to its small size and infrequent turnover. To improve new employee awareness, we recommend a robust check-in sheet that meets indoctrination-training requirements and includes interviews with program managers to acclimate onboarding personnel to NSA Monterey specific processes. This has proven to be effective at other similarly sized commands.

**Recommendation 1.** That NSA Monterey update the new personnel check-in sheet to include points of contact (POC) for mandatory training topics listed in OPNAVINST 1740.3C, Command Sponsor and Indoctrination Programs.

**Customer Service Desk**

The Customer Service Desk (CSD) at NSA Monterey, with Personnel Support Detachment (PSD) Lemoore serving as the parent organization, is meeting the needs of its serviced population, which consists of 8,500 active duty, reservists, and family members. CSD Monterey’s small staff of 4 civilians and 13 contractor employees maintains a timeliness rate of 87 percent, below the DON standard of 97 percent established in MILPERSMAN 1000-025, Personnel Transaction Timeliness. The inability of CSD Monterey to meet timeliness metrics is principally due to the late receipt of non-judicial punishment paperwork and documentation associated with new personnel gains.

CSD Monterey ensures the timely processing and liquidation of travel claims, an important QOL measure, with an average turnaround time of four days. Of note, CSD Monterey does not track initial travel claim error rates upon receipt from tenant Command Pass Coordinators (CPCs). A travel voucher that contains errors is returned to the submitting CPC and eventually on to the member for correction. Timeliness metric measurement commences when CSD Monterey receives an error-free travel voucher. Total time from initial submission to final PSD processing is a better metric with respect to the impact on Sailor QOL. Further, its measurement will provide the data necessary to identify all process barriers to effect total process improvement.

**Recommendation 2.** That CSD Monterey conduct monthly CPC meetings with serviced tenant commands to improve communication, efficiency, and facilitate specialized training where required.

**Recommendation 3.** That NSA Monterey CSD measure the total time from initial travel claim submission to liquidation to help identify tenant commands that require additional CPC training to reduce error rates.
**Total Force Manpower**

NSA Monterey total manpower requirements are funded at 83 percent or 55 of 66 total billets authorized. NSA Monterey has its full complement of officers (4 of 4) and enlisted personnel (2 of 2) and 82 percent (49 of 60) of its civilian billets authorized. Overall, Navy billet authorization benchmarks are 84 percent for officers, 87 percent for enlisted, and 95 percent for civilians.

NSA Monterey has a civilian Deputy Commander. The civilian deputy model, and the continuity it provides, is particularly advantageous to NSA Monterey based on the command’s overall size and predominant civilian composition of the installation, NPS, FNMOC, and NRL detachment.

The CNIC decision to regionalize specific installation positions in 2014 resulted in the elimination of the NSA Monterey N5 billet; the Deputy Commander subsequently assumed these functions. The N5 served as the installation’s business manager, strategic planner, and principal missions, functions, and tasks integrator. At NSA Monterey, the N5 also performed long range planning functions, to include Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Master Plan integration and alignment, as well as other business management functions. CNIC recently decided to introduce a separate Installation Program Integrator (IPI) at a majority of installations beginning in FY16-17, assuming enterprise full time equivalent (FTE) resourcing can be identified. NSA Monterey is expected to have an IPI when the initiative is fully implemented.

We also note that regionalization presents challenges across the CNIC enterprise, particularly at smaller installations. Though installation commanders retain full responsibility, they often experience reduced command authority under regionalization due to the lack of overall budget visibility, elimination of some installation level positions, and instances where local civilian program directors report to and are evaluated by program managers at the Region vice the installation commander.

**Recommendation 5.** That NSA Monterey request a desk audit to determine and document the impact of regionalizing the N5 position in the event an IPI is not implemented at the installation.

**Civilian Hiring Process**

CNRSW and the Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR) Stennis Operations Center (Stennis) perform human resources services for NSA Monterey employees with the exception of Non-appropriated Fund (NAF) employees who are serviced by NAF Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) Human Resources Office (HRO). While we were impressed with the timely and efficient local hiring processes, the overall hiring process is adversely impacted by the amount of time it takes OCHR Stennis to issue hiring certificates to local hiring managers. Local hiring managers are receiving certificates within 58 days for
Security Department vacancies and within 67 days for other vacancies. These metrics significantly exceed the DON goal of 25 days or less. This negatively impacts the hiring process as selected applicants are often no longer available upon notification, having already accepted other employment offers. Upon receipt of certificates, local hiring managers make selections within 7-13 days, which is well within the DON goal of 20 days or less.

Monterey’s high cost of living presents hiring and retention challenges for the installation. The Wage Grade 05/06 Small Arms Repairer (WG-6610-05/06) position has been vacant since September 2015, and has been announced five times with selections made each time. Selected candidates have consistently declined the position due to the low salary offer and Monterey’s high cost of living. We recommend that NSA Monterey explore recruitment incentive options to increase the likelihood of selected applicant position acceptance.

Recommendation 6. That NSA Monterey coordinate with CNRSW and OCHR Stennis to review recruitment incentives for the Small Arms Repairer (WG-6610-05/06) position.

The NAF HRO staff, comprised of two personnel, performs recruitment and staffing, HR training, performance management, employee benefits, worker’s compensation, records management, security (including background checks, eQIP entry, and finger printing), and employee and labor relations functions for 257 employees. The NAF HRO staff also schedules physicals and drug testing for employees, when required. NAF HRO processes lack automation and position vacancies are announced via recruitment websites, email, and intranet postings. Automating recruitment through staffing tools such as USA Jobs would expand the eligible applicant pool, increase recruitment process transparency, and reduce the administrative burden of manually accepting applications. NAF HRO self-reported averages of 45 days for recruitment and 59 days for employee onboarding. We were unable to obtain an independent metrics report during our inspection due to the lack of automated processes.

Recommendation 7. That NSA Monterey NAF HRO automate recruitment processes and consider automating other HR programs, as appropriate.

Civilian Human Resources Processes

Interim Performance Management System (IPMS) processes at NSA Monterey were not compliant with DON IPMS policy. We assessed NSA Monterey IPMS processes by sampling 13 civilian employee performance plans. Of those sampled, none of the performance plans were initiated within 30 days of the new appraisal period, 69 percent of the mid-cycle progress reviews were timely, and 92 percent of end of cycle appraisals were completed within 30 days. NSA Monterey did not maintain Individual Development Plans (IDPs) for their employees, but has established a Plan of Action and Milestones (POAM) to implement by July 2016.

Deficiency 1. CNRSW HRO does not monitor and track annual performance plans and annual appraisals within prescribed timeframes. Reference: Interim Performance Management System DON Handbook, paragraphs 6b and 6c2b.


NSA Monterey employee awards programs are compliant with Federal, DoD, and DON Civilian Human Resources Manual (CHRM) 451-02 requirements. A sample of five IPMS award justifications and five award justifications for bargaining unit employees that operate under the Legacy Performance Management System were reviewed; no discrepancies were identified.
Military and Civilian Training

General Military Training (GMT) is not completed by all NSA Monterey personnel. The fiscal year 2015 (FY15) GMT completion rate was 46 percent for NSA Monterey military personnel. Similarly, civilian mandatory training requirements were not completed by all NSA Monterey civilian personnel. Approximately 50 percent of civilian and civilian supervisor training requirements were met in FY15.

**Deficiency 3.** GMT is not completed by all NSA Monterey military personnel. References: OPNAVINST 1500.22G, paragraph 4c and 6d(2); NAVADMIN 202/14, FY15 General Military Training Schedule.

**Deficiency 4.** NSA Monterey civilian mandatory training requirements are not completed by all civilian personnel. References: SECNAVINST 12410.25, Civilian Employee Training and Career Development; OCHR Mandatory Training Requirements, paragraph 5.h.3.

**Deficiency 5.** NSA Monterey civilian supervisors have not completed Merit System Principles Basics for Hiring Managers. Reference: Assistant Secretary of the Navy (M&RA) Policy Memorandum, "Merit Systems Principles Mandatory Training for Hiring Managers," dated 26 December 2012.

Equal Employment Opportunity

NSA Monterey Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) programs are managed by CNRSW and assessed as compliant in general. Two sub-areas were not fully compliant, Reasonable Accommodation and Special Emphasis programs. Reasonable Accommodations were not being provided within the 30-day standard and the Region does not provide full Special Emphasis program services to NSA Monterey. Though the CNRSW EEO staff regularly engages with NSA Monterey electronically and telephonically, we recommend periodic onsite Region EEO visits to facilitate face-to-face engagement with NSA Monterey employees and leadership.

**Deficiency 6.** CNRSW self-reported in its FY15 Management Directive (MD) 715 Federal Agency Annual EEO Program Status Report submission that Reasonable Accommodation case processing is not always occurring within 30 days. Reference: Civilian Human Resources Manual 1606, Processing Requests for Reasonable Accommodation, Chapter 2, Section VI.

**Deficiency 7.** CNRSW does not provide the full complement of Special Emphasis program services to NSA Monterey. Reference: Management Directive 110, Chapter 1, Section VII.

Information Technology Infrastructure

The NSA Monterey Information Technology (IT) infrastructure arrangement requires additional maturation. NPS provides Information Technology (IT), telecommunications, and video teleconferencing infrastructure support at no cost to NSA Monterey. The installation operates on the nps.edu domain; this arrangement was in existence prior to the establishment of NSA Monterey.

The installation recently requested a survey and rate card from a Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) Naval Enterprise Network contractor to provide NMCI connectivity to all NSA Monterey buildings. Today, the nearest NMCI point of entry is the Security Department and new conduit will be required to support fiber run to the NSA Monterey command element buildings. NSA Monterey is not an education facility and is not eligible for continued education domain use (.edu).

In the interim, we recommend that NSA Monterey codify its existing relationship with NPS in a MOA. By nature of the current arrangement, NSA Monterey does not maintain an IT budget and lacks regional oversight for the majority of its IT infrastructure. The small NMCI presence at the Security Department is supported by the Region N6, but consists of fewer than a dozen data ports. We further recommend
that NSA Monterey coordinate with CNRSW to procure replacement parts and consumable items rather than continue its reliance on NPS for non-NMCI IT infrastructure needs. This will enhance CNRSW visibility of NSA Monterey IT infrastructure layout and help identify future requirements.

**Recommendation 8.** That NSA Monterey codify its NPS IT support arrangement in a MOA.

**Recommendation 9.** That NSA Monterey submit a budget request to CNRSW for non-NMCI IT replacement parts and consumable items.
FACILITIES, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENERGY CONSERVATION, AND SAFETY AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH

Facilities Management
NSA Monterey Public Works Department (PWD) is effectively managing installation facilities and infrastructure, despite its low level of funding. The composite Installation Figure of Merit (IFOM) rating, which considers condition, configuration, and capacity is 77 out of 100 – lower than the same measure for CNRSW (81) and all Navy installations worldwide (79). NSA Monterey’s IFOM is not expected to improve given declining facility sustainment funding used for preventive, corrective, and recurring building maintenance. Several of the critical educational and research facilities, built in 1954, are considered historical facilities along with several other buildings at NSA Monterey that are on the National Register of Historic Places. This designation makes exterior repairs and renovations more expensive and time-consuming because of cultural resource requirements. Moreover, prior funding streams, such as congressional earmarks and special Flagship Institution funding provisions for the U.S. Naval Academy, Naval War College, and NPS have been discontinued. We note a dire need for facility sustainment and restoration funding to support proper function of basic building systems.

Chronic roof leaks in Building 232 Spanagel Hall are disrupting experiments and lab work with electronics equipment and computers on the fifth floor. Figure 1 depicts a work-around solution to mitigate recurring leaks just below the roof in the aforementioned lab spaces. Roof leaks in Building 700 have [b](7)(1)(B)

Many of the facilities issues can be corrected with Operations and Maintenance Navy funds, but similar to other installations, NSA Monterey is resourced at approximately 63 percent of the DoD Facility Sustainment Model. An increased level of facility sustainment funding would enable NSA Monterey to execute the Building 700 roof repair estimated at $1.5M. Centralized Special Project funding for the full roof repair of Building 232, estimated at $4-5M, is also required.

Fire Alarm Systems
Several pre-event survey respondents noted problems with fire alarm systems in various NSA Monterey facilities, to include Building 339 (Dudley Knox Library) and Building 302 (Glasgow Hall). PWD Monterey was aware of these issues, but does not have organic capability to effect fire alarm system repairs. The installation has seven proprietary systems, all of which require manufacturer-certified technicians to work on these systems. NSA Monterey uses a service contract to perform fire alarm system maintenance and repair. Fire suppression systems are functional and we observed that NSA Monterey has mitigation procedures in place to address fire alarm system concerns. However, the frequency and...
duration of various fire alarm panel outages do not meet the Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) requirements for operation and maintenance of fire protection systems.


**Recommendation 10.** That NSA Monterey modify its fire protection system service contract to improve responsiveness.

## Safety and Occupational Health
We assessed NSA Monterey Safety and Occupational Health (SOH) programs for compliance with 29 U.S. Code (USC) Chapter 15, Occupational Safety and Health, regulations promulgated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1 (Navy Safety and Occupational Health Program Manual), and other safety-related references. During our inspection, we assessed the following SOH program areas:

- Headquarters SOH Organization and Staffing
- Safety Councils, Committees, and Working Groups
- Oversight of SOH Programs at Subordinate Commands
- SOH Management Evaluations
- Explosive Safety
- Fire Safety
- Fall Protection
- Energy Control
- Confined Space Entry
- Hazardous Material Control and Management
- Mishap Reporting/Hazard Abatement
- Traffic Safety (Including Motorcycle Safety)
- Recreational/Off-Duty Safety
- Medical Surveillance
- Safety Trend Analysis

### Safety Program Delivery
The NSA Monterey Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) Program provides Navy Occupational Safety and Health (NAVOSH) Program services for NSA Monterey employees and tenant commands. Funding for Base Operating Support (BOS) safety services is provided to achieve a Common Output Level 4, which supports minimum OSH services. The program is not compliant as a result of the reduced funding and numerous deficiencies self-identified in the NSA Monterey FY15 NAVOSH Program Self-Assessment, dated 16 December 2015.

Our assessment included a review of program documents, interviews with SOH program staff, designated program managers, and SOH staff from NPS and PWD Monterey. The inspection validated the installation’s self-assessment findings and existence of an actively managed POAM to correct self-identified deficiencies. Our assessment did not reveal any further deficiencies beyond those previously identified by the NSA Monterey safety staff.
Safety Program Gaps
Prompt actions were required to correct identified safety hazards within 30 days of notice, or a formal Hazard Abatement Plan must be developed for hazards requiring more than 30 days for correction. At NSA Monterey, 42 hazard notices were issued by the safety department in FY15; 12 notices were corrected and closed, 9 met the 30-day requirement. Additionally, NSA Monterey has gaps in Hazardous Energy Control, Confined Space, Fall Protection, and Recreation/Off-Duty Safety programs.

- **Deficiency 9.** Prompt actions are not taken to abate identified hazards. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, paragraph 1202.
- **Deficiency 10.** NSA Monterey’s Fall Protection program is inadequate. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, Chapter 13.
- **Deficiency 11.** NSA Monterey’s Hazardous Energy Control program policy is inadequate. References: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, paragraph 2404.a. (1); 29 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1910.147.
- **Deficiency 12.** NSA Monterey’s confined space program is inadequate. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, Chapter 27.
- **Deficiency 13.** NSA Monterey’s RODS program is inadequate. References: OPNAVINST 5100.25C; CNICINST 5100.3A, Table 2.

Traffic Safety
Tenant command employees and NPS students receive general traffic safety training during new employee/student orientation. A review of the NSA Monterey FY15 NAVOSH Program Self-Assessment and interviews with NPS OSH staff affirmed that demographic specific training (e.g. motorcycle safety, American Automobile Association Driver Improvement Program, duty driver, Alive at 25, etc.), and OPNAV and CNIC Traffic Safety Program requirements are not provided as part of the NSA Monterey NAVFAC program or BOS safety support services. For example, NSA Monterey does not have a Motorcycle Safety Representative, maintain an inventory of installation motorcycle riders, or host Traffic Safety Committee meetings.

- **Deficiency 14.** NSA Monterey Traffic Safety BOS is inadequate. References: OPNAVINST 5100.12J; CNICINST 5100.3A, Table 3.

Environmental

Environmental Readiness
A review of NSA Monterey operations that considered all major environmental compliance and conservation program areas was conducted with a focus on drinking water, storm water, hazardous waste and hazardous materials, spill planning and response, storage tanks, natural resources, cultural resources, environmental management systems, and the National Environmental Policy Act. Our review included site visits, document reviews, and staff interviews.

The NSA Monterey Environmental Program is not fully compliant with applicable directives in the areas of drinking water, storage tanks, environmental management systems (EMS), and cultural resources. Although the environmental staff is knowledgeable and works to support mission readiness and environmental compliance, their efforts have been negatively impacted by high staff turnover, limited fiscal resources, and a set of special areas, some of which are Government-Owned, Contractor-Operated (GOCO) with unique challenges.
Additionally, we discussed opportunities to improve environmental compliance and program effectiveness, to include drafting an installation project approval instruction and establishing a NSA Monterey and NPS MOA consistent with applicable OPNAV and CNRSW environmental directives.

**Recommendation 11.** That NSA Monterey establish MOAs with tenant commands to clarify environmental roles, responsibilities, and procedures. Reference: OPNAV M-5090, paragraph 1-16.

**Recommendation 12.** That NSA Monterey clarify roles and responsibilities for GOCO operations at NSA Monterey special areas. Reference: OPNAV 5090-M, paragraph 1.3.7.

**Recommendation 13.** That NSA Monterey draft an installation project approval instruction to properly account for special considerations relating to environmental, natural, and cultural resources. Reference: OPNAVINST 11010.20H, paragraph 8-1.

**Drinking Water**
NSA Monterey operates a consecutive public water system (PWS) that consists of distribution and storage, with no water treatment plant facilities. The installation obtains all drinking water from a private water purveyor and is therefore not subject to the regulations of the Safe Drinking Water Act. OPNAV M-5090.1, Environmental Readiness Program Manual, requires completion of a sanitary survey at least every five years for all Navy PWSs. Interviews with installation and CNRSW staff confirmed that NSA Monterey’s last sanitary survey was completed in 2010, though the staff had requested a survey in FY15 and resubmitted their request for a FY16 sanitary survey during the area visit. Additionally, only 10 percent of NSA Monterey backflow preventers had been tested within required periodicity.

**Deficiency 15.** NSA Monterey does not have a current water system sanitary survey. Reference: OPNAV M-5090.1, paragraph 21-3.11.

**Deficiency 16.** NSA Monterey has not conducted required backflow prevention device testing. Reference: OPNAVINST 5090.1D, paragraph 21-3.9.b.(4).

**Environmental Management System**
NSA Monterey did not conduct annual EMS management reviews. EMS management reviews provide an excellent opportunity to highlight environmental progress and deficiencies, gain command concurrence on environmental priorities, and appropriately focus installation resource allocation. Annual management reviews are an important environmental communication mechanism.

**Deficiency 17.** NSA Monterey did not conduct annual EMS management reviews. Reference: OPNAV M-5090.1, 17-3.2.

**Storage Tank Management**
NSA Monterey manages storage tanks at multiple locations, including the airfield and special areas. The installation Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure plan is current. However, the installation tank management program lacks a current Tank Management Plan. Additionally, staff interviews indicate that the ten thousand gallon Navy Flying Club (NFC) aviation fuel storage tank has been taken out of service and is scheduled for replacement. In the meantime, NFC aviation fuel will continue to be provided via rented mobile tanker until the purchased replacement tank can be installed and the old tank removed.


**Cultural Resources**
NSA Monterey has conducted several cultural resources investigations and has a substantial population of historic properties on the main installation and special areas. Significant historic properties include
Herrmann Hall/Hotel Del Monte Historic District, the Naval Postgraduate Engineering School Historic District, and Cold War-era historic properties. Additionally, the installation contains historic and prehistoric archaeological resources.

The 2014 external EMS audit cited regulatory findings arising from the lack of compliant project review procedures to ensure compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966. The installation and NAVFAC Southwest prepared a POAM to correct the deficiencies, but identified corrective measures have not yet been completed.

NSA Monterey does not comply with DoD and DON cultural resources directives, which require installations with cultural resources to have an Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) signed by the commanding officer at least every five years and updated annually by the Cultural Resources Manager. The NSA Monterey ICRMP has not been updated in over four years, despite recent changes to its cultural resources portfolio.

Additionally, NSA Monterey lacks a reliable management system for ensuring all projects subject to Section 106 of the NHPA are reviewed and consulted, consistent with implementing regulations of 36 CFR Part 800, Protection of Historic Properties. This shortcoming may expose the installation to mission risks arising from Section 106 violations. The substantial number and variety of cultural resources located on the installation and the diversity of tenants and special areas, underscores the importance of a compliant ICRMP at NAS Monterey.

**Deficiency 19.** The NSA Monterey ICRMP is not compliant. References: DoDI 4715.16, Cultural Resources Management; SECNAVINST 4000.35A, DON Cultural Resources Program; OPNAV M-5090.1, paragraph 13-4; 36 CFR Part 800.

**Recommendation 14.** That NSA Monterey identify and implement project review procedures to ensure Section 106 compliance.

**Recommendation 15.** That NSA Monterey consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and other interested parties to develop a Programmatic Agreement.

**Energy Conservation**

The NSA Monterey Energy Conservation program is effective and meeting or exceeding Executive Orders and Navy energy and potable water conservation goals. The installation Energy Manager is fully integrated into the PWD Facilities Management Division and receives daily feedback from the Facilities Management Specialists who work in the field. Additionally, NSA Monterey has a unique Energy Management Control System that enables data capture and central control down to the room level in most NSA Monterey buildings. We note a strong portfolio of completed, ongoing, and planned projects that provide renewable energy contributions, energy security, and utility conservation. NSA Monterey is well ahead of Navy water conservation goals, driven in part by Monterey County and water purveyor that limits usage to 60 gallons per day, per person, vice the 100-gallon standard for consumption planning. We observed that the NSA Monterey Energy Conservation program meets the intent of Navy instructions, but deviates from the 2007 CNRSW energy and building management policy. The CNRSW instructions are not well suited for NSA Monterey; we recommend that NSA Monterey consider developing a local policy tailored to its size and tenant command mission support requirements. We further observed that several NPS academic spaces left computer monitors on after hours; this presents an opportunity for additional energy conservation.

Recommendation 17. That NSA Monterey conduct night audits to help further reduce utility consumption.

Public-Private Venture Family Housing
We assessed the Army’s execution of Public-Private Venture (PPV) family housing and Presidio of Monterey barracks that house Sailors attending the Defense Language Institute (DLI) as part of our overall QOL assessment. We observed that the PPV family housing program is effective; occupancy rates hover around 90 percent, of which 22 percent of the resident population are civilian personnel. The Army management team prioritizes active duty personnel, followed by civilian NPS and DLI faculty members, and actively works to attract first responders (i.e. firemen and security) to fill remaining units offering a 15 percent discount. The overall condition of the housing at La Mesa is better than many similar PPV housing programs at other Navy installations.

Presidio of Monterey Barracks
Barracks are owned, operated, and maintained by the Army Installations Command at the Presidio of Monterey. Navy provides a barracks manager, who provides excellent assignment, maintenance tracking, and coordination functions. We observed that many Navy students are initially assigned to older barracks with common bath facilities for a period of 3-6 months, and then move to newer barracks configured for 2-3 students per room with a shared bath. The dated barracks are slated for demolition in FY17; Sailors will go directly to newly configured buildings at that time.
SECURITY PROGRAMS AND CYBERSECURITY/TECHNOLOGY

The Security Programs and Cybersecurity and Technology Team used survey and focus group responses, document review, and face-to-face interviews to assess the following areas:

- Information Security
- Personnel Security
- Industrial Security
- Physical Security and Antiterrorism/Force Protection
- Operations Security
- Counterintelligence Training and Support
- Cybersecurity
- Personally Identifiable Information
- Emergency Management

Command Security Overview

Overall NSA Monterey security responsibilities are centrally administered by CNRSW with the NSA Monterey Administrative Officer (AO) acting as the collateral Assistant Security Manager for the installation.

Because command security functions are centrally administered by CNRSW, NSA Monterey lacks its own security directive. This is contrary to the detailed requirements for a command security directive found in SECNAV M-5510.36, Department of the Navy Information Security Program, and SECNAV M-5510.30, Department of the Navy Personnel Security Program. With no local security directive, NSA Monterey-specific security practices are not codified. Examples include processing of visitors, check-in/out procedures, areas designated as off-limits to visitors, and others.
**Information Security**

The NSA Monterey Information Security Program is not fully compliant with SECNAV M-5510.36. NSA Monterey lacks a command-specific security directive, which delineates NSA Monterey-specific policies. Other deficiencies are listed below.

**Deficiency 20.** NSA Monterey does not have a local security directive in place as a supplement to the Navy Information Security policy. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Exhibit 2A.

**Deficiency 21.** NSA Monterey does not have a written MOA or Security Servicing Agreement with CNRSW or NPS articulating security function support provided to the installation. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2-10.

**Deficiency 22.** NSA Monterey does not ensure military and civilian personnel whose duties significantly involve the handling, creation, or management of classified information are documented on performance evaluations. References: DoDM 5200.01-V1, DoD Information Security Program: Overview, Classification, and Declassification, Enclosure 2, paragraph 7h; SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 2-2, paragraph 2k; and SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2.1, paragraph 5h.

**Personnel Security**

NSA Monterey’s Personnel Security program is not fully compliant with SECNAV M-5510.30. The installation lacks a command-specific security directive delineating NSA Monterey-specific policies. Additionally, NSA Monterey was slow to report unfavorable employee information when timely reporting was appropriate.

The NSA Monterey AO does not have access to either the Joint Personnel Adjudication System (JPAS) or the Clearance Adjudication Tracking System (CATS). For all personnel security-related actions, NSA Monterey relies on CNRSW to provide required support. The lack of an onsite personnel security servicing capability, exacerbated by the AO not having access to required databases, brings into question NSA Monterey’s ability to perform timely, effective, and responsive continuous evaluation of NSA Monterey personnel, as required by SECNAV M-5510.30. Other deficiencies are listed below.

**Deficiency 23.** NSA Monterey does not have a local security directive in place as a supplement to the Navy Personnel Security policy. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C.

**Deficiency 24.** NSA Monterey was slow to report unfavorable information concerning a member of the command who had access to classified information, to the DoD Central Adjudication Facility via JPAS. Information was put into CATS vice JPAS, the system of record. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 10-5.

**Recommendation 19.**

**Industrial Security**

Although NSA Monterey does not require an Industrial Security program, we recommend the security instruction be updated to reflect guidance for future compliance in the event a classified contract is required.

**Recommendation 20.** That NSA Monterey include provisions for industrial and contracting services, to include Contract Security Classification Specification forms (DD Form 254) procedures, in the installation’s security directives.
Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection

The installation AT plan is missing required elements
• An ineffective key and lock program
• Key and Lock program: Numerous gates were observed to have daisy-chained locks from multiple agencies.

NSA Monterey has agreements in place and enjoys a solid working relationship with local law enforcement. In addition, they have coordinated additional physical security support from the U.S. Army Garrison Presidio of Monterey. We observed quick and effective coordination between NSA Monterey and the Monterey Police Department in response to an incident that occurred during our inspection.

Deficiency 26. NSA Monterey does not have an effective Key and Lock Control program. Reference: OPNAVINST 5530.14A CH-2, Enclosure (1), Article 0209, paragraph a(1).

Deficiency 27. NSA Monterey is not using the Data Housing and Reporting Tool (DHART) to track NSF qualifications and individual sustainment training. Reference: CNICINST 3502.2, Navy Security Force Shore Training Manual, Enclosure (1), Articles 0301, 0401, and 1102.

Deficiency 28. NSA Monterey does not have a list of all restricted areas in writing from its tenant commands. Reference: OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2, Enclosure (1), Article 0210, paragraphs g(1) and g(6).


Deficiency 30. The NSA Monterey AT plan has not been fully exercised. Reference: DoDI 2000.16, Standard 7 (AT Plan) and Standard 23 (AT Training and Exercises).

Deficiency 31. The NSA Monterey AT plan does not address all required program elements. Reference: OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2, Enclosure (1), Article 0201, paragraphs a and b(4).

Deficiency 32. The NSA Monterey barrier plan is not executable as written; it lacks specific implementation details. References: DoD 5200.08-R CH-1, Section C3.4.2.4; DoDI 2000.16, Enclosure 3, DoD Standard 13 (AT Physical Security Measures).


**Operations Security**

OPSEC at NSA Monterey is not fully compliant with OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Operations Security. NSA Monterey has a commanding officer approved Critical Information List (CIL), but we did not find that the CIL was readily in use or available to its workforce. Our review of NSA Monterey’s OPSEC program found that the program lacks coordination and synchronization of OPSEC efforts between NSA Monterey and tenant commands, as required by OPNAVINST 3432.1A.
The NSA Monterey OPSEC officer is not involved in required OPSEC reviews of contracts due to the contracting function being handled by CNRSW. Given the lack of local OPSEC officer involvement, we are not confident that appropriate OPSEC reviews for protecting installation specific critical information for NSA Monterey contracts is being accomplished.

**Deficiency 37.** NSAMINST 3431.1, Operations Security (OPSEC) Plan does not have all the required elements of an OPSEC instruction. Reference: OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5n.

**Deficiency 38.** The OPSEC Officer could not show that OPSEC Programs and plans are exercised or evaluated through regular assessments. Reference: OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5f.

**Deficiency 39.** The OPSEC Officer has not conducted an annual assessment of the command’s OPSEC Program. References: NPSINST 3432.1A, paragraph 5c; and OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5e.

**Deficiency 40.** NSA Monterey does not coordinate with tenant command OPSEC Program Managers/Assistants to implement OPSEC awareness, training, and assessments. Reference: OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5i.

**Deficiency 41.** NSA Monterey OPSEC officer has not attended the OPSEC fundamental training course. Reference: DoDM 5205.02M, DoD Operations Security (OPSEC) Program Manual, Enclosure 7, paragraphs 2a and 2b.

**Deficiency 42.** The NSA Monterey OPSEC officer and Security Manager are not involved in the review process of information intended for public release. References: DoDM 5205.02-M, DoD Operations Security (OPSEC) Program Manual, Enclosure 5, paragraph 1a; and OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5n(3).

**Deficiency 43.** NSA Monterey does not conduct required specialized training for OPSEC program managers/coordinators, contracting specialists, and personnel responsible for the review and approval of information intended for public release. References: DoDD 5205.02E, DoD Operations Security (OPSEC) Program, Enclosure 2, paragraph 11(l); and CJCSI 3213.01D, Enclosure A, paragraph 6i(2).

**Deficiency 44.** The NSA Monterey CIL is not disseminated throughout the command to ensure all personnel know what information is deemed critical by the commander and thus requires protection. Reference: DoDM 5205.02-M, Appendix 1 to Enclosure 3, paragraph 2a(5).

**Recommendation 22.** That NSA Monterey re-perform the OPSEC planning process, to include updating its CIL, to reflect both installation and tenant command capabilities, and critical information.

**Counterintelligence (CI) Training and Support**

CI training to NSA Monterey personnel is performed by the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS) Monterey Resident Agent and is compliant with DoDD 5240.06, Counterintelligence Awareness and Reporting (CIAR).

**Cybersecurity**

NSA Monterey’s cybersecurity program is completely administered and supported by NPS; our assessment of NPS Cybersecurity is covered in our NPS 2016 Command Inspection report.
Personally Identifiable Information

NSA Monterey Personally Identifiable Information (PII) program is compliant per SECNAVINST 5211.5E, Department of the Navy (DON) Privacy Program. CNRSW provides PII program management and support for NSA Monterey. We found a number of shredders that do not meet the minimum standards for PII destruction; however, the command had posted signs above each shredder indicating those not intended for PII. A best practice is to procure shredders that are listed on the National Security Agency (NSA) Evaluated Products List (EPL).

Recommendation 23. That NSA Monterey replace existing shredders that are inadequate for PII destruction with shredders specified on the NSA EPL.

Emergency Management

Emergency Management (EM) at NSA Monterey is not fully compliant with OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Department of the Navy Emergency Management Program. NSA Monterey is designated by CNRSW as a Group 3 installation, as defined by CNI Instruction 3440.17, Navy Installation Emergency Management (EM) Program. Group 3 installations are protected primarily through integration of existing organic capabilities into the appropriate state/local community’s EM program. The EM Manager is experienced;

Deficiency 45. The Emergency Manager has not developed resource management objectives nor implemented resource management procedures. References: DoDI 6055.17, DoD Installation Management Program, Enclosure 3, paragraph 4b(1); and OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 2c.

Deficiency 47. NSA Monterey has not held quarterly EM working group meetings on a consistent basis. Reference: OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 7b.

Deficiency 49. The Category 5 personnel training program does not result in certification to the maximum extent possible. Reference: OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 9a.

Deficiency 50. NSA Monterey does not ensure tenant EAPs comply with 29 CFR 1910.38 and align with the installation EM plan. Reference: OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2) paragraph 7k.

Recommendation 24. That NSA Monterey coordinate with CNRSW and local/state law enforcement to enhance communications interoperability capabilities for public safety response.
COMPLIANCE AND PREVENTION, QUALITY OF LIFE, AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

The Compliance and Prevention, QOL, and Community Support Team assessed 17 areas and programs. The findings reflect responses from survey respondents, onsite focus group participants, document review, facility site visits, and face-to-face personnel interviews. These are programs designed to comply with Navy regulations, prevent or respond to adverse events, foster QOL, and provide necessary community services. We reviewed the following programs and functions:

- Compliance and Prevention Programs
  - Casualty Assistance Calls Program
  - Command Managed Equal Opportunity
  - Hazing Policy Training and Compliance
  - Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
  - Overseas Screening
  - Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program
  - Suicide Prevention Program
  - Transition GPS

- Quality of Life Programs
  - Morale, Welfare, and Recreation
  - Navy Exchange/Commissary

- Community Support Programs
  - Base Legal Support
  - Child and Youth Programs/Child Development Centers
  - Fleet and Family Support Center
  - Medical/Dental Support
  - Navy College/Education Services
  - Religious Support
  - Installation Voting Assistance

Transition GPS; Morale, Welfare, and Recreation; Commissary; Navy Exchanges; Child Development Centers (CDC); Fleet and Family Support Center; Religious Support; and medical and dental activities collectively support the NSA Monterey community. Programs with identified concerns are addressed in the following sections.

Casualty Assistance Calls Program

NSA Monterey is not compliant with MILPERSMAN 1770, Morale and Personal Affairs, and CNICINST 1770.2, Causality Assistance Calls Program. NSA Monterey does not have a designated Casualty Assistant Calls Officer (CACO), nor is the command performing assigned CACO functions. There are no training records on file. Although a 15 October 2015 memorandum for the record signed by NPS Chief of Staff states that NPS will perform CACO functions for NSA Monterey, a formal MOU between the two commands is necessary to properly codify this arrangement.

Deficiency 51. NSA Monterey does not have a designated CACO and is not performing assigned command CACO functions. Reference: MILPERSMAN 1770-160, Paragraph 3.
**Command Managed Equal Opportunity**

NSA Monterey is not compliant with CMEO instruction requirements. NSA Monterey’s command climate assessment, Equal Opportunity/sexual harassment grievances, higher level reviews, and training are handled at the regional level. This does not meet the intent of the existing policy to ensure accountability at the appropriate level.

**Deficiency 52.** NSA Monterey does not have a CMEO program in place that complies with existing regulations. Reference: OPNAVINST 5354.1F, paragraph 7k.

**Recommendation 25.** That NSA Monterey coordinate with the Region to build an organic CMEO program that is compliant with the law and Navy regulations.

**Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention**

NSA Monterey’s small number of military staff make it difficult to run an organic Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention program. Command Drug and Alcohol Program Advisor (DAPA) services are provided by the regional DAPA with a mutual, informal agreement to utilize the NPS DAPA in the event of an alcohol related incident, positive urinalysis report, or when training is required. In turn, the NPS DAPA receives support from the regional Alcohol and Drug Control Officer for DAPA and Urinalysis programs. This arrangement is logical, but requires formal codification.

**Recommendation 26.** That NSA Monterey develop an MOA with NPS to codify mutual DAPA support.

**Sexual Assault Prevention and Response**

The NSA Monterey Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) program is not compliant with governing instructions. Our engagement with NSA Monterey confirmed that the command is committed to maintaining an environment free of sexual assault and that victims would undoubtedly receive excellent care and support services. However, NSA Monterey effectively had no SAPR program until the hiring of a new installation Sexual Assault Response Coordinator (SARC) in September 2015, and appointment of a command SAPR POC in January 2016. The SARC and SAPR POC self-identified several deficiencies and initiated corrective actions prior to our visit. NSA Monterey does not have a SAPR instruction, but a draft instruction is in review.

NSA Monterey lacks sufficient staff to meet the requirement for two SAPR unit victim advocates. NSA Monterey leadership and the SARC have engaged with NPS to provide the required SAPR VA support. This relationship needs to be codified in a MOU.

SAPR training is required for military, civilians and for civilians who supervise service members. There was no evidence of FY14, FY15, or FY16 SAPR training completion.

NSA Monterey has not conducted watchstander training for its Command Duty Officers (CDOs). After normal working hours, CDOs maintain a phone watch from their residence. There were no watchstander response protocols in place to aid watchstanders to properly respond to reports of sexual assault and other critical incidents that require an immediate command response. We recommend personnel complete watchstander training prior to being assigned to the CDO watchbill and that NSA Monterey provide CDOs with critical incident reporting response tools. During our visit, five of six CDOs received watchstander training, and a CDO binder with protocols was developed.
The NSA Monterey Commanding Officer, Deputy, and Senior Enlisted Leader did not receive the Military Rules of Evidence (MRE) 514 brief from the Staff Judge Advocate (SJA) within 30 days of the commanding officer assuming command as required by DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program Procedures; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Sexual Assault Prevention and Response; and OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Navy Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program.

NSA Monterey did not conduct the one time required review of the Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) of all permanently assigned and newly transferred personnel to determine if any service member had any documented field code 91 (FC 91) entries in accordance with NAVADMIN 025/15, Updated Guidance for the Inclusion and Command Review of Information on Sex-Related Offenses in Personnel Service Records. Commanders, commanding officers, and officers in charge are required to review all documents in FC 91 for all newly reporting personnel within 30 days of checking onboard, in accordance with OPNAVINST 1752.1C.

**Deficiency 53.** NSA Monterey has not codified SAPR VA support with NPS in a MOU. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (2), paragraph 6j, Enclosure (5) paragraphs 3k and 4a-c; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (5), paragraph 3k; OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraphs 8k(1-4), 13d, 14c-d, 15l(3), and Appendix 2B (page 2B-2).

**Deficiency 54.** NSA Monterey has not completed required SAPR training for military, civilians, and for civilians who supervise service members. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (10), paragraphs 1b and 2b; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (3), paragraph 2d; OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraphs 1, 15ac, Appendix 2B (page 2B-3), and Chapter 10.

Deficiency 55. NSA Monterey did not conduct formal watchstander training to ensure proper response protocols are in place to respond to reports of sexual assault. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (5), paragraph 2a and Enclosure (10), paragraph 2d; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (3), paragraph 2c (1), Enclosure (5), paragraph 3a, and Enclosure (10), paragraph 2d.

Deficiency 56. NSA Monterey has not developed proper crisis response protocols for watchstanders to respond to reports of sexual assault. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (5), paragraph 3a and Enclosure (10), paragraph 2d; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (3), paragraph 2c (1), Enclosure (5), paragraph 3a, and Enclosure (10), paragraph 2d.

Deficiency 57. NSA Monterey Commanding Officer, Deputy, and Senior Enlisted Leader did not receive the required MRE 514 privilege brief from the SJA within 30 days of the commanding officer assuming command. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (5), paragraph 3b; SECNAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (5), paragraph 3b; OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraph 15b and Appendix 2B (page 2B-1).

Deficiency 58. NSA Monterey did not conduct the required one time mandatory review of each service member’s OMPF by 3 April 2015 for notation of sex-related offenses. Reference: NAVADMIN 025/15.

Deficiency 59. NSA Monterey does not conduct a command review of all Sex Offense Accountability Record (NAVPERS 1070/887) or FC 91 documents in OMPF for permanently assigned and newly transferred personnel. Reference: OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraph 15ab, and Appendix 2B (page 2B-1).

**Recommendation 27.** That NSA Monterey update NSAMNOTE 5420 to reflect SARC and SAPR POC responsibilities.

**Recommendation 28.** That NSA Monterey Fleet and Family Support update the SAPR Standard Operating Procedures to accurately reflect the relationship and monthly meeting requirements.
Recommendation 29. That NSA Monterey provide SAPR training to all newly reporting personnel.

Recommendation 30. That NSA Monterey add SAPR requirements to its watchstander Personnel Qualification Standards (PQS).

Suicide Prevention

The NSA Monterey Suicide Prevention program is not compliant with governing instructions. During our inspection, we observed that while some elements of an effective Suicide Prevention program were in place, several deficiencies were identified. NSAMINST 1720.1, Suicide Prevention, Crisis Response and Intervention Plan, dated 13 March 2013, and NSA Monterey Standard Operating Procedure – Suicide Prevention, dated 10 February 2016, require updates to align with DON policy. A crisis intervention plan needs to be established in order to support those who seek help, and take appropriate safety measures for those at high-risk, as required by OPNAVINST 1720.4A, Suicide Prevention Program.

There was no evidence of Suicide Prevention training completion for FY14, FY15, or FY16 for military, civilians, and full-time contractors. NSA Monterey self-identified that while they are providing training at NPS for military personnel, they are not providing training for civilians and full time contractors, and they do not document staff training completion.

NSA Monterey senior leadership does not regularly publish messages, information, or guidance concerning Suicide Prevention. In addition, Suicide Prevention been not been incorporated into Health Promotion/Life Skills training. There was limited evidence of Suicide Prevention resources and local contact information posted in public locations, such as MWR facilities or other NSA Monterey establishments. This is required to support individuals who may be at risk or want to seek help.

The Suicide Prevention Coordinator (SPC) and Assistant SPC were appointed in writing in August 2014, but did not complete requisite training requirements until February 2016.

NSA Monterey conducts formal CDO training; however, there are no crisis response protocols in place. We recommend that the command provide critical incident reporting response tools to support watchstanders ability to properly respond to suicide behavior related calls and other command critical incident reporting requirements. A watchstander binder was implemented during our visit.

Deficiency 60. NSAMINST 1720.1 is not aligned with DON policy and requires revision. Reference: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraphs 5b (1), Enclosure (3), paragraphs 4, 6, 9, and 11.

Deficiency 61. NSA Monterey does not have a written safety plan that incorporates identification, referral, and access to treatment and follow-up procedures for personnel who indicate a heightened risk of suicide. Reference: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 5b(1), and Enclosure (3), paragraphs 4, 6, 9, and 11.

Deficiency 62. NSA Monterey military, civilian, and full-time contractor personnel have not completed required Suicide Prevention training. Reference: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 5a (1), 6h (3), Enclosure 3, paragraph 1.

Deficiency 63. NSA Monterey does not regularly publish Suicide Prevention guidance or messages, nor do they incorporate Suicide Prevention as a component of Health Promotion/Life Skills training. Reference: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraphs 5a(2, 3) and 6h(4), and Enclosure (3), paragraph 2.
Deficiency 64. NSA Monterey does not post information concerning suicide prevention resources and local contact information throughout the installation. Reference: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 5c, and Enclosure (3), paragraphs 5 and 10.

Deficiency 65. NSA Monterey’s SPC and Assistant SPC were not trained as soon as possible following appointment. Reference: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 6i(2).

Deficiency 66. NSA Monterey did not ensure proper crisis response protocols were in place for watchstanders to respond to suicide-related behavior calls. Reference: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraphs 5b(1), 5c, Enclosure (3), paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 10, and 11.

Recommendation 31. That NSA Monterey provide Suicide Prevention training for all newly reporting personnel.

Recommendation 32. That NSA Monterey SPC and Assistant SPC complete the Department of Defense Suicide Event Reporting (DoDSER) training.

Recommendation 33. That NSA Monterey add Suicide Prevention requirements to its watchstander PQS.

Navy College/Education Services
The NSA Monterey Navy College office (NCO) is compliant with the governing instructions; however, it may be understaffed. NSA Monterey is served by the NCO at NAS Lemoore and billeted for three full-time equivalents (FTE) personnel, but is currently manned solely with the program director for 133 Unit Identification Codes consisting of approximately 6,000 active duty personnel. The program manager is providing NCO services, but is struggling to keep up with the demand. She has not been able to attend indoctrination briefs at NSA Monterey or conduct outreach, but instead relies on constituents visiting the NCO website.

Recommendation 34. That NSA Monterey NCO consider hiring additional staff to better meet serviced population needs.

Child and Youth Programs/Child Development Centers
NSA Monterey generally has excellent Child and Youth Programs/Child Development Centers (CYP/CDCs). However, during our visit, the CYP/CDC front-line staff was unable to show adequate EAPs in their SOPs. The SOPs provided discourse on mobilization and contingency plans following an emergency; however, there were no written procedures to handle an emergency if it occurs.

Deficiency 67. NSA Monterey CYP/CDCs emergency action plans are inadequate. Reference: CNICINST 1710.3, paragraph 105c.

Medical/Dental Support
Focus group participants and a number of leaders noted that timely access to medical care is a significant issue at NSA Monterey. Medical care for active duty members is provided by the Presidio of Monterey Army Health Clinic. The Navy Medical Admin Unit (NMAU), a detachment from Naval Hospital Lemoore, serves Navy commands by assisting with appointments, facilitating readiness tasks, and managing Navy medical board processing. We observed an impressive level of cooperation between the Army Health Clinic and the NMAU, who work together proactively to develop creative solutions to address their beneficiary populations concerns and efficiently leverage limited resources. The Army Health Clinic and NMAU are working a number of initiatives to address access to care concerns, including hiring additional primary care providers, training appointment clerks, managing appointment
templates more efficiently, educating patients on urgent care alternatives, and developing a Readiness Clinic to relieve routine readiness task responsibilities from the clinic.

**Recommendation 35.** That NSA Monterey continue engagement with the Army Health Clinic and NMAU to monitor progress in addressing access to health care concerns.

**Overseas Screening**
The overseas screening process involves a number of entities at the installation and command level. The NMAU is providing excellent service to NSA Monterey commands; however, in order to ensure that the process is working, SECNAVINST 5300.39 requires that overseas suitability screening be an assessable unit in the installation Managers’ Internal Control (MIC) program.

**Deficiency 68.** CNRSW has not identified the overseas suitability program as an assessable unit in the NSA Monterey MIC. Reference: SECNAVINST 5300.39, paragraph 4a(3).

**Religious Support**
NSA Monterey has one Religious Ministry team (RMT) that consists of two chaplains, a religious Program Specialist, and a contract Roman Catholic Priest. The RMT is meeting the religious needs of the NSA Monterey and tenant command population, numbering about 5,000 authorized personnel. The RMT expressed concerns that one Chaplain billet would be gapped in summer 2016 and that CNIC may shift the billet to another location within its enterprise. Prior to the stand-up of NSA Monterey, one of the Chaplains was a billeted as an Ethics instructor at NPS; an option to retain two Chaplains in Monterey is to re-instate the Ethics instructor duty requirement at NPS.

**Installation Voting Assistance Program**
The NSA Monterey Installation Voting Assistance (IVA) office is located in Building 271, but is not clearly advertised that it serves as the IVA office. No posters or advertisements were located in key installation areas or Annex locations to advertise the location. The IVA email address was tested, but the IVA officer failed to meet the required return contact timelines. The email address listed on the Federal Voting Assistance Program portal connects to the CNIC Voting Program office, not the installation. Since all emails had to be forwarded or redirected to the installation, this delayed the IVA officer’s response. Since the inspection, a technical solution has been implemented to allow all installations to receive emails directly, eliminating potential time delays and reducing response times from the IVA office.

**Deficiency 69.** NSA Monterey IVA office is not located in a well-advertised location or physically co-located with an existing office that receives extensive visits by service (Air Force, Army, Cost Guard, and Marine) personnel, family members, and DoD civilians. Reference: DoD 1000.04, Enclosure (4), paragraph 2c(3).

**Deficiency 70.** NSA Monterey IVA officer does not maintain posted hours to provide direct registration and voting procedure assistance. Reference: Memorandum For Senior Service Voting Representatives Of The Military Departments; Subject: Installation Voter Assistance Office Expectations, October 15, 2013.

**Deficiency 71.** NSA Monterey IVA office voicemails were not returned within three business days. Reference: Memorandum for Senior Service Voting Representatives of the Military Departments; Subject: Installation Voter Assistance Office Expectation, October 15, 2013.

**Deficiency 72.** NSA Monterey IVA office did not return emails within three business days. Reference: Memorandum for Senior Service Voting Representatives of the Military Departments; Subject: Installation Voter Assistance Office Expectations, October 15, 2013.
SENIOR ENLISTED ENGAGEMENT
The NAVINSGEN Command Master Chief (CMDCM) engaged in with local Senior Enlisted Leaders (SEL) to get a sense of the quality of family life and the single Sailor experience at NSA Monterey. The NAVINSGEN CMDCM also participated in focus groups with spouses and Ombudsmen.

Sailors reported that career management programs were well established and no junior or senior enlisted personnel communication barriers were identified. CPO 365 events are held on a regular basis, hosted by the Center for Information Dominance Unit at Presidio of Monterey, and are well attended.

The Fleet and Family Service Center conducts training and certification for Ombudsmen. An inaugural online Ombudsman assembly is planned and all San Francisco area Ombudsmen are expected to be invited.

The top concern shared by Sailors and Ombudsmen was Monterey’s high cost of living and the associated impact on junior Sailors. The SEL concurred with issues brought forward by Sailors and Ombudsman in our survey and focus groups.

NSA Monterey does not have a Command Indoctrination program principally due to its small size. Enlisted Sailors are provided a check-in sheet and attend the NPS Command Indoctrination sessions on an ad hoc basis. We recommend a check-in sheet that meets indoctrination-training requirements and includes interviews with program managers to acclimate new personnel to NSA Monterey processes. This has proven effective at other similarly sized commands.

Our overall assessment is that foundational programs established to support Sailor career development are effective, and adequate services are being provided in support of active duty personnel and their dependents in the Monterey area. Uniforms, grooming, and military bearing met standards.
Appendix A: Summary of Key Survey Results

PRE-EVENT SURVEY

In support of the NSA Monterey Area Visit held from 14-18 March 2016, NAVINSGEN conducted an anonymous online survey of active duty military and Navy civilian personnel from 25 January to 26 February 2016. The survey produced 321 respondents (78 military, 243 civilian). According to reported demographics, the sample represented the NSA Monterey workforce with a better than a 1 percent margin of error at the 99 percent confidence level. Selected topics are summarized in the sections below. A frequency report is provided in Appendix C.

Quality of Life

QOL was assessed using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is worst and 10 is best. The overall NSA Monterey area average QOWL, 6.63, was higher than the historical area visit average, 6.39 (Figure A-1). The overall NSA Monterey average QOHL, 8.1, was higher than historical area visit average, 7.18 (Figure A-2).

Figure A-1. Distribution of QOWL from the pre-event survey. The x-axis lists the rating scale and the y-axis represents the number of survey respondents. Response percentages for ratings are shown at the base of each bar. Counts for each rating are shown above each bar. The most frequent rating is shown in blue.
The perceived impact of factors on the QOWL rating is summarized in Table A-1. Factors of potential concern were identified by distributional analyses, where 20 percent negative responses served as a baseline. Four factors listed in Table A-1 were significantly higher overall than this baseline. Overall, leadership support, advancement opportunities, command morale, and command climate were identified as having an overall negative impact on QOWL. Closer examination reveals that civilian and female respondents influenced this result. Civilians more often identified leadership support, leadership opportunities, advancement opportunities, command morale, command climate, and quality of workplace facilities as negative impacts on QOWL than military respondents (see highlighted percentages in the “Military” and “Civilian” columns of Table A-1). Females more often identified leadership opportunities and command climate as negative impacts on QOWL (see highlighted percentages in the “Male” and “Female” columns of Table A-1).

Table A-1. Negative Impacts on Quality of Work Life Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunities</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of workday</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement opportunities</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and recognition</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command morale</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command climate</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of workplace facilities</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Perceived impact of assessed factors on QOWL rating based on negative versus aggregate positive and neutral response. Low percentages are "better." Overall values in bold are significantly different than a 20% baseline; higher values in bold indicate significant differences between subgroups.
There was a follow-up question relating to the SAPR program as to how it impacts QOWL, “Briefly describe why you disagreed or strongly disagreed that your command has an effective SAPR program.” There were only a few responses to this question; however, the comments are worth noting. A sample includes: “Overwhelming climate of fear, favoritism, and retribution.” “I can only address the training I receive, as I have not had interactions with other aspects of the program. The training only emphasizes outsiders being responsible to disrupt a potential incident, rather than focusing on perpetrators being held accountable and persecuted to the full extent of the law.” “The Navy’s SAPR program is ineffective.” “The training appears designed to allow someone high in the organization to say they provide training. Like most DoD administrative training, it is a waste of time.”

The perceived impact of factors on QOHL life rating is summarized in Table A-2. Only one of the factors is significantly different from the 20 percent baseline. The cost of living (63 percent) was rated as having a negative impact on QOHL. This result suggests that participants overall are not experiencing negative impacts to QOHL. While this is true for this set of survey questions, within the general comments participants expressed some areas of negative impacts to QOHL. There were some concerns regarding the Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) as not sufficient and the cost of living being too high. “The BAH rate is not adequate for the current rental rates.” “BAH [is] completely inadequate to afford housing on economy, making privatized military housing the only option.” “Cost of living in this area is a major concern of mine. It is very difficult to find a suitable home that does not take up the entire BAH amount. COLA would be another option to offset financial burden of living in Monterey.”

### Table A-2. Impact of Factors on Quality of Home Life Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of home</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of school for dependent children</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of childcare available</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping &amp; dining opportunities</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation opportunities</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to spouse employment</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to medical/dental care</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** Perceived impact of factors on quality of home life rating based on negative verses aggregate positive and neutral (Other) responses. Negative values in bold are significantly different than a 20% baseline.

### Area Job Importance and Workplace Behaviors

Table A-3 lists aggregate ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ response percentages to survey questions addressing perceived job importance, and whether fraternization, favoritism, gender/sex discrimination, sexual harassment, or hazing occurs at NSA Monterey. Overall area visit percentages over a 5-year period are shown for comparison. Excepting job importance, lower values are “better.” Perceived fraternization, favoritism, gender/sex discrimination, race discrimination and hazing at NSA Monterey was significantly lower than the 5-year area visit value. The remaining factors were comparable to the 5-year area visit averages.
Table A-3. Perceived Job Importance and Occurrence of Workplace Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Topic</th>
<th>NSA Monterey%</th>
<th>Area Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Importance</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternization</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Sex Discrimination</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Discrimination</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazing</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Aggregate strongly agree and agree (SA+A) response percentages for selected command climate topics. Area Visit percentages from FY10-15. Excepting Job Importance, lower percentages are “better.” Bold values indicate a significantly different distribution of SA+A responses than Area Visit.

Area Support and Services
Satisfaction with area support and services was assessed using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is worst and 10 is best. The average ratings for the various area support and services were above a 6.5 baseline on this 10-point scale. The bullets below illustrate the various area support services surveyed. Additional analysis revealed the following amplification of each of the area support and services. Medical appointment availability was a concern for 42 percent of the survey participants. Some survey participants (35 percent) negatively rated the variety of merchandise at the Navy Exchange. More than a third of the survey participants (38 percent) rated the affordability of housing negatively.

- Fleet and Family Support Center; 7.49
- Morale, Welfare, and Recreation; 7.58
- Navy Exchange; 6.81
- Commissary; 7.40
- Healthcare Benefits; 7.06
- Family Healthcare Benefits; 6.55
- Child Development Center; 7.43
- Residence; 7.14

Mission Tools & Resources
Below is a list with aggregate ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘disagree’ response percentages to survey questions probing the adequacy of tools and resources that support the mission. Items of potential concern were identified by distributional analyses, where 20 percent negative responses served as a baseline.

- I work more hours than I report in a pay period because I cannot complete all assigned tasks during scheduled work hours (46 percent strongly disagree and disagree).
- My position description is current and accurately describes my functions, tasks, and responsibilities (29 percent strongly disagree and disagree).
- The Human Resource Service Center provides timely, accurate response to my queries (56 percent strongly disagree and disagree).
- My (local) Human Resource Office provides timely, accurate response to my queries (42 percent strongly disagree and disagree).
• My command/organization conducts recruitment actions fairly and fill job vacancies with the best-qualified candidate (38 percent strongly disagree and disagree).
• My current workweek affords enough time to complete mission tasks in a timely manner while maintaining an acceptable work-home life balance (26 percent strongly disagree and disagree).
Appendix B: Summary of Focus Group Perceptions

FOCUS GROUPS
On 8 March 2016, NAVINSGEN conducted focus groups with various active duty military (14), Ombudsmen (1) and civilian personnel (65) for a total of 80 participants. Each focus group was scheduled for 60 minutes and included one facilitator and two note takers. The facilitator followed a protocol script: (a) NAVINSGEN personnel introductions, (b) brief introduction to the NAVINSGEN mission, (c) privacy, non-attribution, and basic ground rules statements, (d) participant-derived list of topics having the most impact on the mission, job performance, or QOL, and (e) subsequent discussion of participant-derived topics with an emphasis on refinement and understanding of perceived impact. Focus group participants were asked to characterize as major, moderate or minor the impact on the mission, job performance, and/or QOL for each topic using a standardized Impact Matrix, see Matrix B-1. Note takers transcribed focus group proceedings, which were subsequently coded by NAVINSGEN staff to protect the confidentiality of participants.

Matrix B-1. Area Visit Impact Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>• Severe negative impact on command climate or quality of life</td>
<td>• Negatively impacts the mission, job performance, or quality of life, but does not meet any of the Major impact requirements</td>
<td>• General distractor that does not meet the Moderate impact standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unable to accomplish a mission or task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accepted substantial risk to accomplish an assigned mission or task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deferred key mission readiness tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clearly violates law or regulation (e.g., Title 10, U.S.C, 32 CFR) or Navy policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>• Outstanding aspect of command climate or quality of life</td>
<td>• Positively impacts mission, job performance, or quality of life, but does not meet any of the Major impact requirements</td>
<td>• General positive effect that does not meet the Moderate impact standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Table B-1 lists focus group topics that were expressed as having a major impact on the mission, job performance, or QOL in at least two groups.

**Table B-1.** Participant-Derived Focus Group Topics Expressed as a Major Impact on the Mission, Job Performance, or Quality of Life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manning/Manpower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay/Compensation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Descending order of the number of focus group/interview topics that were expressed as a major impact on the mission, job performance, and/or quality of life in at least two military or civilian groups; colored arrows indicate active duty military (↑) or civilian (↓). An arrow pointing up indicates a positive impact. An arrow pointing down is a negative impact.

**Manning/Manpower**

The most discussed topic in focus groups was manning/manpower. Focus group participants commented on the lack of manpower within their organization, personnel cuts, and the changes in mission without changes to requirements. Participants expressed concerns about meeting workload demand. Overall, participants said that manning and manpower issues negatively impacted QOWL. The following are a few of the representative comments made by focus group participants.

Civilian comments (Security Department members): “We have experienced over 60% reduction in personnel.” “Reduction in manning has created the need for 12 hour shifts.” “We are unable to complete training during duty time, including weapons qualification for security personnel. Management personnel are forced to cover for shortages in security personnel.” “We barely have enough people to man the gate.”

Civilian comments (general): “Hiring personnel takes 6-8 months.” “Background checks are completed after people are on-boarded.” “The lack of manning is impacting training.” “Only have 75% of the people we need.” “It takes 6 to 9 months to hire replacements. As a result selected candidates are taking other jobs.”

Military comments: “It is hard to recruit due to the cost of living. We have luck with hiring local young people.” “There is a high vacancy rate - we can’t get well.” “There are military gapped billets. Some of our billets are filled by detailer for transition [retirement].”

**Pay and Compensation**

Participants expressed concerns about pay, cost of living, and BAH rates being inadequate and thus negatively impacting QOHL. The civilians most negatively impacted were Wage Grade employees.
military personnel most negatively impacted by the cost of living in Monterey were junior officers and enlisted.

Civilian comments: “Wage Grade employees do not get locality pay. They say our pay is equitable. If you compare local tradesmen in Monterey, I bet I am making below them. It is hard to keep guys here. An HVAC [repairman] is going to make $20 more per hour in San Francisco.” “[Wage Grades] don’t get locality pay. It is not fair and balanced.” “The lack of COLA causes disengagement and lack of quality among employees.” “Single family housing is high in this area. The only affordable housing in is located in high crime areas.” “The cost of living is a deterrent for obtaining quality personnel.”

Military comments: “It is expensive to live here. We should get COLA. Gas is higher, food is higher.” “COLA and BAH is based on the county. The decision on COLA and BAH does not take into account the cost of living in Monterey.” “The high cost of living could impact someone’s plans when you are looking to move here.” “A downshift in BAH may put you in the worse school system.” “Monterey is comparable to Hawaii. It is pretty expensive to live here.”

Security
Two focus groups, one military and one civilian, reported that security was a major negative impact on QOWL. The following are a sample of the comments.

Civilian comments: [b] [7][e]

Military comments: [b] [7][e]

Facilities
The general theme regarding facilities concerned aging building infrastructure. Two focus group participants indicated that facilities were a major negative impact on QOWL. The following are a sample of the types of concerns expressed by participants.

Civilian comments: “AC doesn’t always work.” “Window tenting would help with heat problem in my building.” “We need to be more energy conscious.” “Facilities are older and not all services are being provided.”

Military comments: “There are problems with roofs leaking.” “There is so much red tape to deal with contractors that it takes forever to get something fixed. To fix a window that was over our credit card limit, it took nearly a year. Expand the issue to a leaky roof.”
Workload
Two civilian focus groups indicated that workload had a major negative impact on QOWL. A sample of their comments follows. “TWMS and ESAMS training requirements add to our workload; but, we already have full workdays.” “We don’t have time to do training.” We have a constant stream of taskers. We are swimming already. These taskers are busy work.” “The wage survey was an enormous amount of work - all this work resulted in a 1/2% raise. 5 months prep work - lots of work for this small gain.” “We spend 50% of our time on taskers. They give unrealistic deadlines.” “People are working off-the-clock to get the work done resulting in breaking rules and causing stress.” “Our workload increase but no increase in FTEs.”
Appendix C: Survey Response Frequency Report

Numerical values in the following tables summarize survey responses to forced-choice questions as counts and/or percentages (%). Response codes are listed below in the order that they appear.

SD  Strongly Disagree
D   Disagree
N   Neither Agree nor Disagree...
A   Agree
SA  Strongly Agree

-   Negative
N   Neutral
+   Positive

N   Never
R   Rarely
S   Sometimes
F   Frequently
A   Always
On a scale from 1 (worst) to 10 (best), please rate your Quality of Work Life (QOWL). QOWL is the degree to which you enjoy where you work and the availability of opportunities for professional growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the factors below, please indicate whether they have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on your QOWL rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunities</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Hours/Schedule</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement opportunities</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and recognition</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command morale</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command climate</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of workplace facilities</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale from 1 (worst) to 10 (best), please rate your Quality of Home Life (QOHL). QOHL is the degree to which you enjoy where you live and the opportunities available for housing, recreation, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the factors below, please indicate whether they have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on your QOHL rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of home</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the school for dependent children</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the childcare available</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping &amp; dining opportunities</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to spouse employment</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to medical/dental care</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My command gives me sufficient time during working hours to participate in a physical readiness exercise program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My current workweek affords enough time to complete mission tasks in a timely manner while maintaining an acceptable work-home life balance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My position description is current and accurately describes my functions, tasks, and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I work more hours than I report in a pay period because I cannot complete all assigned tasks during scheduled work hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Human Resource Service Center provides timely, accurate responses to my queries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My (local) Human Resources Office provides timely, accurate responses to my queries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DON civilian recruitment process is responsive to my command’s civilian personnel requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the last performance evaluation cycle, my supervisor provided me with feedback that enabled me to improve my performance before my formal performance appraisal/EVAL/FITREP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am satisfied with the overall quality of my workplace facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate your satisfaction with your Child Development Center (CDC) on a scale of 1 (worst to 10 (best).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Availability of childcare services (regular &/or drop off) | 64% | 14% | 21%
Quality of childcare services (regular &/or drop off)     | 71% | 7%  | 21%
Cost of childcare services                               | 57% | 36% | 7%
Staff's customer service                                  | 71% | 14% | 14%
Hours of operation                                         | 71% | 21% | 7%

Rate your overall satisfaction with the Fleet Family Support Center (FFSC) services on a scale of 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family/Social Services available                           | 63% | 37% | 0%
Quality of services                                        | 68% | 21% | 11%
Appointment availability                                   | 58% | 39% | 3%
Staff's customer service                                   | 68% | 29% | 3%
Hours of operation                                         | 55% | 45% | 0%

Rate your overall satisfaction with your healthcare benefits on a scale of 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of healthcare services available                      | 55% | 29% | 17%
Appointment availability                                   | 38% | 34% | 29%
Waiting time                                               | 40% | 32% | 27%
Time with staff or care provider                            | 61% | 30% | 9%
Hours of operation                                         | 49% | 31% | 19%

Rate your overall satisfaction with your family's healthcare benefit on a scale of 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of healthcare services available                      | 48% | 32% | 19%
Appointment availability                                   | 38% | 34% | 29%
Waiting time                                               | 38% | 38% | 25%
Time with staff or care provider                            | 49% | 38% | 13%
Hours of operation                                         | 53% | 32% | 14%

Rate your overall satisfaction with the Morale Welfare and Recreation (MWR) services on a scale of 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Variety of MWR services available
- Quality: 65% (62), 27% (29), 8% (8)
- Cost: 67% (64), 30% (31), 3% (3)
- Hours of operation: 55% (53), 42% (42), 3% (3)

### Quality of services
- Quality: 67% (64), 28% (29), 5% (5)

### Cost
- Quality: 67% (64), 30% (31), 3% (3)

### Staff's customer service
- Quality: 77% (74), 23% (24), 0% (0)

### Hours of operation
- Quality: 55% (53), 42% (42), 3% (3)

### Rate your overall satisfaction with the Navy Exchange (NEX) on a scale of 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variety of merchandise selections
- Quality: 31% (28), 35% (33), 35% (33)

### Quality of merchandise selections
- Quality: 59% (56), 32% (30), 9% (9)

### Cost
- Quality: 56% (53), 39% (37), 5% (5)

### Staff's customer service
- Quality: 73% (70), 21% (20), 5% (5)

### Hours of operation
- Quality: 52% (49), 31% (30), 17% (17)

### Rate your overall satisfaction with the Commissary on a scale of 1 (worst) to 10 (best).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variety of products/produce/meats selection
- Quality: 52% (49), 35% (33), 13% (13)

### Quality of products/produce/meats selection
- Quality: 49% (46), 35% (33), 16% (16)

### Cost
- Quality: 76% (73), 19% (18), 5% (5)

### Staff's customer service
- Quality: 60% (57), 35% (33), 5% (5)

### Hours of operation
- Quality: 59% (56), 33% (32), 8% (8)

### Rate your overall satisfaction with your residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location of dwelling
- Quality: 91% (88), 5% (5), 4% (4)

### Quality of dwelling
- Quality: 57% (54), 29% (27), 14% (14)

### Affordability of the dwelling
- Quality: 23% (21), 39% (37), 38% (38)

### Within Basic Allowance for Housing amount
- Quality: 44% (41), 30% (29), 26% (26)

### Affordability of insurance
- Quality: 56% (53), 42% (40), 3% (3)

### Quality of neighborhood
- Quality: 81% (78), 14% (13), 5% (5)

### Safety and security
- Quality: 71% (68), 21% (20), 8% (8)

### School system
- Quality: 32% (30), 56% (54), 12% (12)

### My command is concerned about my safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### My job is important and makes a real contribution to my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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__________ is occurring at my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternization</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Sex Discrimination</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Discrimination</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazing</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have adequate leadership guidance to perform my job successfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My performance evaluations have been fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The awards and recognition program is fair and equitable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Military and civilian personnel work well together at my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My superiors treat me with respect and consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My command attempts to resolve command climate issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have adequate time at work to complete my General Military Training and/or mandatory civilian training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>